

8-1-2010

Qualitative and quantitative inquiry into the affective domain of preservice teachers enrolled in children's literature courses

Jennifer Augusta Davis-Duerr

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Davis-Duerr, Jennifer Augusta, "Qualitative and quantitative inquiry into the affective domain of preservice teachers enrolled in children's literature courses" (2010). *Dissertations*. Paper 103.

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. For more information, please contact Jane.Monson@unco.edu.

© 2010

JENNIFER DAVIS-DUERR

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Greeley, Colorado

The Graduate School

QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE INQUIRY INTO THE AFFECTIVE
DOMAIN OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS ENROLLED IN
CHILDREN'S LITERATURE COURSES

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Jennifer Davis-Duerr

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Teacher Education
Ed.D. Educational Studies: Reading

August, 2010

This Dissertation by: Jennifer Davis-Duerr
Entitled: *Qualitative and Quantitative Inquiry into the Affective Domain of Preservice Teachers Enrolled in Children's Literature Courses*

has been approved as meeting the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Education in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in the School of Teacher Education, Program of Educational Studies

Accepted by the Doctoral Committee

Michael F. Opitz, Ph.D., Chair

Alexander Sidorkin, Ph.D., Committee Member

Jennifer Harding-DeKam, Ed.D., Committee Member

Monica Geist, Ph. D., Faculty Representative

Date of Dissertation Defense _____

Accepted by the Graduate School

Robbyn R. Wacker, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice President of Research and Extended Studies
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Davis-Duerr, Jennifer. *Qualitative and Quantitative Inquiry into the Affective Domain of Preservice Teachers Enrolled in Children's Literature Courses*. Published Doctor of Education dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 2010.

Elementary teachers are in the position of inspiring young children to become lifelong readers. Some preservice teachers' do not possess a positive affective domain of reading to fill the role of an inspiring reading model in young children's lives. In this sequential explanatory mixed methods investigation, I detected and described six preservice teachers' affective domains of reading within three children's literature courses. I also described how experiences in children's literature courses contributed to preservice teachers' affective domains of reading. Mixed data collection and analyses of six preservice teachers revealed three typologies of preservice teacher readers: Confident Established Readers, Apprehensive Prospective Readers, and Striving Isolated Readers. Qualitative data collection and analyses of three children's literature instructors and the contexts of three children's literature courses resulted in findings indicating the pervasiveness of preservice teachers' affective domains of reading in these courses, and five ways instructors should address preservice teachers' affective domain of reading in literacy teacher preparation: a) investigate students' unique and complex affective domains of reading, b) act as a reading model and form relationships with all students, c) provide targeted text exposure, d) use flexible grouping to design purposeful small group activities, and e) include guided self-selected reading.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The process of writing this dissertation is a life story in and of itself, and one that is likely to be passed down for generations. Like all good stories, there were harrowing tales of desperate measures taken to conquer the seemingly impossible, that is completing the dissertation. This quest, like many, was far from a solitary feat. Therefore I must acknowledge the skills and efforts of those that have become my life's heroes and heroines.

First, I thank my committee members for their support, encouragement, knowledge and scrupulous attention to this work in all its many stages and drafts. I extend my gratitude to Dr. Jenni Harding-DeKam for her careful editing and thoughtful questions, to Dr. Alexander (Sasha) Sidorkin for his fresh perspective and prudent suggestions, and to Dr. Monica Geist for her research expertise and infectious enthusiasm.

Second, my outpouring of appreciation is bestowed upon my family and friends whose patience, love, and applause I collected continuously throughout my doctoral journey. Those desperate measures, such as my many sleepless nights, jam-packed days, and tearful challenges were undertaken only with the kind words and plentiful hugs from my husband, Sunny, daughter, Ellie, and innumerable dear friends. I am especially grateful to my dad, Fred, who raised me to strive for my dreams, and provided the support I needed to achieve them.

Most notably, I am indebted to Dr. Michael F. Opitz, whose heroic acts far exceeded those of many doctoral advisors, including countless hours of undivided attention to discussing this research, conferencing and revising my writing, encouraging me throughout the process, and guiding me toward success in academia. This dissertation was a success due to his generous contributions, which will live on through my continued journey in education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Rationale	3
	Need for the Study	7
	Statement of the Problem.....	7
	Purpose of the Study	10
	Research Questions.....	10
	Significance of the Study	10
	Overview of Remaining Chapters.....	11
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	12
	Introduction.....	12
	Preservice Teachers' Attitudes/Beliefs/Values in Reading	13
	Information Sources for Investigating Attitudes/Beliefs/Values in Reading	27
	Children's Literature Courses	34
	Chapter Summary	40
III.	METHODOLOGY	41
	Overview	41
	Introduction.....	41
	Rationale for Mixed Methods	43
	Researcher Stance	44
	Philosophical Stance	48
	Research Design Overview	59
	Data Collection and Analysis	71
	Validation Framework: Construct Validation.....	92
	Chapter Summary	111
IV.	FINDINGS	112

Overview.....	112
Research Question 1	113
Research Question 2	153
Research Question 3	176
Research Question 4	189
Summary of Findings.....	218
 V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 221
Overview.....	221
Research Questions.....	222
Overview of Procedures.....	222
Summary and Discussion of Findings	224
Conclusion	244
Implications	248
Recommendations for Future Research.....	250
 REFERENCES	 251
 APPENDIX A: SURVEY RATING SCALE.....	 273
 APPENDIX B: LETTERS OF CONSENT.....	 278
 APPENDIX C: RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF SURVEY RATING SCALE RESULTING FROM PILOT STUDY.....	 286

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Research Design for Data Collection and Analysis.....	72
Table 2: Weakness Minimization Legitimation	105
Table 3: Description of Dimensions	114
Table 4: Rating Scale Means and Standard Deviations	116
Table 5: Participant Survey Rating Scale Results	117
Table 6: Typology Descriptions	139
Table 7: Instructional Decisions Influenced by Affective Domain	190
Table 8: Participant Survey Rating Scale Proportional Results	231
Table 9: Pilot 1d Reliability Statistics of Adult Motivation for Reading Scale	288
Table 10: Pilot 1d Case Processing Summary	288
Table 11: Pilot 1d Adult Motivation for Reading Scale Item Total Statistics	289
Table 12: Pilot 1e Reliability Statistics of Adult Motivation for Reading Scale.....	290
Table 13: Pilot 1e Case Processing Summary	290
Table 14: Pilot 1e Adult Motivation for Reading Scale Item Total Statistics	291

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Research Design	60
Figure 2: Observation Protocol	82
Figure 3: Validation Framework	94
Figure 4: Inside-Outside Legitimation Framework	106
Figure 5: Children’s Literature Course Construction	246
Figure 6: Adult Motivation for Reading Scale	274

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

“I don’t really like to read. I wish I liked to read, but I don’t.” As I read these words from various undergraduate students in my teacher preparation courses, they conjured up over twenty-five years of memories, knitting a well worn scarf of “the other side” of reading, that of attitudes, beliefs, and values rather than theories, skills, and strategies. This scarf, woven with the threads of personal stories and at times, fraught with the holes of reading defeat, surrounds myself and my students as they prepare to enter the field of education as elementary teachers, and therefore teachers of reading. For some, the scarf is mere decoration, an object of conversation and a reminder of their perspectives based on their experiences as readers in elementary school. These students, having developed a passion for reading sometimes despite their personal histories with reading, are not the ones who tugged me into this research. The wearers of the scarves that seemed beyond repair, those with the dangling threads, gaping holes, and stranglehold, are the students that warranted the need for this study.

My experience teaching a children’s literature course in fall of 2008 echoed the essence of my elementary teaching career teaching students who could be described as reluctant readers, some of which had been labeled with reading disabilities. Bewildered in the initial stages of the reading process, defeated after years of struggling, or simply

disengaged from reading, many of these elementary students looked on in frustration as their peers dove into adventures and imaginary worlds created in children's literature. These struggling and reluctant readers experienced frequent disappointment, often times feeling the sting of envy as fellow students racked up prizes and praise for reading achievements at school and home. The resulting loss of self confidence in reading became the barricade preventing them from becoming avid readers. In example, Zach wondered aloud one day, "I'm tired, Ms. Davis. Will this ever get any easier?" causing me to fear his waning motivation and interest.

Within the undergraduate classroom, the tattered scarves reminiscent of students past quickly caught my attention. Undergraduate preservice teachers ashamedly admitting, "I don't really like to read," caused concern as my anticipation for a semester swathed in the delight of children's literature became a calling to recruit more members to the literacy club (F. Smith, 1987). For many students, the experiences we shared that semester did much to mend their damaged attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading and for others, these experiences became an elaborate adornment. Yet for all these students, the added strength to their confidence and abundant enthusiasm for their future careers as teachers of reading was evident through their course reflections and appreciative comments.

These ageless moments of confidence and enthusiasm in regards to reading and text, reveal aspects of the affective domain in these learners and are what led me to this career and to this investigation. I desired to unveil the mystery that shrouds such triumph in an effort to better understand how to guide those who teach preservice elementary teachers to become not only reading teachers, but avid readers; those who can teach

children how to craft their personal histories of reading, seamlessly woven with a passion for reading and texts.

Rationale

Researchers have repeatedly espoused the importance of teachers in the effective teaching of reading (Bond, Dykstra, Clymer, & Summers, 1997; IRA, 2000, 2003; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). When Bond and Dykstra (1997) studied numerous first grade teachers' instruction, they discovered and reported that specialized techniques, materials, and methods were not nearly as influential as the teachers of the students in those classrooms. Snow, Burns, and Griffin supported this same finding in their report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. They recommended "teachers who are well prepared" and "highly knowledgeable" (1998, p. 6). Building on and extending these iterations, Farstrup and Samuels (2002) argued that researchers need to value and respect the artistry teachers employ when implementing research findings to improve effectiveness of reading instruction. Clearly, researchers are cognizant of the significance of teachers in facilitating children's journeys toward becoming readers.

But just how knowledgeable are researchers of the significance that teachers' views of themselves as readers plays in enabling children's reading growth? As Anders, Hoffman, and Duffy (2000) explained, those who have investigated teachers as readers have done little more than describe characteristics of teachers. These descriptions often times lead to negative assumptions about teachers' abilities to teach reading effectively. In addition, in *Teaching Teachers to Teach Reading: Paradigm Shifts, Persistent Problems, and Challenges*, a review of studies in teacher education completed in the last thirty years, Anders et al. (2000) outlined a number of thesis statements. In one statement,

the authors chronicled a continued struggle to understand the impact of teachers' "knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and habits" on their own development as teachers over time. They summarized their findings and pointed to a need for further investigation of teachers as readers who infuse their practice with their own beliefs and attitudes about their reading habits. Both beliefs and attitudes are related to the affective domain

Grounding of the affective domain rests on the philosophical belief and understanding of education in the holistic nature of human beings (Dewey, 1902), the imbedded nature of feelings as part of human beings (Buber, 1970), and human beings engaging in learning through relation (Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004). This grounding is framed within the belief in education as the stimulation of universal lines of human development (Dewey, 1902). The notion that education is (and serves the purpose of) development of the human being, not set apart from or upon human beings, is fundamental to the context of education as relation. Furthermore, Buber's (1970) theory of the separation of feelings from institutions reveals the need for the affective domain of human beings within relational education. His distinction between the I-It world as experience versus the I-You world of relation lends support to defining this philosophy of relational education (Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004), revealing the affective domain at its core. Illustrative of this, the affective aspects of humans and their communication serve as the catalyst, purpose, and characterization of relations. Relations occur within and often as a result of these affective aspects of the human condition, thus education occurs within relation.

Margonis' theory that, "...any learning – any relationship between an individual and subject matter – occurs within a context of human relationships" (Bingham &

Sidorkin, 2004, p. 45), provides further support of the significance of human characterization influencing education. This characterization within relation is exemplified through an illustration of contextualized learning. When learning any skill or piece of knowledge, the attitudes, beliefs, and values relating to that content and the context of the learning are involuntarily present in the learner. Regardless of how these attitudes, beliefs, or values are (or are not) outwardly expressed, they cannot be detached from human (learners) or from the contexts in which humans engage. In addition, the mere qualification of the motivation and engagement of the learner in the relational exchange demonstrates the presence of the affective domain through attitudes (positive or negative), beliefs, and values.

The philosophical grounding of the affective domain is also revealed in the relational element of reading by Stengel's consideration of her daughter's resistance to reading when void of relational aspects (Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004) and Frank Smith's (1987) description of the literacy club. When reading is recognized as relational through the affective domain including shared interests, attitudes, and values of texts, the relation itself breeds further reading. Void of relational aspects, reading rests in the cognitive domain, which "includes all forms of 'intellectual' activity – attending, perceiving, remembering, associating, discriminating, analyzing, synthesizing, evaluating, - all behaviors that can loosely be called thinking", (Ringness, 1975, p. 4). Such emphasis on the cognitive domain perpetuates the ability to read accompanied by a lack of interest in actually doing so.

Surprisingly, researchers have shown a persistent and predominant focus on the cognitive domain of teachers' reading (Askov, Kamm, Klumb, & Barnette, 1980; Laine,

1984; Sullivan, 1976) and their understandings of reading concepts applied to instruction (Kingston, Brosier, & Hsu, 1975; Pavlik, 1975). The authors of these studies reveal and describe conceptual knowledge, procedural knowledge, and to a small extent, the context of teacher education, though their studies are often limited to practicum or field experiences of preservice teachers (Anders, et al., 2000). Regrettably, the findings have done little in providing answers to unrelenting problems in teacher education, specifically the affective domain of those preparing to be teachers. As Anders et al. states, “The ‘what works’ question plagues our profession,”(2000, p. 726)

Athey (1982, 1985) and Cramer & Castle (1994) assert that attention must be given to the affective domain in reading education if we are to more fully determine “what works” in reading education. Although there have been numerous researchers exemplifying this need at the school age level (Biberstine, 1977; Condon, 1978; Cramer & Castle, 1994; Mathewson, 1994; Shapiro & Whitney, 1997) their studies remain insufficient when applied to teacher education. In essence, these authors often inform teacher educators of what to *tell* preservice teachers *about* the affective domain in children as learners, yet not what to *do with* preservice teachers or why it may be necessary to address the affective domain in preservice teachers.

This apparent need for affective domain research in preservice teacher education, specifically in the area of reading, intensifies the rationale for this study. I had a vested interest in continuing to build on my past experiences teaching a children’s literature course by determining possible affective factors at work in establishing a love of reading. I set out and am now able to improve my teaching of preservice teachers, hence their affective domain related to reading and their teaching of future students.

Need for the Study

This mixed methods study, which combines a survey rating scale with one-on-one interviews, observations, and artifact collection reflects a finding of the International Reading Association's published survey of what should be a priority in reading research today (Cassidy & Cassidy, 2009). It also answers the call of Anders et al. to study "our programs, our courses, our teaching, and our expectations and requirements... consenting to be the subject of study ourselves" (2000, p. 734). Furthermore, of the eight critical features of excellence in reading teacher preparation programs that authors outlined in *Prepared to Make a Difference* (IRA, 2003), personalized teaching, a focus on community, and assessment of programs, students, and ourselves as instructors align with this research study.

Statement of the Problem

Research of preservice teacher education in reading has been scarce, representing less than 1% of the total studies in reading over the past 30 years (Anders, et al., 2000). Of these investigations, researchers have primarily focused in the cognitive domain, centering on conceptual and procedural knowledge considered important in teaching reading to elementary aged students. The expectation that this predominant cognitive focus will provide solutions to problems in reading teacher education defies over sixty years of research in reading education emphasizing the importance of the affective domain in learning to read and developing positive reading habits, especially in young learners. The lack of empirical support for addressing the affective domain of reading in

teacher education is compounded by a current overemphasis on accountability and standardization of reading education. What is the effect of this single-mindedness?

According to the recently published final report of Reading First outcomes, the pouring of billions of dollars into the only five components of reading instruction (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary) outlined by the National Reading Panel (NRP) has not resulted in any statistically significant positive impact on reading comprehension test scores (Gamse, Jacob, Horst, Boulay, & Unlu, 2008). On the contrary, this narrow focus on the NRP recommendations and the rigid compliance with curriculum designed to ace standardized assessments, has resulted in schools and teachers that aspire to evade the consequences of federal accountability measures such as Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) with curriculum and instruction that disregards the side effect of students' declining motivation to read.

Apparently, the billions of dollars devoted to a program that intended to increase reading, has resulted in the very opposite. According to the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2006 study, not only are children of all ages, races, and socioeconomic classes not reading as often or as much, but their attitudes about reading are deteriorating (Mullis, Kennedy, Martin, & Foy, 2007), painting a bleak picture of the future of literacy and education (Gallagher, 2009). The college classroom and teacher preparation in particular are not immune to the effects. Preservice teachers have repeatedly expressed concerns about turning children on to reading, especially as they experience practicum placements where they observe "inane, mind-numbing practices" (Gallagher, 2009). Clearly, continually restricting the focus of reading teacher

preparation on the cognitive domain will prove inadequate, thus preventing improved literacy engagement and achievement of K-12 students.

Furthermore, investing reading research efforts in teacher preparation is imperative. Researchers have proven the impact of teacher preparation, showing that “future teachers do learn what they are taught,” (Anders, et al., 2000, p. 727). This finding, in lieu of the state of reading illustrated in practicum experiences and the lack of research in teacher preparation in reading instruction, has the potential for alarming consequences. Could it be that professors are teaching teachers how to teach reading yet doing little if anything to address the affective domain? If so, could their oversight result in teachers who complete courses yet lack the desire to thoroughly enjoy reading themselves and see the value of reading for pleasure? Although presumably unintentional, this effect of teacher preparation could exacerbate the problem of “readicide” (Gallagher, 2009), and contribute to a cycle of aliteracy.

The preponderance of persons having the ability to read, yet choosing not to, presents numerous problems for children. Of greatest consequence may be the loss of creative thinking and problem solving, an asset which Zhao (2006) claims to be the competitive edge preventing the United States from losing its superpower status. In addition to this are the more obvious consequences of students that struggle in other content area learning due to the declining vocabulary and critical thinking skills that emanate from recreational reading. Finally, this propensity for aliteracy contributes to the continuing deterioration of writing skills (Krashen, 1993, 2006), a growing concern at all levels of education.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this sequential explanatory mixed methods study was to detect and describe the affective domain of reading within preservice teachers preparing to teach elementary aged students. The secondary purpose of this study was to describe how experiences in children's literature courses might contribute to preservice teachers' affective domains of reading.

Research Questions

Four main questions guided this study. Two focused on preservice teachers' perspectives as readers and learners in a children's literature course. The other two focused on instructors' perspectives as facilitators of student learning in a children's literature course.

- Q1 How do preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values about reading characterize their views of reading and themselves as readers?
- Q2 Under what circumstances do preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers become evident, if at all, in a children's literature course?
- Q3 What perceptions, if any, do children's literature instructors have of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers?
- Q4 How might instructors' perceptions of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers contribute to their instructional decisions?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its attempt to understand preservice teachers' affective domains in reading to inform teacher preparation in reading instruction. Through this key objective, instructors of current teacher preparation courses may better

determine alignment with what is known to be effective in teaching reading and developing positive reading habits in teachers, thereby their elementary students. In addition, with this study I contribute to the understanding of factors that influence positive reading habits, specifically in preservice teachers.

Overview of Remaining Chapters

In the succeeding four chapters of this research, I provide information grounding the study in the field of reading education, and a thorough explanation of the process I employed to conduct the research. Chapter two, the literature review, incorporates my examination of 1) research that's been done in the affective domain of reading, 2) techniques for gathering data in this proposed research, and 3) children's literature courses and textbooks. Chapter three includes an explanation of the design of this study detailing the procedures, data collection, and data analyses I used to answer each of my research questions and the validation procedures I implemented. Chapter four is a reporting of the findings resulting from data collection and analyses, which is followed by a discussion of these findings in Chapter five.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Literature related to this study is presented in three sections. The first section, Preservice Teachers' Attitudes/Beliefs/ Values in Reading, provides a historical and thematic overview of investigations in the affective domain of reading. I conducted this overview to confirm the presence of the affective domain in reading education and reveal the shortcomings of research in this area. The second section, Information Sources for Investigating Preservice Teachers' Attitudes/Beliefs/Values in Reading, identifies and describes four approaches to gathering information in the affective domain. Given use of mixed methodology in this study, this exploration of approaches distinguishes the most effective blend of research tools and strategies to answer the research questions. The third section, Children's Literature Courses, examines types of children's literature courses, general descriptions of those that are offered in teacher education programs, and the texts that are often assigned in these courses. The review of children's literature courses allowed me to identify and classify the general and the specific features of such courses, helped me to select appropriate research instruments, and helped to guide me in soliciting participants for this study from multiple institutions.

Preservice Teachers' Attitudes/Beliefs/Values in Reading

My review of the literature in the affective domain of reading revealed the following six themes, which emerged within research involving children, adolescent, adult, college students in general, and preservice teachers specifically. I approached the review this way to provide a framework in which to theoretically ground my study, and to inform the methodology and possible practical implications of this project.

First, the affective domain is difficult to measure (McKenna, 2001), which has resulted in numerous researchers dedicated to developing surveys (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Chen, 2007; Cline & Fixer, 1985; Elliott, 1983; Estes, 1971; Haase, O'Malley, Robinson, & Luiten, 1981; Ley, Schaer, Wright, & Neal, 1988; McKenna & Kear, 1990; Nathanson, Pruslow, & Levitt, 2008; Schutte & Malouff, 2007; C. M. Smith, 1990; Stepp, 2008; Warmack, 2007; Weidler & Askov, 1984), researchers using qualitative and quantitative methods (Gebhard, 2007; Midcalf, 2008), and the quantitizing of qualitative data (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Bean, 1994; Nathanson, et al., 2008).

Second, many researchers have attempted to correlate reading attitudes with other aspects of reading, though inconsistencies have prevailed. For example, researchers have attempted to show correlations among attitudes about reading and reading skills or achievement (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Brown & McDowell, 1979; Haase, et al., 1981; Irwin, 1979; Lickteig, Johnson, & Johnson, 1994; Reed, 1989; Shell, Murphy, & Bruning, 1989; Stepp, 2008; Stone, 1994; Tolsma, 1981), yet a significant positive correlation was not found (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Gebhard, 2006). Other researchers have attempted to find correlations among attitudes about reading and reading tendencies or habits, and have shown positive correlations

(Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Bean, 1994; Fahrenbruck, Schall, Short, Smiles, & Storie, 2006; Frager, 1987; Gebhard, 2006, 2007; Gomez, 2005; L. D. Miller, Fine, & Walker, 1994; Nathanson, et al., 2008; Powell-Brown, 2003-2004).

Third, studies of reading attitude over the last thirty years demonstrated the scope and the extent of the problem in that:

- a) there exists a steady decline of positive reading attitudes beginning at approximately eight years old (Cramer & Castle, 1994; McKenna, 2001; Mullis, et al., 2007; Parsons, 2007; C. M. Smith, 1990)
- b) approximately 50% of preservice teachers report themselves to be unenthusiastic and infrequent readers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Arici, 2008; Koehler, 1985; Nathanson, et al., 2008; Schutte & Malouff, 2007; Su-Yen, 2007)
- c) many college students and adults reporting poor attitudes about reading also report a negative personal history with reading either due to lack of support from parents or a negative experience in their elementary or secondary school years (Bean, 1994; Gebhard, 2006; Gerla, 1994; Gomez, 2005; Nathanson, et al., 2008; Parsons, 2007; Powell-Brown, 2003-2004)

Although these findings are admittedly disconcerting, other researchers have provided optimism with their findings revealing a majority of college students improving their attitudes about reading and themselves as readers when participating in educational experiences addressing reading attitudes and habits within developmental reading, reading education methods, or children's literature courses (Frager, 1987; Gerla, 1994;

Gomez, 2005; Hamston, 2006; Parsons, 2007; Powell-Brown, 2003-2004; Warmack, 2007).

Fourth, there is an assumption, held by teacher educators and others, that preservice teachers have positive attitudes about reading and/or are prolific readers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Arici, 2008; Chen, 2007; Gebhard, 2006; Parsons, 2007), though in my review of the research in this field, I found no studies supporting this assumption.

Furthermore, there is an assumption that preservice teachers' poor attitudes about reading and absence of a habit of recreational reading will negatively affect the elementary students they will eventually teach (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Gebhard, 2006; Nathanson, et al., 2008), though this claim can not be substantiated by research. In my review of the literature, I found only one study investigating elementary students' reading achievement in connection with student teachers' attitudes about reading (Schofield, 1980).

Finally, investigations in the affective domain of reading tend to mirror trends in other areas of reading research. For example, the rise of content area reading in the 90s is reflected in researchers exploring preservice teachers' attitudes about content area reading (Bean, 1994; Bean & Readence, 1995; Fox, 1994). Furthermore, the continuing and notable growth in acceptance of qualitative methods in social science research beginning in the mid 90s is reflected in qualitative methods used to investigate the affective domain of reading (Bean, 1994; Bean & Readence, 1995; Fahrenbruck, et al., 2006; Fox, 1994; Gerla, 1994; Hamston, 2006; Stone, 1994). Finally, the increased attention on teacher-action research at the beginning of this decade is also reflected in

research in this area (Fahrenbruck, et al., 2006; Gomez, 2005; Parsons, 2007). Therefore, the choice of methodology seems to be dictated by fashion, not by the nature of the subject.

Having established this themed framework leads naturally to a more detailed review of the specific studies supporting the development and completion of this study. I organized this portion of the review into five subsections. In the first subsection I provide an overview of influential studies establishing the current state of preservice teacher attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading, which confirms the need for and significance of this study. Next, I provide an overview of mixed methods studies guiding the methodological design of my study. In the third subsection I describe studies that exemplify effective quantitative research of the affective domain. Then, I review studies conducted in children's literature courses that enhanced my understanding of approaches to conducting research within this context. In the fifth and final subsection I provide an overview of the process and findings of studies that lend support to the development of qualitative methods and data analyses I used in this study.

Current State of Preservice Teachers' Attitudes, Beliefs, and Values of Reading

This topic was investigated by Applegate and Applegate (2004) through the design and development of a brief questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to focus on reading habits and attitudes as well as factors that might have influenced those attitudes. The researchers conducted a pilot study, and then a follow-up study using this open-ended survey, which they analyzed through a quantizing of qualitative data. Participants for the pilot and follow-up studies were purposefully selected from two

different universities; one university reporting mean SAT scores of 920 and the other university reporting mean SAT scores of 1220.

The researchers compiled data from the pilot study and follow-up study resulting in data collected from 379 preservice teachers over two years. Applegate and Applegate (2004) reported 51% of participants classified as unenthusiastic readers, with 57.6% coming from the university with traditionally lower SAT scores and 47.9% coming from the university with traditionally higher SAT scores. Interestingly, the researchers reported that there were no consistent correlations between reading attitude and perceived achievement when they compared the findings of their pilot and follow-up studies. Their findings lend support to the previously reported trend regarding inconsistency of positive significant correlations of reading attitude and achievement.

Also of interest in this study are the findings regarding factors influencing past and present attitudes of reading. Responses to the open-ended questions within the survey showed that elementary and/or secondary teachers' positive and negative attitudes about reading were evident to the participants. Finally, a small percentage of students did state that their "own attitudes toward reading had improved as a result of their college reading experiences" (Applegate & Applegate, 2004p. 561).

Nathanson, Pruslow, and Levitt (2008) affirmed the findings of Applegate and Applegate (2004) when they administered the same questionnaire with 747 students enrolled in a graduate school of education. Some of these students were practicing teachers and others prospective teachers awaiting employment. Nathanson et al. (2008) highlighted specific questions that revealed notable results. For example, 63.6% of participants categorized as enthusiastic readers reported having a teacher who shared a

love of reading, as compared to 56.4% of participants categorized as unenthusiastic readers reporting lacking this experience. Furthermore, 46.3% of enthusiastic readers reported a positive early reading experience, as opposed to only 8.5% of unenthusiastic readers. Finally, the researchers' overall findings echoed those reported in trends in this topic, as well as those seen in the study conducted by Applegate and Applegate (2004); 47% of the respondents characterized themselves as enthusiastic to highly enthusiastic readers, and the remaining reported lack of time and/or little if any pleasure from reading (Nathanson, et al., 2008).

The trends reported in the overall literature review in this topic, in addition to the two preceding studies illustrating these trends justify Applegate and Applegate's (2004) call for teacher education to devote energies to reexamining curricula and prioritizing engagement in reading through modeling and meaningful experiences for preservice teachers. The following section provides descriptions of studies answering this call.

Mixed Methods Studies in the Affective Domain

Bean's (1994) exploration of preservice teachers' attitudes toward reading involved a series of quantitative and qualitative methods, culminating in 11 case studies of preservice teachers reporting positive, negative, and finally mixed attitudes toward reading. Beginning with a thorough analysis of students' reading autobiographies including coding for alignment with four predetermined research questions (i.e. positive or negative reading attitude, materials connected to attitudes, and others), Bean then quantitized this qualitative data. The results indicated 67% of respondents reporting positive attitudes toward reading throughout development, 29% demonstrating times of

positive and times of negative attitudes toward reading, and 4% revealing consistently negative attitudes toward reading (Bean, 1994).

The culmination of methods resulted in Bean's selection of 11 case studies from each of these categories. These case studies revealed the significance of early reading experiences at home, with the majority of students categorized with positive attitudes describing being read to early in life and often, having lots of books available at home, adults recommending books of particular interest to these students at various stages of development, and positive influence of teachers at both the elementary and secondary levels. Bean's case studies exemplifying negative and mixed attitudes toward reading reveal the significant negative impact of uninteresting reading instructional materials and practices, leveled grouping for instruction and of materials, and disinterested parents (Bean, 1994). These case descriptions highlight the individualistic nature of attitudes in reading (Bean, 1994), adding further support for qualitative methods in which a constructivist stance is necessary.

Like Bean's research (1994), Gebhard's (2007) recent mixed methodology dissertation exemplifies this constructivist stance through the narrative analysis of preservice teachers' reading autobiographies. Unlike Bean's study (1994), Gebhard utilized the Adult Survey of Reading Attitudes (C.M. Smith, 1990 as cited in Gebhard, 2007) at the beginning and end of a required literacy course delivered in two formats; online and face-to-face. Although a key purpose of Gebhard's research (2007) was to compare the impact of online versus face-to-face course instruction on preservice teachers' attitudes toward reading, her findings uphold the results of Bean's analysis in that social modeling, learning communities, and authentic experiences with literature

have greatest influence on students' attitudes toward reading regardless of age or stage of development.

Another recent researcher used a sequential explanatory mixed methods design to investigate the attitudes of elementary preservice teachers regarding content area reading instruction (Midcalf, 2008). In this two-phase study, Midcalf (2008) first utilized a survey to determine overall reading attitudes of preservice teachers and then followed this with voluntary informal interviews of a portion of the original sample to explain and support quantitative data. Using a constant comparative method of data analysis, Midcalf (2008) reported students' overall positive attitudes toward content area reading instruction despite mostly negative elementary and high school experiences with content area reading.

These three studies utilizing quantitative and qualitative methodology represent a growing trend in mixed methods research, which guide the design of my research study. Taking into consideration the complicated nature of quantitatively measuring the affective domain, I utilized a tool that was developed through the experience of other researchers in this field. The two closely related studies described in the following subsection provided me examples of how to utilize and modify formerly used tools in research, and how to interpret and apply results from quantitative instruments used to research the affective domain.

Instruments Measuring the Affective Domain of Reading

The Motivation for Reading Questionnaire, created and analyzed by Baker and Wigfield (1999), consists of 54 Likert scale items addressing multiple dimensions of reading motivation. This survey was validated and correlated with measures of reading

achievement and self reported reading activity with a sample of urban fifth and sixth-grade elementary students. Based on confirmatory factor analyses, eleven dimensions of reading motivation were found to be significant: self efficacy, challenge, work avoidance, curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, grades, competition, social, and compliance (1999). In addition, the use of cluster analyses revealed seven distinct motivational profiles that were then correlated with reading activity and reading achievement: 1) Very Low Reading Motivation, 2) Low Reading Motivation, 3) Low Competition, Efficacy, and Recognition, 4) Low Importance, Competition and Work Avoidance, 5) Low Competition and Work Avoidance; 6) High Importance and Compliance, and 7) High Reading Motivation (1999). Baker and Wigfield's results indicated strong evidence for the multidimensionality of reading motivation, and a strong correlation of reading motivation with reading habits. Similar to numerous other studies in this field, Baker and Wigfield (1999) found inconsistent and weak correlations among reading motivation and reading achievement.

Because the elementary population sample utilized for Baker and Wigfield's (1999) study was significantly different than the population for my study, I turned to Schutte and Malouff's (2007) work for the instrument I used in my mixed methods investigation. Using reading engagement theory (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), the researchers collaborated with other experts in the field to develop an instrument to measure adult reading motivation. A revised version of Baker and Wigfield's Motivation for Reading Questionnaire was created to determine the statistical significance of ten theoretical dimensions of reading motivation: efficacy, challenge, curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, performance, social, compliance, and avoidance. In addition,

three items were added requiring participants to report their enjoyment of reading and reading habits, resulting in a total of 53 items. Schutte and Malouff (2007) tested this instrument with a sample of 220 men (n=80) and women (n=136) from community and university settings. Notably, over half of the sample (n=146) consisted of undergraduate students from a variety of majors and programs.

After multiple statistical analyses, the researchers determined four statistically sound factors from the 50 Likert scale motivation items: Reading as Part of Self, Reading Avoidance Versus Reading Efficacy, Reading For Recognition, and Reading to Do Well in Other Realms. In subsequent data analyses, including correlations with items indicating reading enjoyment and reading habits, Schutte and Malouff (2007) reported that university students scored significantly higher than those participants recruited from the community and women scored significantly higher than men. Furthermore, results of this instrument are similar to others in the past in that high reading motivation evident within the factor titled Reading as Part of Self (i.e. positive attitudes toward reading) was significantly correlated with enjoyment of reading, and frequency of reading. This correlation was important to participant selection in my study and to assigning participants one of the four typologies of readers I developed from the four determined dimensions of reading motivation combined with my qualitative data analyses .

*Children's Literature Courses as Contexts for
Research in the Affective Domain*

The following three studies represent a current trend of teacher-action research and were all conducted in undergraduate children's literature courses. In the first, several children's literature instructors provided a narrative account of the theoretical framework

that guided instructional practices used within their children's literature courses (Fahrenbruck, et al., 2006). The researchers/instructors described their focus on building community, frequent small group literature discussions, and a variety of literary response techniques. Through thematic analysis of students' oral and written reflections of class activities and assignments, the researchers/instructors identified three emerging categories: personal connections, intertextuality, and evaluation. In consideration of these themes, Fahrenbruck, et al. (2006) concluded that the theoretical framework and corresponding class activities and assignments encouraged preservice teachers to become "engaged readers who made connections between books and their personal lives" (p.35). Relevant to my study, Fahrenbruck, et al. (2006) also noted that students' attitudes and expectations of themselves as readers and thinkers changed as they actively pursued reading "because it added something to their lives" (p. 35).

Through her review of literature in the area of preservice and practicing teachers' attitudes of reading, reflections of her own teaching practices, and narrative accounts of students' reflections, Gebhard (2006) asserts the importance of children's literature courses in teacher preparation programs. Her claim is supported through descriptions of preservice teachers' experiences with a variety of children's literature and opportunities to build an aesthetic versus efferent response to literature (Rosenblatt, 1978), a theme found within other studies reviewed in this area (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Gerla, 1994; Gomez, 2005; Powell-Brown, 2003-2004). Gebhard's (2006) reminder that "for many preservice (and inservice) teachers, literacy and aliteracy are companion traits" (p. 462) emphasizes the concern many reading teacher educators have voiced throughout studies in teacher preparation, including Parsons' (2007) investigation.

Parsons (2007) conducted a qualitative case study of her own students, focusing on the impact of course instruction, activities, and assignments on preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading. Through constant comparison analysis (Merriam, 1998) of 74 reflection documents from 31 students, Parsons (2007) identified three major categories of response: Previous experience and perceptions, Quality of the experience, and Growth in ability, attitude, and knowledge. In reporting the findings, the bulk of Parsons' attention focused on a detailed account of course instruction and experiences, and students' growth in ability, attitude, and knowledge illustrated through findings specific to the writer's notebook and findings specific to literature study (2007). Parsons (2007) described five distinct impressions of the data specific to literature study: Learning about the world, Learning about literature, Learning to read, Understanding reading, and Renewed interest and confidence. In line with other researchers and educators previously reviewed, Parsons (2007) underscored the impact of students' aesthetic reading (Rosenblatt, 1978), revealing the novelty of this experience for many of her preservice teacher participants.

*Findings and Data Analysis Supporting Qualitative
Method Development*

My review of the following three studies assisted me in the planning and implementation of the qualitative portion of my study. First, Gerla (1994) used case study, researcher reflection, and observation within her teacher-action research dissertation investigating the effects of a transactional approach to teaching preservice reading specialists. Of primary importance in her research was determining preservice teachers' perceptions of themselves as readers and writers. Her study offers a suitable

example of the narrative analysis and writing I applied to my own qualitative research. Gerla's (1994) detailed and reflective account of classroom observations, interspersed with in-depth explanations of specific interactions with and among students demonstrates the potential impact of qualitative study in that findings and evidence for those findings is transparent and emotionally moving. Her grounded theory explaining students' changes in their perceptions of themselves as readers and writers rests on the interplay of six key threads that emerged throughout the study: ownership and control, immersion in reading and writing, social interaction, response, time, and a risk-free environment (Gerla, 1994).

Powell-Brown (2003-2004) extends Gerla's attention toward developing a love of reading in preservice teachers by candidly addressing the question plaguing many reading teacher educators, "Can you be a teacher of literacy if you don't love to read?", which also serves as the title of her publication. In her reflections on teaching literacy courses for preservice teachers, Powell-Brown (2003-2004) brings to light the depth of understanding that can be derived from simply asking preservice teachers about their experiences and reflections on those experiences. These perceptions served to guide my creation of interview questions to include in the qualitative portion of my study. For example, although some of her students reported not reading or enjoying reading, many then reported enthusiasm for reading children's literature and young adult novels. Furthermore, Powell-Brown (2003-2004) included a number of thoughtful questions she'd asked of her students, such as, "Do you believe that one can become a passionate reader at any age, and what suggestions do you have to help people develop a passion for reading?" The analysis of preservice teachers' responses showed introspective and insightful suggestions that hinted at the lost opportunities from their past reading

experiences. Powell-Brown's (2003-2004) concluding remarks reiterate other researchers' findings that the effective practices of elementary, secondary and college classroom instruction entails using literature circles, immersing students in literature, and recommending resources for students.

Gomez's (2005) response to Powell-Brown (2003-2004) was a similar teacher-action research study providing many overlapping themes as well as perspectives to consider in developing the qualitative methods within my mixed methods research study. Gomez (2005) considered the reading autobiographical responses of graduate students to be particularly interesting in that the students pointed out the irony of advising parents of the elementary students they taught to do the very things they themselves did not do as readers or experience as children. Activities such as reading aloud daily, being a model reader who takes pleasure in reading, and creating family reading time in the home were all cited as activities rarely included in their lives as novice teachers (Gomez, 2005).

Interestingly, Gomez (2005) took these findings and dug deeper into the reflections of these graduate students to discover that many desired to establish a love and lifelong habit of reading, but didn't know how to go about doing so in their own lives. They expressed frustrations with finding text that held their interest, having not had positive experiences with reading in their pasts and lacking the knowledge of various adult literature genres and authors (Gomez, 2005). This perspective of a desire to enjoy reading, but a perceived inability to embark on the journey toward becoming a passionate reader is one I had not considered prior to reading Gomez's work, but did in my study.

The review of the diverse methodologies applied to the topic of my interest has shown that such complex phenomenon as readers' attitudes, beliefs, and values can only

be understood properly by triangulating data through multiple data sources, and various methodologies. Next I will discuss the data sources available for my study, their respective advantages, and shortcomings.

Information Sources for Investigating Attitudes/Beliefs/Values in Reading

Within the field of research in the affective domain, a variety of information sources have revealed important findings contributing to the knowledge base for this study. Modeling my research methodology after previous effective research in this field resulted in my desire to apply a combination of information sources. Surveys, interviews, observation, and written artifacts yielded data that addressed the four research questions.

Surveys

Within survey research, defined as “a research design in which a sample of subjects is drawn from a population and studied (often interviewed) to make inferences about the population” (Vogt, 1999, p. 286), there are a variety of measures that can be used. Some examples include questionnaires, inventories, scales, and interviews of which all can be designed in a closed or open form (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2006). These types of surveys can be administered in multiple ways, including by mail, face-to-face interviewing, online, or by phone (2006).

Despite the criticism social survey research has endured (Aldridge & Levine, 2001), there are a number of recommendations that regulate its effectiveness and contribute to its longstanding use in social research. Highly applicable to my study, Aldridge and Levine recommend the use of surveys within a multi-method approach as

an effective way of increasing the validity and reliability of findings resulting from surveys, given a triangulation of data (2001). Furthermore, using surveys in the initial or extensive stage of a research study, often for the purpose of guiding a more intensive second stage of research, is a well established technique in social research (Aldridge & Levine, 2001).

Given the preponderance of social survey research, there are a number of pitfalls that have been identified and therefore can be avoided to ensure the effectiveness of this research tool. First, the obstacle of nonresponse can be prevented through careful consideration of sampling techniques and data collection methods (Fowler Jr, 2002). This guidance, combined with the experience of a pilot administration of the survey instrument I used within my study, resulted in designing my research process to take into account the fit between my study participants, the survey content, and this data collection method.

Second, the dilemma of developing quality survey questions is a time intensive and sometimes tedious process. This process is affected by numerous factors, such as the language structure, vocabulary, length and matching these with participant knowledge and background. Other factors include desired content and administration procedures .(Aldridge & Levine, 2001; Fowler, 2002; Rea & Parker, 2005).

Furthermore, the increasingly popular use of online surveys introduces various other factors that could contribute to determining the effectiveness of this information source. The advantages of web based surveys (i.e. available on SurveyMonkey), such as speed of gathering data, ease of access to participants, relatively low cost, improved options for creativity and added content, variety of question types, and preservation of

anonymity when necessary (Sue & Ritter, 2007), have contributed to their popularity in social research. Even so, the disadvantages and possible glitches must be taken into consideration as well. For example, assuming that all participants in a given sample are able to access and complete an online survey may result in unexpected nonresponses and should be taken into consideration prior to administering the survey and when analyzing data collected. In addition, the ease with which participants may abandon a web based survey and the researcher's dependence on the reliability of the technology (i.e. the computer, the internet connection, the software used to host the site and survey, etc.) also contribute to the effectiveness of online surveys as an information source in social research (Sue & Ritter, 2007).

This review of literature in survey methods as well as my experience piloting the survey instrument solidified the process I employed within the first (quantitative) stage of my research study.

Interviews

In its most basic conception, interviews “consist of oral questions asked by the interviewer and oral responses by the research participants” (Gall, et al., 2006, p. 228), generally in a one-on-one format. This conception is built upon in Silverman's (1993) description of interviews that aim to fact-find, elicit stories of experience, or provide an interactional encounter. When considering interviews as a viable source of data in social research, the type of interview implemented must align with the research questions being investigated, the context within which research is occurring, and the participants experiencing the process (Merriam, 1998). Each of these types of interviews is chosen to obtain a particular sort of knowledge, generated by specific researcher tasks and is guided

by several fundamental practices to improve the quality of data derived from this source. (Creswell, 2007; Lancy, 1993; Merriam, 1998). For example, in-depth interviews seeking participants' accounts of their subjective lived experiences and emotions, often in the form of stories, require that the interviewer/researcher and interviewee/participant establish an empathic relationship (1993), opposed to simply a seeker of information with a vessel to procure it from.

In the initial stages of the qualitative research, the use of semi-structured interviews is recommended for several reasons. First, semi-structured interviews provide the opportunity to use a mix of more and less structured questions (Merriam, 1998). This is important in building a rapport with research participants to carry forth throughout the duration of a research study. By having a set of main questions prepared in advance of the interview, interactions between the researcher and participant can be facilitated yet not directed or restricted. Furthermore, the semi-structured interview appears to account for a more natural presence of the multiple functions of verbal communication (i.e. referential, emotive, conative, metalingual, poetic, and phatic) (Shank, 2002), while still remaining focused on research questions. This natural form of communication helps to build a common ground between the researcher and participant, a necessity when researching personal matters such as attitudes, beliefs, and values. Through the use of probes prompted by participant responses to stated questions, a researcher is more likely to discover details, attain clarification, and hear supporting examples which contribute to a deeper understanding of participants' perspectives (Merriam, 1998). Finally, the semi-structured interview gives the researcher the privilege of responding to the participants' actions and reactions to the process of being researched. These responses, both verbal and

nonverbal, may provide opportunities for more in-depth data given the personal nature of the research topic (i.e. attitudes, beliefs, and values) as compared with highly structured interviews.

Although a researcher must remain cognizant of the researcher/participant roles throughout the study, thereby monitoring levels of disclosure and intimacy among participants likely to occur during unstructured interviews (Shank, 2002), these provide an exclusive look into personal attitudes, beliefs, and values that may be unavailable through any other data source. The use of this type of interview to generate oral narrative requires “substantial change in customary practices” when choosing narrative analysis of interview data (Riessman, 2008, p. 23). The research interview is no longer restricted to question/answer interactions and is replaced by conversation in which “speaker and listener/questioner render events and experiences meaningful – collaboratively” (2008, p. 23). In this way, both researcher and participants construct meaning together, both gaining a better understanding of perspectives, the context in which they interact, and the topic researched. This construction of meaning becomes further complicated by the act of transcription, which is greatly influenced by the perspective of the researcher with unique experiences, theoretical orientations, and particular goals in mind for the research (Riessman, 2008).

Observations

The context of this proposed research study also gives rise to a wealth of valuable information for answering the research questions, thus requiring observation of participants. Beyond simply eyewitness accounts of the naturally occurring events and interactions among participants with one another and their environment, observation is

characterized by the understanding of events, actions, and norms from the perspective of the participants (Schwandt, 2007). This understanding is developed through recording and analyzing of details within the specific context (i.e. social, historical, political, etc.) of the research. To analyze and then represent what is observed, the researcher must remain objective, refraining from assumptions or premature deduction (2007) regardless of observational role assumed (i.e. complete participant, participant as observer, observer as participant, and complete observer)(Merriam, 1998).

Within education, specifically in the field of literacy, observation contributes to evaluation for the purpose of improved curriculum and instruction (Jaggar & Smith-Burke, 1985). Often termed kidwatching (Y. M. Goodman, 1985), this tool is also essential for acquiring observational data in a research setting. For example, just as children respond differently in different situations (Goodman), preservice teachers are also likely to do the same. This is also emphasized by Gall, Gall, & Borg (2007) in the importance of using observation to balance out self-report measures, such as interviews and surveys.

Goodman's descriptions of effective kidwatching mirror those of qualitative researchers. For example a) displaying constant curiosity, asking "I wonder why this is so?" or "What do you think is happening here?", b) talking with the children (or participants) upon observing a situation in which they were troubled or demonstrated unusual responses to events in the classroom, and c) combining anecdotal records with logs, writing samples, etc. are all techniques applicable to qualitative research.

As used by qualitative researchers, observation differs greatly from the common awareness of one's surroundings. This difference is evident in a researcher's ability to

“observe the extraordinary and the ordinary at the same time, without one type of observation getting in the way of the other” (Shank, 2002, p. 20). For example, as an observer participant, a general awareness of the surroundings is necessary in addition to more focused observation of particular participants (i.e. their actions, reactions, etc.), interactions among participants, and responses to being observed. All of these factors must be considered in preparing for data collection through observation. Other preparations may include visiting the site of observation prior to data collection to determine appropriate locations to observe from, possible distractions, and/or aspects of the context that may influence participants in some way (i.e. furniture arrangement, window/door locations, temperature, etc.), and appropriate length of time and time of day for observation. Observation protocols (Creswell, 2007) or prewritten prompts for field notes (Merriam, 1998) helping to focus the researcher’s observations to aspects of or events within the context, such as participant interactions, reactions, and/or environmental changes can also result in more accurate and valuable observational data.

With adequate preparation, observational data can serve to complement and be complemented by interviews and other data sources, such as artifacts , thereby making observation “part of the process, or as a means to a larger and more complex methodological end” (Shank, 2002, p. 27).

Artifacts

Although there are myriad terms used for this data source, such as documents and “available” materials, the description provided by Merriam (1998) serves the purposes of my study: “a wide range of written, visual, and physical material relevant to the study at hand” (1998, p. 112). In some cases, artifacts may refer to historical documents and/or

those that are produced prior to investigation. To use artifacts effectively in qualitative research, Krathwohl (1993) offers up several important factors to consider: 1) characteristics and skill of the author(s) must be taken into consideration in analyzing and constructing meaning from artifacts, 2) the circumstances under which artifacts are produced should also be considered in interpretation, 3) purpose(s) for which the artifact were produced must also be taken into consideration. It is quite possible that the author's purpose for writing is far different than a researcher's purpose(s) for utilizing the document (Merriam, 1998), thus impacting the ways in which the document could be coded, or even if a document is included in an investigation.

As is the case in all methods of data collection, the accumulation and interpretation of artifacts must be "guided by questions, educated hunches, and emerging findings" (1998, p. 120). Through a purposeful, systematic, and yet flexible research plan incorporating a variety of information sources, a researcher can have confidence in her ability to discover answers to her research questions while experiencing the gratification of the research process.

Children's Literature Courses

The scope of children's literature courses can be found within English, Education, Library Science, and Literature departments of institutions throughout the United States. The inclusion and/or requirement of these courses within Education curriculum have been inconsistent over time and among programs within various two and four year institutions. Furthermore, the preparation and experience of individuals teaching the course has also varied over time and among institutions and even within departments of institutions offering the course (Landau, 1968; Lundin & Cubberley, 1995). Historically,

librarians and the field of Library Science have been instrumental in the development of children's literature studies, thereby shaping the field from the early 1900s (Lundin & Cubberley). Consistently influenced by the support and input from practitioners, such as psychologists, sociologists, historians, librarians, authors, and teachers, (Lundin & Cubberley) the field of children's literature reflects the complexity that characterizes the use of children's texts throughout society.

The various contexts of children's literature courses often dictate the topics to be covered, the background of the instructors, as well as the texts used within the course. For example, a children's literature course housed within an English department tends to focus primarily on the sociological impact of children's literature, literary criticism, and literature authorship (Landau, 1968; Lundin & Cubberley, 1995). On the other hand, children's literature courses offered through Library Science programs, often taught by experienced librarians as opposed to professors, tend to focus on the historical significance of children's literature, the influence of children's literature in the home, and literary merit of children's texts (Landau; Lundin & Cubberley). Children's literature courses within Education programs often prioritize children's relationships with text, shifting from a focus on the text to the reader's response to the text. Furthermore, these courses of study concentrate on the use of texts with children for a variety of practical purposes including teaching reading concepts and skills, instilling an appreciation of literature (Hoewisch, 2000; Landau), and more recently utilizing children's literature in the teaching of writing, as well as math, science, and the social studies (Hoewisch; Lundin & Cubberley).

Interestingly, Lundin and Cubberly's (1995) review of children's literature courses within four-year colleges across the country (regardless of associated department or program) led them to conclude that one goal of children's literature courses is "introducing students to books and helping students to find affective pleasure in the arts" (1995, p.11). They go on to state, "Students [i.e. preservice teachers] must be able to view children's books as adult readers before they can introduce them to children," (1995, p.11).

Hoewisch (2002) echoes these sentiments in her critical analysis of children's literature course content and pedagogy. Although focused primarily on a call for inspection of course content for "two critical elements", that of children's literature being "seen as a significant educational tool" and "a valuable, beautiful, and impressive part of literary history" (2002, p.4), Hoewisch alludes to the importance of the affective domain. Nonetheless, like other researchers and instructors of children's literature, Hoewisch (2002) addresses the affective domain as if preservice teachers come into the course seeing themselves as readers and with an enjoyment of reading.

Hoewisch's recommendations for course content include, "history of the discipline, opportunity to interact with the relevant instructional materials, pedagogical principles, and field experience" (2002, p.4), which she sees as valuable and necessary in the field of children's literature. Hoewisch's concluding call for children's literature instructors to "systematically and carefully review our children's literature course syllabi, the required assignments, the textbook emphases, and even students' attitudes about children's literature when they leave our courses" hints at attending to the affective domain in children's literature courses.

Although Hoewisch (2002) provides a preliminary appraisal of fairly current children's literature courses, a more in-depth investigation of the content and materials included in current children's literature courses within Education programs was necessary to fully understand the contexts within which I conducted this proposed study. The following analysis of several currently used syllabi from various institutions within and outside of the region in which this study took place supports this effort.

Children's Literature Course Syllabi

In my review of five syllabi of children's literature courses within Education programs, I discovered several similarities within course intent, materials, requirements, and content. Common goals and objectives include, 1) critiquing and selection of literature, 2) exposure to a variety of texts and genres, and 3) integration of literature into effective teaching of elementary students. These course goals and objectives are frequently met through 1) reading a large variety of current (rather than classic) children's literature, often categorized by genre and/or awards received, and including both fiction and nonfiction, 2) annotated bibliographies, 3) student participation in literature circles, 3) projects and presentations focusing on particular authors or texts, and 4) assigned reading within a textbook, and 5) occasional exams or quizzes. Student use of technology and demonstration of effective teaching with children's literature are integrated throughout various assignments and activities, which are completed individually and within small groups. Study of new literacies and/or texts beyond books was not evident in the review of course syllabi. In addition, none of the courses reviewed incorporated any field component or requirement for students to apply their learning to interactions with children.

Of the differences found among syllabi, one course exclusively focused on multicultural literature indicated the study of children's literature reflecting the rise in English Language Learners and their needs within the elementary classroom. In addition, although the course goals and objectives did not specifically state intentions to impact the affective domain of students within the courses reviewed, one of the syllabi did incorporate subtle messages indicating the expectation that students enjoy reading and literature. These messages were communicated in the form of quotations from well known authors, researchers, and other prominent figures in education. One such tidbit the instructor quotes from Mem Fox states, "Teachers have a duty to be passionate about reading. If teachers don't love to read, why on earth should children?" Although verification of the authenticity of this quote was not found, the inclusion of such a statement indicates the instructor's position on the affective domain of reading within elementary preservice teachers.

Children's Literature Course Textbooks

In an examination of seven recent children's literature textbooks (N. A. Anderson, 2009; Galda & Cullinan, 2002; Kiefer, 2010; Lynch-Brown & Tomlinson, 2005; Norton, 2007; Stoodt-Hill & Amspaugh-Corson, 2009; Tunnell & Jacobs, 2008), with 2nd-10th editions spanning 2002-2010, course content remained fairly consistent. Although varied in depth, organization, and supporting text features (such as tables, illustrations, references, etc.), all texts included information about genres of literature, a history of children's literature, children's responses to literature, recommended literature, evaluation and selection criteria, notable authors of children's literature, and award winning children's literature.

Prominent differences reflected among texts were the authors' philosophies regarding the comprehensiveness of a children's literature textbook and objectives of a children's literature course. While some authors explicitly stated that the text was intentionally brief for the purpose of prioritizing students' reading of a large quantity of quality children's literature, authors of more comprehensive textbooks did not explicitly address this issue. Comprehensive texts provided many color illustrations of the covers and sometimes inside pages of children's literature and often times included very extensive lists of recommended children's literature. These bibliographic lists varied from text to text, sometimes providing summaries of texts, categorization of texts within each genre, and indicators of texts appropriate for reluctant readers. Features, such as this, designed to assist students in selecting appropriate texts for specific teaching purposes, were inconsistent among the texts I reviewed, and often reflected the author's overall objective of the text to either enhance students' literary knowledge or to prepare students for utilizing children's literature for effective teaching.

Other attributes suggesting an author's goal of preparing students for instructional uses of children's literature include 1) sections within every chapter outlining strategies for literature based instruction, 2) chapters centered on lesson or unit planning with literature, 3) demonstrations of children's interactions with literature at various grade levels accompanied by reproductions of students' work or photographs of classrooms and teaching, 4) tables indicating age/grade level literacy concepts with accompanying literature, 5) techniques to integrate content area learning through the use of literature, and 6) practical tools, such as library tutorials helping students locate texts within public libraries. These elements characterize the authors' intentions to address instructional

purposes for children's literature, whereas some of the textbooks give the impression of prioritizing students' acquisition of literary knowledge for the purpose of evaluating and selecting exemplary literature. Examples of these types of texts spotlight the literary elements of each genre (in some cases, categories within genres) through multiple chapters or pages within chapters. Additionally, this type of text includes a greater quantity of information about awards, such as the Caldecott, Newberry, Orbis-Pictus, and Scott O'Dell. Criteria for book nominations, lists of award winners of multiple years, and the origin of each award are frequently included.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I provided a review of literature investigating preservice teachers' affective domains in reading. Within this literature, I first clarified the current state of preservice teachers' affective domains of reading, followed by an analysis of a variety of studies strengthening the methodology of my study. These included mixed methods studies in the affective domain, studies using instruments to measure the affective domain of reading, studies conducted in children's literature courses, and those demonstrating exemplar qualitative methods and data reporting. I also reviewed sources of information I will use in my study. I concluded with an investigation into the content of children's literature courses by examining several current syllabi and children's literature textbooks. Taken together, the sections of this literature review support the rationale and need for this study. The study promises to further extend the findings of previous researchers.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

In this chapter I describe the methodology for this study in five sections. The introductory section provides a brief overview of mixed methodology as a rising paradigm for educational research, and a rationale for using mixed methods. The second section, Researcher Stance, provides a brief overview of my background experiences followed by a narrative illustrating the influence of these experiences. The third section, Philosophical Stance, explains my alignment with ontological, epistemological, axiological, methodological, and rhetorical theories. In the fourth section, I present my research design and explain how implementing the components of this design lead to answering my research questions. I also explain the data analysis techniques I used. In the last section, Validation Framework: Construct Validation, I explain the quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods validity relevant to this investigation.

Introduction

Although researchers have been mixing methods and debating the value of doing so well before the paradigm wars of the 70s, 80s, and 90s (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), mixed methods as a research paradigm has come into its own in the last decade (Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2008). The increasing prevalence of resources to guide mixed

methodologists, include textbooks (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007; Greene, 2007; Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2008), *The Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2002), and the *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, a journal dedicated to publishing exemplar studies using mixed methods.

Definitions of mixed methods research are numerous. While some equate mixed methods research to “using multiple methods to generate and analyze different kinds of data in the same study” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 196), this broad definition includes mixing methods within the same paradigm. For example, using interviews and observation, both qualitative methods, could be viewed as mixed methods research by this definition. Other complex definitions of mixed methods research have also been offered up to better focus the work of researchers in this rising paradigm:

Mixed methods research is a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases in the research process. As a method, it focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007, p. 5).

While this definition focuses primarily on the design of mixed methods research, other definitions highlight the significance of philosophical stances, as in Greene’s (2007) definition of mixed methods inquiry:

...the planned and intentional incorporation of multiple mental models with their diverse constituent methodological stances, epistemological understandings, disciplinary perspectives, and habits of mind and experience – into the same inquiry space for purposes of generatively engaging with difference toward better understanding of the phenomena being studied (p. 30).

These and other definitions continue to influence the paradigm of mixed research by requiring researchers to critically evaluate their stance, effective research design, and purpose(s) for mixing methods. I have chosen to ground my work in the definition espoused by the editors of the *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*: "...research in which the investigator collects and analyzes data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study" (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007, p. 4).

Rationale for Mixed Methods

Researchers have made various assertions attempting to solidify fundamental characteristics of mixed methods research. Greene's (2007) stance captures this foundation when she states:

The core meaning of mixed methods social inquiry is to invite multiple mental models into the same inquiry space for purposes of respectful conversation, dialogue, and learning one from the other, toward a collective generation of better understanding of the phenomena being studied (p. xii).

I relay my rationale for using mixed methods for this investigation in this vein. Two tenets of my rationale are mixing of methods, a) to understand complex phenomena, and b) to generate new ideas. In order to understand the complex phenomena of preservice teachers' affective domains of reading, I used quantitative methods to select participants and to inform qualitative methods I developed. Using mixed methods enabled me to "elaborate, enhance, deepen, and broaden the overall interpretations and inferences" (Greene, 2007, p. 101) of research findings, thus generating new ideas in teacher

education and teacher education research. These tenets fall under what Greene delineates as “mixing methods for the purposes of complementarity” (2007, p. 101).

My rationale is grounded in my stance as a mixed methodologist researcher. Greene (2007) espouses six stances for the mixing of mental models and research methods, the most popular of which is the Alternative Paradigm stance. According to Greene (2007), this stance “offers its own internal coherence and integrity and so does not present the tensions and challenges that can accompany the joint use of two more traditional paradigms ...”(p. 82). This stance aligns with my philosophical and theoretical positions that shape my methodological decisions, which are a result of my past and present experiences forming my researcher stance.

Researcher Stance

My past and present academic and social experiences with students of all ages, including preservice teachers, contribute to my researcher stance. After attaining a degree in special and elementary education, I worked with elementary struggling readers as a Title 1 teacher for two years and Special education resource teacher for seven years. In these positions, I also had the opportunity to work with elementary classroom teachers as a literacy instruction coach and assistant staff developer for several years. I have taught preservice teachers at the undergraduate and graduate levels for approximately three years, focusing my teaching in literacy, including one children’s literature course. My reflective nature in roles as a struggling reader, teacher, and mother of a developing reader add to my stance in this study. Finally, my current and anticipated dedication to teacher education in literacy and students’ views of reading and themselves as readers intensify my interest in this topic of study and the applicable nature of the findings. This

researcher stance contributes to my philosophical beliefs, which are illustrated through the following narrative describing my prior experiences as a special education teacher.

A Learner's Legacy

I tried to avoid his eyes, that look of frustration I'd witnessed at least a hundred times throughout my career. My gaze remained glued to the Woodcock Johnson protocol on my clipboard, pencil poised to record his response. We were nearing the ceiling.

"Come on, Zach, one more wrong and we can stop this torture," I thought as he agonized over item 14 in the fifth subtest we'd conquered that morning. I heard the gurgles of his stomach and wondered wearily if he'd had anything to eat that day.

"Cost?" I sprang back to attention. Dang. He got it right. At least five more questions now. Zach struggled through the items, guessing at two and finally saying, "I don't know," for the last two. We'd reached the end, the five consecutive zeros cueing us both of the end of this frightfully long slew of testing sessions. "Is there still time for me to go outside for recess?" he asked excitedly. Just as I glanced up at the clock, the recess bell rang and Zach's shoulders sagged. "I'm sorry, Zach. We just had to finish this up today to get ready for the meeting tomorrow morning with your mom. I'll try to see if you can have a few extra minutes of recess this afternoon, okay?" Disheartened, Zach silently swung the Resource Room door open and trudged back to class.

With a deep sigh, I placed the protocol on my desk next to his file, almost two inches thick with IEP paperwork from all his years in the system. I flipped through the file, noting accommodations and modifications, goals, objectives, strengths and needs - the assessment protocols, Informal Reading Inventories, and anecdotal records wedged in amongst the official looking forms. I turned to the buckets of picture books,

newspapers, magazines, and website printouts strewn on the tables and started to organize my supplies for the next group due to arrive in just five minutes. As I scanned over the protocol, attempting to predict where Zach would land in the standardized scoring of the assessment, I recalled the small group lesson he participated in earlier that morning. The article we were reading about the Leaning Tower of Pisa still sits on the overhead projector, along with the students' responses piled up on top. I set down the Woodcock Johnson protocol and picked up the papers, sifting through these to locate Zach's. The questions he'd scrawled were so insightful, his curiosity and engagement evident right there on the paper. "He was really into this lesson today," I thought. Thinking back to last year at this time, I recalled how disinterested Zach was with reading; his frustration and anxiety overriding his inherent curiosity.

I peered at the bottom of the page, Zach's inferences about the causes of the leaning tower listed one by one. His statement about the ground under the tower being soft had a big crooked star next to it. He must have read further on in the article than the rest of the group, determining that his inference was right. I smiled. "Good for you, Zach!" He hadn't said anything about this before he left the room or even during the testing. I looked at his copy of the article and flipped to the last paragraph. Sure enough, he'd circled the exact sentence that mentioned the soft earth. I glanced at the clock and slipped the article and Zach's response into his IEP file just as the first student rushed in the room, the rest of the rowdy second-grade boys close behind.

The next morning Ms. Irwin arrived ten minutes late, her nursing uniform on, circles under her eyes. "Sorry I'm late! I just finished up my shift and had to get the boys some breakfast before I headed over here," she gasped as she hurried over to the

conference table. The specialists all gaped at her, shuffling their forms and files to make room at the table. Following introductions, the school psychologist started off by explaining the purpose of the meeting and the general order of proceedings: explanations of test results, summary of strengths and needs, suggestions of accommodations and modifications, and finally discussion of goals and objectives. I watched Ms. Irwin take in all this information, looking nervously at the piles of papers between her and each of the special education team members. As the speech language pathologist rifled through her stack, she began to explain the language assessment she'd administered. Seeing the furrow-browed expression on Ms. Irwin's face, I interrupted to clarify an acronym and provide a summary of the meaning behind it. Ms. Irwin relaxed slightly, yet still grappled with each piece of information.

The meeting progressed and then it was my turn. I stood, grabbed a few white-board markers and began to draw the graphic I'd prepared representing Zach's achievement scores. As I explained this, I handed a paper copy to Ms. Irwin. She perused the document, pointing to the sentences as she read below the colored tables and graphs describing Zach's scores. I waited silently, pretending to organize my paperwork as I gave her an opportunity to comprehend the information. As she finished, I passed the work samples and summary of anecdotal records and observations I'd collected over the last year. I pointed out the growth in his writing and pulled up a chair to sit next to her. I went on to explain the improved engagement observed in class, and his latest work on the article just the previous morning. She looked up, pleased. "So he's improving?" she asked, hope lining her words. "Definitely, Ms. Irwin," I replied. "But these make it look like he hasn't changed at all," she inquired as she pointed to the protocols, a concerned

tone in her voice. I explained the many methods I used to provide evidence of Zach's growth, and mentioned the long testing sessions necessary to administer the Woodcock Johnson. "I can't say with certainty that those tables and graphs show us all we should know about what Zach can do and the things he needs to work on," I reply. Ms. Irwin glanced at the protocols again and then returned to the work samples, comparing them and noting improvements he'd made just in the last couple of months.

After nearly an hour, the meeting came to a close. Zach was to continue to receive special education services based on all the data collected, but his new goals and objectives reflected the progress he'd made and the promise of further growth. That afternoon, after awarding Zach an extra ten minutes of recess, I sat with him to go over the information shared at the meeting that morning. Zach shared his pride at all he'd accomplished and committed himself to another year of great effort. He ended the conversation with, "Ya know, I was right Mrs. Davis!" "What's that, Zach?" I asked. "I was right. About that leaning tower thing. I said it was because the ground was too squishy, and I was right! I was thinking about what Marisa said about how her dad got to ride in boats on rivers all over Italy and how all that water must make the ground squishy." he proclaimed excitedly. "Ah, yes! You were right. Nicely done, Zach!" I smiled back at him.

Philosophical Stance

Within the following five sections, I provide a brief explanation of each component of my philosophical stance. To support each explanation, I refer back to the narrative, *A Learner's Legacy*, composed from memories of my past experiences as a

special educator. In this way, I aim to more accurately illustrate my philosophical stance and provide an awareness of its derivation.

Ontology

Recognized as the study of reality, often termed metaphysics, ontology examines “the real nature of whatever is, of first principles,” and is “concerned with understanding the kinds of things that constitute the world,” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 190). An ontological belief in critical realism has recently arisen within social science research as being particularly appropriate for mixed methodologists. Pratschke (2003) interprets a critical realists’ (Bhaskar, 1975) fundamental belief in the explanatory power of theories, such that, “the most powerful theories are those that explain the widest range of phenomena” (Pratschke, 2003, p.16). I share this belief, and other tenets of critical realism as summarized by Scott (2000, 2007): a) “There are real objects in the world which do not depend for their existence on whether they are known by anyone or everyone” (2000, p.2), b) “...knowledge of these objects is always fallible because any attempts at describing them needs to take account of the transitive nature of knowledge” (2007, p. 14), and c) any assertion of knowledge must be derived from contextualized ways of knowing and in the understanding of the interaction of structure and agent in a social world (Scott, 2000, 2005, 2007).

Like other researchers who have interpreted Bhaskar’s theories, I maintain a position of seeking “unity of the world” (Nash, 2005, p. 187) and an understanding of the interaction among structures and agents within the social world (Scott, 2000). This understanding, according to critical realists, requires the identification and description of the systems that characterize the structure of the social world and which both impact and

are impacted by agents (individuals) within structures (society) (Nash, 2005). In order for accurate, yet admittedly fallible knowledge or truth to be attained at any given time, I support the critical realist requirement of both reflexive and interpersonal relations accompanying statistical explanation (Scott, 2007).

My work as a special educator contributed significantly to forming these beliefs, as evidenced in *A Learner's Legacy*. First, my belief in knowledge as fallible is demonstrated in my collection of evidence marking Zach's ever changing achievement, shown through the collection of work samples and informal assessments discussed at his Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meeting. Every day that I worked with young students, their rapidly developing knowledge and understanding of the world was challenging to keep up with. As I strived to provide differentiated instruction, their individual experiences in and outside of school became catalysts for the ongoing revision of their background knowledge, advancing their achievements in reading and math. This, combined with the changing contexts of instruction and assessment practices necessitated frequent and varied measurements of students' knowledge.

Second, my belief that knowledge must be derived from contextualized ways of knowing and in the understanding of the interaction of structure and agent in a social world (Scott, 2000, 2005, 2007) is also illustrated in the narrative above. I used multiple formal and informal assessments to determine Zach's academic achievement. While some of these measures required decontextualization (i.e. the Woodcock Johnson), others were included specifically for an understanding of Zach's achievement in the context of classroom learning (i.e. observations and work samples).

In addition, this need for contextualization is evident in my interactions with Ms. Irwin, Zach's mother. Given the complex and sometimes baffling world of special education laws, assessment, and specialists, Ms. Irwin (like many parents of students with special needs) needed the context of Zach's accomplishments to understand his achievement and progress. Represented in numbers and acronyms, Zach's assessment results could be misinterpreted by Ms. Irwin as signifying no progress in his achievement. Through explanation of how Zach applies his knowledge in the classroom, and work samples showing this application, Ms. Irwin was able to gain a more accurate understanding of her son's strengths and needs. In addition, by closely observing and reflecting on Ms. Irwin's interactions with the special education team and events during the meeting, I could better understand her difficulty in grasping her son's educational standing. This attention to the relationship between individuals and structures in a social world (Nash, 2005) enabled me to provide better support to Ms. Irwin and others in the school system throughout my career.

Epistemology

Defined as "the study of the nature of knowledge and justification," (Schwandt, 2007, p. 87), epistemological theories address the derivation of knowledge, the composition of knowledge, and the development of knowledge. In alignment with my ontological beliefs in critical realism, I have considered and adopted multiple epistemological beliefs. An overarching theoretical worldview of constructionism (Crotty, 1998; Geertz, 1973; Humphrey, 1993; Lyotard, 1984) is that human beings construct meaning "as they engage with the world they are interpreting" (p.43). This view provides the foundation for my belief in interpretivism (Crotty, 1998; Gerth & Mills,

1970; Weber, 1949). Therefore, I believe that the meaning of a human action must be unearthed from the action occurring within its context. This fuels my belief in “culturally derived and historically situated interpretation of the social life-world” (Crotty, p. 67).

Given the relevance of the social world in both critical realism and interpretivism, Kucer’s (2005) description of socio-cultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) provides the distinction needed in applying these theoretical perspectives in my research in reading education. According to Kucer, this dimension of literacy accounts for the multiple ways in which literacy shapes and is shaped by communities and thus society. Through social interactions and experiences, knowledge is constructed, infused with the collection of people’s knowledge, beliefs, values, and ways of life (Tracey & Morrow, 2006).

The origin of my epistemological beliefs can be clarified by returning to *A Learner’s Legacy* and my teaching experiences over the last twelve years. Having graduated from an undergraduate university which emphasized constructionist teaching, I often incorporated this philosophy in my own teaching of elementary students and now my teaching of undergraduates. As exemplified in the narrative above, I remain dedicated to the belief that students bring their own ideas (i.e. questions, inferences, background knowledge, etc.) to every learning experience and utilize the ideas of others as meaning is made (i.e. from text, experiences, problems, etc.). The small group instruction at the heart of intervention services as a special educator continues to influence my teaching at the college level. Within these small groups, students, like Zach, are encouraged to consider what they already know about a topic (i.e. the Leaning Tower of Pisa, the stability of soil, etc.) and to share these ideas with others.

My observation and reflection on students' collaboration and critical thinking has revealed many instances when students make connections amongst concepts and therefore build a deeper understanding of the world around them. This experience has shown me the significance of contextualization when interpreting students' achievements, knowledge, and theories they carry about the world. For example, there have been numerous occasions when I have been pleasantly surprised by a student's thought process when I take the time to search beneath the surface of his/her action, as illustrated by the closing conversation with Zach in *A Learner's Legacy*. Zach revealed valuable critical thinking skills which led him to his inference about the causes of the leaning of the tower of Pisa. His sharing of ideas provides support for the need to go beyond the face value of a student's response, especially if that response is limited to a number or selection among multiple choices.

Finally Kucer's (2005) socio-cultural theory is helpful in explaining the separation between Ms. Irwin and the special education team in the story above. This theory affirms the multiple ways in which literacy shapes and is shaped by communities thereby impacting society. Within the field of education, the professionals that work within special education develop a literacy that often closes off communication with others, especially parents. Although frequently joked about, the countless acronyms, use of statistical measurement, and legal speak used within IEP paperwork and meetings is oftentimes what causes parents the most anxiety when they consider seeking help for their sons and daughters struggling in school. This, unfortunately, has the potential to create opposing groups, an *us vs. them* mentality in which the language and literacy of a special education team further confuses and intimidates those persons they're supposedly

assisting. Therefore, the conscious effort to teach parents the literacies of special education is necessary to unite these groups for the benefit of the children. As I use these past experiences to enhance my current teaching and research, I continue to reinforce my epistemological beliefs in constructionism, interpretivism, and socio-cultural theory.

Axiology

Gaining more attention with the rising paradigm of mixed methods, axiology, or the “philosophy of values” (Given, 2008, p. 52) leads a researcher to clarify and reflect on intrinsic values that influence every stage of the research process, from refining research questions to generating hypotheses. As raised by Guba and Lincoln (1994), values and ethics directly impact and are impacted by the role of the researcher in relation to the researched or participants, thus establishing the need for ontological and epistemological stances. For example, an emphasis on the process of research as opposed to the product of research aligns with a constructionist epistemology (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) in which the researcher is seen as a facilitator rather than director.

The clarification of my ontological and epistemological beliefs provide the underpinnings of my axiological stance in so far as I strive to develop a thorough understanding of participants as agents influencing the structures which influence them and their perceptions, emotions, and motivations. This desire to construct understanding exceeds that of gaining knowledge for the sake of meeting my own needs or those found within the field, to that of beneficence for participants and the context in which they are situated. I believe that educational research should extend beyond providing general practical solutions and informing effective practice, to grant teachers and students the opportunity to form positive perceptions of their involvement in research. These positive

perceptions are imperative to improve the relationships between higher education and K-12 education, as well as increase the likelihood that research findings will be used to improve the lives of those who are researched. Furthermore, the hesitation and even resistance to investigating our own practices in education require even greater attention to my axiological position. Inviting researchers into one's classroom to observe instruction and classroom relationships is an inherently sensitive research topic requiring great respect for the relationships among participants and the researcher.

Set outside the context of research, my axiological stance was firmly established as I advocated for students with special needs at the elementary level. Believing that these students and their parents required and deserved greater attention and support, I often found myself ensuring that the process of assessment or service delivery as well as conferences or meetings be as meaningful for children and parents as they were necessary for specialists and educators. Therefore, I reviewed all assessments with students, helping them to understand the purpose for these assessments, the information derived from assessments, and ways we both could use the information to help them achieve their own academic goals. Using developmentally appropriate language and concepts, the students, like Zach in *A Learner's Legacy*, could see the process of assessment as beneficial for them as much as it was for me. In addition, my communication and support of parents, such as Ms. Irwin, prioritized solid understanding of information shared, inclusion of their input into educational decisions, and confidence in supporting their children to achieve educational goals.

Methodology

A participant selection model of a mixed methods sequential explanatory design (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007; Creswell, Plano-Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2008) using purposive multilevel mixed methods sampling (Teddlie & Yu, 2008) provided the methodology framework. This design began with a quantitative survey in which a rating scale was used to obtain data for a variety of sampling methods and to inform further investigation into each selected case. This design then placed emphasis on using multiple qualitative methods (i.e. interviews, observation, and artifacts) and data analyses that align with case study as described by Merriam (1998) and Creswell (2007). In addition, narrative research methods (Pagnucci, 2004; Riessman, 2008) guided data collection, data analysis, and rhetoric used throughout stages of this study.

Support for my chosen methodology came not only from my ontological and epistemological positions, but also from my experiences with teaching. In *A Learner's Legacy*, and as discussed in my ontology section, the use of multiple measurements to understand students' strengths and needs was imperative to designing effective instruction. In Zach's case, the quantitative data derived from the Woodcock Johnson Tests of Achievement were a portion of the data necessary to accurately diagnose his strengths and needs. As is echoed in this study, the quantitative data was often a starting point, leading to more in-depth inquiry. For example, when a student was referred to special education, my perusal of his/her educational portfolio began with Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) scores, state assessment scores, and district test scores. Drawing conclusions from these, I could determine which subtests of the Woodcock Johnson were most necessary to isolate the difficulties the student was experiencing. Often the greatest

impact in my understanding of the student came about from discussions with the student's teachers, parents, and other specialists working with the student, as well as anecdotal records accompanying IRIs, and my own observation of the student in multiple settings.

Compiling these pieces of evidence enabled me to create accommodations, modifications, and educational goals and objectives that would assist teachers and parents in providing scaffolded support and differentiated instruction. Without this body of evidence, I could have run the risk of making very poor assumptions and either wasting the student's precious learning time, or frustrating the student, parents, and teachers even further. As illustrated with Zach's story, every student's progress and achievement was based on this thoughtful and thorough process.

Rhetoric

Understood as "the art or technique of persuasion, especially through language" (Schwandt, 2007, p. 267), rhetoric has become of particular interest to mixed methodologists. This interest stems from a clash between the styles and purposes for quantitative research writing (i.e. scientific, objective, and formulaic) and qualitative research writing (i.e. artful, constructivist, and reflexive) (Sandelowski, 2008). Given the integration of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, yet recognizing my emphasis on constructionist and interpretivist theoretical stances, I have employed primarily first person, reflective narrative techniques integrated with visual representations of both quantitative and qualitative data where appropriate. A creative integration of writing styles and techniques was necessary to convey mixed methods

findings in ways that best represented each participant as well as themes arising from data across cases and contexts (Greene, 2007; Sandelowski, 2008).

These reporting techniques stem from my strong support for and use of multiliteracies in my teaching. For example, I often incorporated text sets representing various writing styles and purposes in my instruction, as illustrated in *A Learner's Legacy*. Through combining various types of texts, students could build their background knowledge and therefore their understanding of new information while learning the wide variety of literacy skills needed to make meaning from various textual elements. The graphics, text features, photographs, narrative, video, and others intertwined in media today necessitate exposure and scaffolded reading instruction for student success and eventual reading independence. Similar to my use of a wide variety of texts for instruction, I also incorporated a variety of communication techniques in my teaching. When working with students with disabilities, I often relied on multiple modalities to creatively teach unknown concepts. Inventing visual diagrams, using metaphors, and incorporating models and movement were everyday occurrences in my classroom, and remain so in my teaching of preservice teachers.

I also used creative communication techniques to report test results and other important information during IEP meetings. From the example above, my use of color coded diagrams assisted Ms. Irwin in comprehending the quantitative results of the Woodcock Johnson, though her full understanding of Zach's progress and achievements was only grasped when Ms. Irwin looked through Zach's portfolio, showing classwork, writing samples, and other qualitative information. In addition, my conversation with her expanding on those results and recounting Zach's skills during lessons also helped Ms.

Irwin be assured that Zach had made progress since the previous year. These experiences of utilizing creative communication within instruction and other professional endeavors have prepared me for effective communication of mixed methods findings from this study.

Research Design Overview

In keeping with Creswell et al.'s (2008) recommendation for researchers to use a visual model to represent mixed methods design, I created *Figure 1*. Visual models in mixed methods design often use a notation system to represent both order of events (in the form of arrows) and major/minor emphasis on data collection (in the form of capital and lowercase fonts respectively) provided in shortened notation (i.e., *quan* representing a minor emphasis in quantitative methods and *QUAL* representing a major emphasis in qualitative methods, as in this study) (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007; 2008). All of these conventions show themselves in *Figure 1*. An explanation of my research design referencing this figure follows.




Figure 1. Research Design

Quantitative Phase

I began this study in the Fall 2009 semester by soliciting instructors of children's literature courses and then selecting three of them from three different teacher education programs within two and four year institutions on the Front Range. After providing a brief explanation necessary to acquire participants, I described the study in more detail to individual instructors and their students. Shortly after obtaining consent to conduct research at each of the institutions, I made arrangements to administer the online rating scale.

The process of administering the online rating scale was refined following the Summer, 2009 pilot study conducted in courses offered at the university I attended. To conduct this pilot study I asked instructors of literacy courses if they would administer the survey to their undergraduate preservice teachers. Several instructors volunteered to administer the survey to their students. More important than the data obtained confirming the reliability and validity of the measure (see Appendix C), the pilot study revealed technological issues with e-mailed links from SurveyMonkey, difficulty gaining access to computer labs during class times, and lack of response from students when asked to do so on their own time. I remedied these technological and administration issues when I conducted this study in Fall 2009, resulting in 1) more efficient website use, downloading of data, and organization of data, 2) providing a description of the study to students myself (as opposed to asking the course instructor to do so), and 3) asking instructors to provide time in class in an available computer lab to complete the online survey. In addition, this pilot study resulted in my review of the possible setbacks in online survey

research (Sue & Ritter, 2007), and prompted me to make hard copies of the survey available, which was necessary in one class that participated in this study.

Once arrangements had been made, I brought students to one of their campus computer labs so that they could gain access to the online rating scale, adapted from Schutte and Malouff's (2007) study of adult reading motivation. When a campus computer lab was not available, I provided paper copies of the survey rating scale and then later entered each participants' responses into the online rating scale so that organization of all data remained consistent. The introductory page to this rating scale included a letter that explained the study and students' rights as participants (See Appendix A for the survey rating scale and Appendix B for the letter of consent). This letter of consent also invited students to select a piece of fruit I had provided in a basket as a token of appreciation. Because each class session was at least two and a half hours long and was held during meal times, the offer of fruit was greatly appreciated by all participants in the study and helped me to begin to build rapport with students. Once the survey was completed, I used descriptive statistics to analyze participant responses. These analyses enabled me to gain a basic understanding of preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading and also contributed to purposive sampling of six cases.

Sampling

My pursuit of appropriate contexts for this research study began with an online search of teacher education program course offerings at ten regional two and four year institutions. Five of the ten teacher education programs required their undergraduate elementary education students to take a children's literature course of some kind, though there was significant variety in the format and objectives among those required courses.

After obtaining contact information for instructors of these courses, I sent an e-mail to eleven potential instructor participants introducing myself, explaining my topic of research, and providing a very brief description of the participatory requirements of the study followed by an invitation to take part in my study. Three of these eleven instructors responded to my e-mail expressing interest in the study. All three of these instructors and their classes became part of my sample for this study.

Instructor participants.

One instructor, Brian, was teaching a required children's literature course through the English department of a two-year institution set in a semi-rural community on the Front Range of Colorado. (Pseudonyms are used throughout this study to protect the confidentiality of all participants.) The course was a requirement for students obtaining an associate's degree in elementary education and intending to continue their studies at a nearby four-year institution. Approximately 75% of students in the course were currently working within elementary schools in assistant or aide positions and received scholarship funds from their school districts to obtain their elementary teaching licenses. In addition, ten of the sixteen students in this class were bilingual or developing English language proficiency. Other languages spoken include various dialects of Spanish and Portuguese. All students in this class took the online rating scale in a computer lab located within their classroom.

Brian, a veteran instructor of composition courses for first-year college students, had taught children's literature for English majors approximately eight years ago at a state college on the East coast. Having a Master's degree in English focused in professional composition, Brian was unfamiliar with the children's literature course for

education majors, though he was very enthusiastic about the opportunity to teach the class and to learn from his students' experiences with children's literature in the elementary classroom.

Another instructor with a strong English background, Alice, volunteered to take part in this study. Alice had taught the children's literature course for non-majors (meaning students that were not English majors) many times at the four-year urban institution and other institutions in the region as well. The particular section of the course that she invited me to conduct my study in was comprised of approximately 27 total students, of which most were working toward elementary teaching licensure. Some of these students were obtaining their elementary teaching license through a post-baccalaureate program. (These post-baccalaureate students did not take part in my study due to my prior decision to focus my study only on undergraduate preservice teachers.) All students displayed English language proficiency, though a variety of ages, races, and backgrounds were evident. Twenty-seven students were enrolled in this course, and only ten of the 22 that were eligible volunteered to complete the rating scale. Five of the 27 students were post baccalaureate students seeking elementary licensure.

Alice, having earned a Masters degree in creative writing with an emphasis in drama, had taught undergraduate and graduate online and face-to-face courses in American and English literature for adults, children's literature, folklore, storytelling, and a variety of other related subjects. Alice was very knowledgeable in creative writing, literary criticism, the history of children's literature, and a wide variety of children's literature texts and authors. Given her background in theatre and the arts, Alice also

incorporated the visual arts, film, and drama into the study of children's literature throughout the course.

The third instructor participant who volunteered to take part in this study, Chris, had multiple prior experiences teaching the children's literature course offered through the Reading department within the teacher education program of a four-year institution located on the Front Range of Colorado. The section of the course Chris invited me into was comprised of 25 undergraduate students, of whom all but one were seeking elementary or early childhood teaching licensure (21 and 3 respectively). The student population of this class was more homogenous than those within the other two contexts being studied, given that all but one of the 25 students fell between 18 and 23 years of age, were proficient in English, and appeared to represent similar races (i.e. white). All 25 students in this class completed the survey rating scale at the beginning of their class session in the computer lab located in the same building as their class was held.

Chris, a former elementary teacher, had recently completed a Ph.D. in Research Methods with a cognate in Reading and a strong interest in teacher education and the affective domain of reading. These interests were evident in his reputation among students and faculty at the university and his dissertation study in the experiences of striving readers in elementary classrooms. Serving as a teaching assistant and then adjunct instructor for the university, Chris had taught a variety of literacy theory and methods courses within the teacher education program and often incorporated many of his own elementary teaching experiences into his teaching of children's literature.

Preservice teacher participants.

Once each of these contexts for the study was established with IRB consent from each institution, I began to consider the selection of my undergraduate preservice teacher participants. To this end, purposeful sampling was used to obtain a variety of participants within this study. My objective in employing this purposeful sampling was to attempt to capture the individuality of students' affective domains of reading. Using the descriptive statistics acquired from the Adult Motivation for Reading Scale (AMRS) (Schutte & Malouff, 2007) in addition to precursory observations, I selected two cases resulting from maximum variation sampling, one typical case, and three unique cases (Merriam, 1998).

To begin this process, I focused first on the quantitative data I collected shortly after this study was begun. Therefore the first three preservice teacher participants were selected based solely on their responses to the items in the Adult Motivation for Reading Scale (Schutte & Malouff, 2007). First, I compiled all students' scores across all three classes, arranged the total Reading Motivation scores from lowest to highest. I selected the highest scoring participant (Richard, scoring 95) and the lowest scoring participant (Denise, scoring 43), thereby capturing what was presumed to be the maximum variation found in the sample according to this measure. Richard and Denise were the first two of the six participants identified for this study.

In order to identify the typical case, a sequence of calculations was used to determine if there were similarities within responses that could lead to identifying a typical case. First, I calculated the mean and standard deviation of scores within each dimension of reading motivation (Schutte & Malouff, 2007): Reading Avoidance Versus Reading Efficacy ($M = 20.12$, $SD = 3.01$), Reading as Part of Self ($M = 29.53$, $SD =$

6.20), Reading to Do Well in Other Realms ($M = 12.80$, $SD = 3.41$), and Reading for Recognition ($M = 8.22$, $SD = 2.28$). Based on this information, I assembled all cases within one standard deviation of the mean for each dimension. After disregarding any case that did not have representation across all four dimensions, I declared this group as being representative of the typical scorers across all four dimensions. Next, I calculated the mean and standard deviation of the total Reading Motivation scores for all participants in this group ($M = 71.21$, $SD = 4.43$), omitted any cases that were not within one standard deviation of the mean (between 66.78 and 75.64) and was left with a group of 24 students that could be said to represent the typical scores of preservice teachers enrolled in children's literature courses.

As a final step to provide further assurance of this group representing the typical affective domain of reading found in students enrolled in children's literature courses, I calculated the mean and standard deviation for the number of hours spent in recreational reading each week ($M = 6.93$, $SD = 7.46$). I then considered all cases within one standard deviation of the mean for hours spent in recreational reading and compared this list to those students representative of typical scorers for the Adult Motivation for Reading Scale. Through this comparison, I discovered twenty student participants that were present in both groups. Therefore, this list of twenty students out of the total sample of fifty-one could be said to represent the affective domain of typical students enrolled in an undergraduate children's literature course required for preservice teachers. From this list of twenty students, I identified my third participant for this study (Rachel) using random selection.

The final three unique cases were selected through a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. Prior to administering the rating scale, I observed all students in each of the classes chosen to take part in the study. Following these two full class sessions of initial observation in each context, I noted particular students in the class that I felt represented atypical and/or rare attributes that might reveal interesting data within this study. These three cases were Maria, Catherine, and Helen.

Maria, was noted as unique for her lack of English language proficiency. I observed Maria remaining silent throughout the class discussions and speaking primarily in Spanish to her peers before and after class. In addition, Maria's professor, Brian, had also mentioned Maria's lack of proficiency in both oral and written English during my first interview with him. Upon collecting her rating scale responses, I found that she had scored higher than average in total Reading Motivation (74) and higher than average in the dimensions of Reading as Part of Self (31), Reading to Do Well in Other Realms (16), Reading for Recognition (12), and hours spent in recreational reading each week (15). Given what appeared to be a relatively high affective domain of reading combined with her difficulties with the English language in a course taught completely in English among all English speaking and bilingual students, I felt that Maria represented a unique case with the potential to reveal very interesting data in answer to my research questions.

Another student, Catherine, appeared to represent atypical characteristics. She, unlike many of her class peers, participated often and easily in the children's literature class. She seemed very familiar with authors and illustrators discussed in class, showed great enthusiasm for reading, and used any spare moments in class to read her own book kept on the corner of her desk. When I reviewed Catherine's rating scale scores, I was

puzzled by her very average total Reading Motivation score of 71. When I looked into her scores further, I noted that her score for the dimension Reading as Part of Self was above average (35) though her scores for the dimensions Reading to Do Well in Other Realms and Reading Recognition were below average (9 and 4 respectively). This large gap between dimensions along with Catherine's obvious enthusiasm for reading and experience with reading caused great interest. Therefore, Catherine was chosen as another unique case to investigate further qualitatively.

The last of my six chosen participants, Helen, represented a unique case in that she had never taken a face-to-face college course. This children's literature course was the first and only course Helen had taken that was not delivered in an online format, therefore her perspective seemed particularly interesting. How would a student accustomed to a faceless identity in her dealings with professors over the internet reveal her attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading or herself as a reader within a face-to-face children's literature course held in an urban university? As I observed students on each of the three campuses, I noted that most students seemed fairly comfortable with their peers and their surroundings, discussing past courses they'd taken together and revealing a familiarity with university routines and policies as well as the social environment. Though I had become aware of the rising prevalence of online learning, I had not considered how this might impact my target population for this study. Therefore, Helen's unique situation and her higher than average rating scale scores (total Reading Motivation = 84, Reading Efficacy = 21, Reading as Part of Self = 31, Reading to Do Well in Other Realms = 20, and Reading Recognition = 12) resulted in my selection of her for this study.

Qualitative Phase

Although the preservice teachers, instructors', and my own perspectives were developed concurrently throughout the study (as evidenced in the black section of Figure 1), the main emphasis was on the students' perspective. Represented by the largest box in the black section of Figure 1, the preservice teachers' perspective was developed through qualitative data collection with the six students chosen using data acquired during the quantitative phase. Due to the extent of the qualitative data collection in this portion of this phase, requiring students to consent to multiple interviews, observation, collection of their notes and assignments, as well as weekly written logs, I included an incentive of a \$25.00 gift card to the participants' store or restaurant of their choosing. I found that for most students this monetary recognition of their efforts and commitment throughout the study was appreciated, but not necessary to prevent their attrition. All instructor and student participants were glad they could help with the study, enthusiastic about being a subject of interest, and enjoyed the process a great deal.

I simultaneously established the instructor perspective in this study (see middle box within the black section of Figure 1) by collecting qualitative data from interviews, observation, and artifacts. As represented by the smaller box in Figure 1, this perspective represents a minor emphasis of the study as compared with the preservice teacher perspective, thus requiring less interviews, tertiary attention during class observations, and collection of already existing artifacts (as opposed to requesting instructors to create artifacts for the purpose of the study). As a thank you to instructors for dedicating their time to the study and welcoming me into their classrooms, I provided each with a \$10.00 gift certificate to Barnes & Noble or Borders bookstores at the completion of the study.

Throughout both phases of the study, my own researcher perspective (See the smallest box on the right side of the black section of Figure 1) was developed through reflexive notes that formed the researcher journal. These field notes taken during data collection and then reviewed and reflected on with additional notes multiple times afterward helped to reveal my perspective within the children's literature course and my own affective domain as I experienced the same events as my participants. In addition, this note taking process helped me to constantly reflect on my research methods, helping me to improve my interviewing, observation, and organization techniques, thus improving the authenticity of the data I gathered.

Data Collection and Analysis

In this section, I explain how I gathered, combined, and analyzed data from all three perspectives (i.e., preservice teacher, instructor, and researcher) to answer my research questions. I refer frequently to Table 1 to guide this explanation and to clarify the sequence of procedures and resulting products that facilitated progression through the study. Following this data collection explanation, I provide a more detailed description of the quantitative, qualitative, and mixed research data analysis techniques I used within this investigation.

Table 1

Research Design for Data Collection and Analysis

<i>Row</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Product</i>
1	QUAL data collection	precursory observation of all class participants	notes identifying possible unique cases
2	quan data collection	purposeful sample selection administered survey rating scale to participants electronically or hard copy, when necessary	undergraduate preservice teachers in required children's literature courses $n = 51$ preservice teachers $n = 3$ instructors (Brian, Chris, and Alice)
3	quan data analysis	descriptive statistics arranged scores lowest to highest determined total and dimension means and standard deviations determined mean and standard deviation for hours of recreational reading per week	highest and lowest scoring student participants parameters within one standard deviation of the mean for dimensions, total Reading Motivation, and hours of recreational reading per week

Table 1 continued

<i>Row</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Product</i>
4	quan results	<p>reported descriptive statistical results</p> <p>purposeful selection for extreme cases</p> <p>compared and contrasted list of typical scorers in AMRS* with list of typical recreational readers</p>	<p>summary tables, graphs</p> <p>$n = 1$ case with highest affective domain (Richard)</p> <p>$n = 1$ case with lowest affective domain (Denise)</p> <p>list of 20 possible typical cases</p> <p>$n = 1$ randomly selected typical case (Rachel)</p> <p>preliminary typologies of readers based on scores in dimensions</p>
5	quan + QUAL results	compared observational field notes with AMRS* results	<p>selection of three unique cases (Catherine, Maria, Helen)</p> <p>total preservice teacher participants $n = 6$</p>

Table 1 continued

<i>Row</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Product</i>
6	QUAL data collection (concurrent)	<p>Preservice Teachers-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) interviewed b) collected weekly written logs (5 of the 6 participants) c) collected artifacts d) observed <p>Instructors-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) interviewed b) collected artifacts c) observed <p>Researcher -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) journaled b) reflected during observations c) reflected following interviews 	<p>Preservice Teachers-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) transcriptions b) printouts of six questions and corresponding answers (5 of 6 participants) c) files of completed assignments, notes, quizzes, etc. d) completed observation protocols logging in-class behaviors and participant quotes <p>Instructors-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) transcriptions b) syllabus, handouts, readings, assignments, quizzes, exams c) completed observation protocols logging classroom events <p>Researcher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) handwritten and typed reflections on data from multiple sources b) observation protocol logging reflections while observing c) transcriptions

Table 1 continued

<i>Row</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Product</i>
7	QUAL + quan data analysis [1] (concurrent)	Preservice Teachers- constant comparison coding of survey rating scale responses, interview transcripts, written logs, artifacts, and observation protocols	Preservice Teachers- themes and quotes describing themes
		Instructors- constant comparison coding of interview transcripts, artifacts, and observation protocols	Instructors- themes and quotes describing themes across all instructors/ courses
		Researcher -constant comparison coding of researcher journal and observation protocol	Researcher - themes and quotes describing etic viewpoint
8	QUAL data analysis [2]	Preservice Teachers- a) thematic narrative analysis of interview transcripts, written logs, artifacts, and observation protocols b) collect continuous connected content describing each participant	Preservice Teachers- Six separate narratives describing each of the preservice teacher participants
9	QUAL + quan data analysis [3]	Data importation for use in extreme case analysis and typology development	Descriptions of High and Low affective domain students
		Warranted assertion method: reread all quan and qual data, themes, and written narratives	Typologies characterizing each reader Set of credible assertions

Table 1 continued

<i>Row</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Product</i>
10	Interpretation of quan → Qual results	Peer checking of how QUAL data explains quan results Member checking of narratives Review of validation framework-legitimation and interpretive rigor	Discussion of overall findings

* *Adult Motivation for Reading Scale*

Q1 How Do Preservice Teachers' Attitudes, Beliefs, and Values About Reading Characterize Their Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers?

I answered this question by using a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. As outlined in the second row of Table 1, the survey, *The Adult Motivation for Reading Scale* (Schutte & Malouff, 2007), was administered to all students ($n = 51$) following purposeful selection of Children's Literature classes and respective instructors ($n=3$). This survey rating scale has been modified minimally by changing the phrase "book or article" to "text (i.e., book, article, webpage, etc.)". This change reflects my intent to include the multiple texts and new literacies (Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear, & Leu, 2008) that appeal to young adults and are often used by college students.

As shown in the third row of Table 1 and explained previously in this chapter, descriptive statistics were used to identify three of the six preservice teachers. The qualitative data from initial observations (see first row of Table 1) combined with the quantitative results (see fourth row of Table 1), assisted me in determining the remaining participants (see fifth row of Table 1) for the second phase of the study. This process resulted in two students being chosen within each class ($n=6$). In addition, data from individually completed surveys revealed subscale scores for four dimensions of reading motivation (Reading as Part of Self, Reading Avoidance Versus Reading Efficacy, Reading for Recognition, and Reading to Do Well in Other Realms) which, when combined with qualitative data, lead to characterizing each participant's views of reading and themselves as readers into one of four typologies to be discussed in the next chapter of this work. These four dimensions and students' alignment with each of these dimensions of reading motivation was discussed in interviews and considered in later analyses of data.

Next, I collected qualitative data to explain and expand the findings from this survey (see sixth row of Table 1). To investigate the preservice teacher perspective, I conducted two one-on-one, in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each student participant and one unstructured interview (Creswell, 2007; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Merriam, 1998). The semi-structured interviews were spaced at intervals of approximately two weeks throughout the duration of the study. The unstructured interview occurred within the last week of the study.

Both semi-structured and unstructured interviews required a surrendering of control (Riessman, 2008) and prioritized the participants and their communication of their perspective. Repeated conversations and merging of various data sources including transcripts from these multiple semistructured and informal interviews necessitated flexibility in the research process and patience in seeking the answers to research questions. Understanding these aspects of the interview process was important to attaining a deep understanding of participants and constructing narratives (see eighth row of Table 1 and chapter 4 for these narratives) that communicated the research findings at the conclusion of data collection and analysis.

As shown in the sixth row of Table 1, student participants also submitted weekly written logs via e-mail, where they reflected on one personalized open-ended question I posed each week via e-mail. These open-ended reflection questions derived from initial analysis of survey responses and ongoing analysis of data from multiple sources including interviews, observation, and course artifacts (see third column, sixth row of Table 1). Because of the personal nature of their reflection logs, students' responses were kept confidential. In addition, one student participant, Maria, did not participate in

weekly written logs due to her self-reported difficulties with written English language. I attempted on several occasions to reword and simplify questions, but Maria would not respond via e-mail and voiced her preference to discuss all questions within face-to-face interviews.

Q2 Under What Circumstances Do Preservice Teachers' Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers Become Evident, If At All, in a Children's Literature Course?

This question was answered through a conflation of qualitative data throughout the investigation, as shown in the seventh, eighth, and ninth rows of Table 1. I observed each participant within their children's literature course throughout the semester, a total of thirteen class sessions for each children's literature course. Class sessions ranged between 2.5 and 3 hours, resulting in a total of approximately 95 hours of observation.

Taking into consideration the various observational roles, the observer as participant role was determinedly most appropriate given the goal of this proposed research, the intentions for data analysis, the participants involved, and the context of the study. In this role, the researcher prioritizes the gathering of information while interacting closely enough with participants to "establish an insider's identity without participating in those activities constituting the core of group membership" (Merriam, 1998, p. 101). Although this observer role was most prominent throughout the research process, I found that it was necessary to explore various roles in various contexts, changing my role multiple times within the same class session. This was often influenced by a number of factors including the rapport I was able to establish with specific students and instructors in each context, the activities students were engaged in, students' and participants' desired levels of interaction, and instructors' desired levels of interaction.

In order to gather data most pertinent to the research questions driving this study being flexible in my role was important. For example, in order to gather observational data such as comments, questions, and reactions, I could not always participate fully in small group projects and discussions as this would have limited my opportunities to follow the actions of the instructor as he/she interacted with each small group. Yet, there were multiple times when students in the class, my selected student participants, and/or the instructor would desire my engagement in an activity or discussion. I found it necessary to constantly negotiate my level of involvement in the class, weighing the benefits of becoming more interactive with students and instructors (such as helping students and instructors to be more relaxed and authentic in my presence, getting an insider's understanding of their experience, helping the class members and instructors to form positive perceptions of researchers in the classroom, and of course increased learning on the topic being discussed) versus the drawbacks of interaction (such as missed opportunities to gather data on a participant not present in the small group I was working with, missed opportunities to gather data on the instructors, the reality of researcher bias impacting the amount and kinds of data collected on various participants, and the complications that could arise if students perceived me as authoritative in any way). I found myself reflecting often both in discussion of my study with peers and in my researcher journal to determine appropriate researcher behavior as well as to understand how my actions might be impacting my study.

Therefore, the various observer roles impacted the types of information I recorded, the process I used to record observations, and the preparations necessary prior to entering each research site. Consequently, I used an observation protocol (Creswell,

2007; Merriam, 1998) as seen in Figure 2 in order to maintain my attention on all three perspectives (i.e. preservice teacher, instructor, and my own) as much as was possible.

This observation protocol and an accompanying journal was essential for organizing my observational notes and recording reflections leading to the answer to this question.

syllabi and notes taken during class observations to alert me as to when I needed to collect assignments to analyze throughout the semester. In addition to out of class assignments, I obtained copies of students' notes from class activities I observed. Collection and then redistribution of copied artifacts often happened before and after observations and interviews. Copies of these artifacts were used within interviews for the purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the participant's written work and eliciting richer responses from interview questions with student participants. Within this study, time limits, student collaboration, and instructor direction were some of the factors accounted for (Merriam, 1998) when participant assignments and written activities were analyzed.

Finally, I used constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) coding of transcribed interviews and weekly written logs (see row seven of Table 1) to answer this question. As discussed in chapter one, Krathwohl's (1993) factors to consider when using artifacts lead me to be conscientious of students' writing skills, personality, past experiences with writing, and preferred mode of communication, which all impacted the weekly e-mailed logs used throughout the study. This became particularly evident with two of my participants, Denise and Maria. Both students expressed difficulties with vocabulary and written language, which in Denise's case was taken into account by discussing weekly logs within the interviews that followed. In Maria's case, the weekly written logs were omitted from my data collection, as she declined several invitations and attempts to use this method. Instead, I developed questions that I might have e-mailed to her and presented those as discussion topics during our interviews. The personalized questions developed and sent to all other participants every week were based on other data sources.

These questions prompted deeper student reflection in many cases, which was applied as needed to elicit interesting discussion during interviews leading to answering this research question.

Q3 What Perceptions, If Any, Do Children's Literature Instructors Have of Their Students' Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers?

While I used a variety of qualitative methods to answer this question, interviews were most informative. I conducted two one-on-one in-depth semi-structured face-to-face interviews, with one occurring within the first two weeks of the study and the second within one week of the final session of data collection (see row six of Table 1). The class survey rating scale data, course syllabi, instructor lesson plans, observation notes, and my researcher journal containing reflections on interview data (both student participant and first instructor interview) served as elicitation devices within interviews. Students' reflection logs, assignments, and transcriptions from interviews were not used for the purpose of confidentiality. These interviews were transcribed and analyzed using constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) as shown in row seven of Table 1.

Observations of the class sessions also revealed insights into the instructors' perceptions of their students. The observation protocol, found in Figure 2, was designed so that I could note the sequence of events throughout each observed class session, the instructor's role in bringing about or reacting to each event, and then student participant and my own reactions to events. An event may be described as a teaching and/or learning opportunity either planned or spontaneously occurring at any time during the observation. Examples included comments or questions posed by the instructor or any student in the class, activities designed and facilitated by the instructor, teachable moments occurring

within class discussions, reading aloud of various texts, student presentations, and other teaching and learning experiences observed in the classroom. This protocol assisted me in remembering and later analyzing the interaction among multiple perspectives in the classroom environment and identifying evidence of the instructors' perceptions of students' affective domain of reading (see row seven of Table 1). This protocol was also very important to organizing my observation of student participants when they were engaged in small group work.

Q4 How Might Instructors' Perceptions of Their Students' Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers Contribute to Their Instructional Decisions?

I used class observations and one-on-one interviews to answer this question. In addition to the two preplanned interviews that occurred at the beginning and end of the semester, I also was prepared for the informal conversational interviews and dialogue that are occurred before and/or after class observations. Acknowledging that capturing these valuable spontaneous informal interactions was not always possible, I scheduled time immediately following each class session observation to record last minute conversations, reflections, and other notes pertinent to answering this and other research questions in my researcher journal. Spontaneous reflections on prior observations and interviews were also recorded in audio format while traveling to and from research sites. Aside from gaining a deeper understanding of instructor participant perspectives and my own, reviewing these audio reflections was also an effective way for me to focus future observations and to facilitate interview question development. Some of these reflective audio recordings were later transcribed for analysis purposes.

In addition, I gathered a variety of artifacts representing instructional decisions throughout the study, as shown in row six of Table 1. Artifacts such as course syllabi, lesson presentation materials, selected children's literature text titles used within lessons, quizzes and exams, copies of online course material where applicable, and the course textbook or collection of course readings yielded much information. Having seen the influence of children's literature textbook authors' theoretical stances in regards to purposes for children's literature courses, I examined how the theoretical stance of instructors is exhibited within selected textbooks and assigned readings, their course syllabi, and course instruction. This theoretical stance varied among the three courses mainly in regards to the department within which the course was offered and the educational background and experiences of the instructors.

In order to gather as much evidence as possible, I collected these artifacts before, during, and after observed class sessions as well as between observations. I provided a list of requests to each instructor as a requirement of participation in the study. This list included a) digital or handwritten lesson plans for every class session, b) digital or hard copies of all handouts used throughout course instruction, c) assigned course readings such as articles and titles of texts used, and d) preplanned quizzes and exams. Given the emergent nature of qualitative research, this list was not all inclusive. Although I had prepared to analyze instructor's plans, none of the instructor participants provided or seemed to have prepared written lesson plans.

Data Analysis

Because this study employs mixed methods, I will first describe the quantitative data analysis as shown in row three of Table 1, followed by the qualitative data analyses

techniques as shown in rows eight and nine of Table 1, and conclude with a description of the mixed method data analysis I implemented, shown in rows seven and nine of Table 1. This segregate account is not to imply that data remained segregate in stages of analysis or reporting. Recalling my purposes for utilizing mixed methods in this study, that of understanding complex phenomena and generating new ideas, my data analysis reflected these purposes. Greene notes that “mixing methods for the purposes of complementarity”, is necessary and appropriate for mixed methods studies that seek “more comprehensive social understandings by using methods that tap into different facets or dimensions of the *same complex phenomenon*” [emphasis original] (2007, p. 101). I conclude this section with Greene’s strategies for data importation (2007) and Caracelli and Greene’s extreme case analysis (2008) to describe the mixed methods analysis used in this study.

Based on the review of several measures, I began this study with a modified version of Schutte and Malouff’s *Adult Motivation for Reading Scale* (2007) described in chapter one. This survey in addition to four items to identify students’ enjoyment of reading and reading tendencies was used for the primary purpose of identifying students with relatively low and high affective domain characteristics and the various dimensions of reading motivation within student participants. The *Adult Motivation for Reading Scale* (AMRS) (2007) contains 21 Likert scale items requiring participants to read statements about reading attitudes, beliefs, values, and tendencies and then to rate these items with a number from 1 to 5 representing a scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Rating scale data revealed each student's overall reading motivation score, as well as scores for each factor representing four dimensions of reading motivation. Scores could have ranged from 21-105, with 21 being the lowest possible score, signifying low motivation and 105 being the highest possible score, signifying high motivation. When these data are correlated with the data from the additional four questions seeking the participants' enjoyment of reading and frequency of reading, each student's overall affective domain of reading can be established. Baker and Wigfield (1999) summarized similar data with elementary-aged students using descriptions of seven types of readers, or reader profiles, based on a cluster analysis of their survey results. Schutte and Malouff (2007) used factor analysis of their data from this rating scale to characterize adult readers' motivation: Reading Avoidance Versus Reading Efficacy (RE), Reading as Part of Self (RPS) , Reading to Do Well in Other Realms (DW), and Reading For Recognition (RR).

Due to a relatively small sample used in this study ($n = 51$), such analyses was not possible, though both constructs (i.e. total Reading Motivation and the four dimensions of reading motivation) were used to frame the informal analysis of descriptive statistics resulting from the AMRS survey data. The mean, standard deviation, and range of scores representing total Reading Motivation within the entire sample across all three classes was most important to understanding the significance of individual preservice teacher participant's scores. The mean and standard deviation of scores within each of the dimensions also proved useful in identifying a typical case, Rachel, as well as unique cases, such as Catherine, Maria, and Helen. In addition these scores were compared to

data collected from prior use of this survey (i.e. from the pilot study and Schutte & Malouff's study) to assist in determining reliability of the measure.

Two main qualitative data analysis techniques were used throughout my study. The first, thematic narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008), was used to analyze student participant interview transcripts, weekly written logs, and reflective notes on conversational interviews that occurred before, during, and after observations (see row eight of Table 1). Thematic narrative analysis was also used with some student artifacts as well, though this depended on the nature of individual students' assignments, quizzes, and class activities.

The purpose of this analysis technique was to construct six separate case stories or narratives (Pagnucci, 2004) of preservice teachers within a children's literature course as shown in the third column of row eight in Table 1 and included in chapter four of this study. This purpose framed my analysis in that I searched the data for continuous connected content describing how aspects of the affective domain characterized the student and his/her journey through the children's literature course. Examples of this content include lengthy excerpts from transcribed interviews and/or weekly logs in which the speaker/author's voice is clearly heard. These pieces of data became cornerstones with which I constructed rich narratives telling the stories of student participant's attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading within his/her children's literature course. With this intent in mind, I attempted to keep students' stories intact, weaving multiple data sources together, while maintaining the sequenced passage of time.

As suggested by Riessman (2008) this narrative analysis remained case centered, rather than across cases, and was contextualized with descriptions of the setting, a

children's literature course, and the experiences within that setting. It is important to note that student participants' reflections related to the course experiences, whether these experiences take place within the classroom or outside the classroom, were also considered as part of the setting or context of the narrative constructed. I set out to develop and communicate a better understanding of preservice teachers' affective domain as it relates to reading through the use of story, fulfilling Pagnucci's (2004) expectations for "a research report (that) ought to help us live in someone else's shoes, not simply hear what kind of shoes the person was wearing" (p. 50).

The second qualitative data analysis technique I used throughout all qualitative and quantitative data within this study is constant comparison inductive coding (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998) as shown in row seven of Table 1. I searched through data to identify emerging themes explaining the characteristics and impact of the affective domain of reading in preservice teachers and the instruction they received in their children's literature courses. This data analysis technique differed from the thematic narrative analysis in that I looked at data derived from all perspectives (i.e. student participant, instructor participant, and my own) and multiple data sources (i.e. rating scale, interview transcripts, observation notes, artifacts, and researcher journal) to construct themes and codes evidenced by quotes describing these themes (see third column of row seven in Table 1). The creation and frequent use of a codebook (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998) helped to organize and maintain consistency throughout the study.

The constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) coding across quantitative and qualitative data represents Greene's (2007) interactive mixed methods analyses in that I searched for "*interaction* among different sets of data during the study" [emphasis

original] (p. 144) and therefore intended to “intentionally incorporate a back-and-forth conversation among diverse methods and data sets” (p. 143). Recognizing the complexity of this process, I utilized Greene’s suggestion of including planned stopping points throughout the study, approximately every other week, to look for ways the quantitative and qualitative data could further inform one another. As Greene described, although convergence, consistency, and corroboration are often the objective of mixed methods research, divergence and dissonance may provide opportunities for further exploration and should not be overlooked.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis processes and techniques described support three mixed methods data analysis strategies: 1) Greene’s data importation in which one form of data (i.e., scores in reading motivation or dimensions of reading motivation) is imported or brought into the analysis of the qualitative data set (i.e. interview transcripts, observation notes, etc.) (2007), 2) Caracelli and Greene’s (2008) extreme case analysis and typology development, followed by 3) M.L. Smith’s (1997) warranted assertion method. First, in line with Creswell & Plano-Clark’s (2007) description of sequential data analysis and Greene’s (2007) data importation, the results of the quantitative portion of this study using the AMRS survey rating scale and additional questions yielded quantitative descriptions of readers and data describing dimensions of the readers’ reading motivation (see the third column of row four in Table 1). These quantitative results were imported or brought into the analysis of the qualitative data (see row nine in Table 1), thus contributing to the framework needed to investigate extreme cases and develop typologies. Therefore, the extreme cases originally determined by quantitative data (i.e. total Reading Motivation scores) were

described and characterized more thoroughly through refining and elaboration (Caracelli & Greene, 2008) made possible by qualitative data analysis. Furthermore, typologies inferred from quantitative data (i.e., scores within four dimensions of reading motivation) were developed and substantiated through analysis of qualitative data.

Finally, M.L. Smith's (1997) warranted assertion method requires the researcher to read through all data repeatedly, "arriving inductively and intuitively at a set of credible assertions" to be confirmed or disconfirmed through weighing evidence from all data sets (see row nine in Table 1). In this process, both quantitative and qualitative data are considered equally important, therefore representing potentially valuable evidence supporting credible assertions. The multiple data analyses taking place prior to this stage of the research assisted me in this final stage of analysis and formation of credible assertions.

Taken together, these data collection and data analysis processes lead to the concluding interpretation and discussion of overall findings as shown in row ten of Table 1. The procedures that will contribute to the validity of these interpretations are outlined in Table 1 and described further in the following section.

Validation Framework: Construct Validation

Dellinger and Leech (2007) proposed the Validation Framework (VF) based on Messick's (1995) idea of construct validity taking into account "both score meaning and social values in test interpretation and test use" (p. 741). According to Dellinger and Leech, construct validity is appropriate for mixed methods research validation because:

...(a) construct validation is a pragmatic process (Cherryholmes, 1988); (b) construct validation requires mindfulness (Langer, 1989), recognition, and the

constant integration of relevant available information, whether qualitative(ly) or quantitative(ly); (c) construct validation assumes that there are no criteria or rulers to measure research quality except as determined by discourse and language in a community of researchers (Cherryholmes, 1988) and the subsequent weight of the research in the negotiations of data meaning; and (d) construct validation is a nonending, continuous, time- and context-specific, open process (Markus, 1998; Messic, 1995, 1998) (p. 321).

The VF is an attempt to address quantitative, qualitative, and mixed validity within the process and products of mixed methods research. It combines a variety of terminology and concepts traditional to quantitative and qualitative research, while incorporating many of the most recent theorists' terminologies for validity in mixed methods research. For the purpose of determining the construct validity of this study, I drew on Dellinger and Leech's (2007) framework thereby addressing validity/credibility, reliability/generalizability, and legitimation (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2008) of the quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods processes and products of this study (See Figure 3).




Figure 3 Validation Framework

Foundational Element

This first section of the validation framework begins the process of building construct validity in my study in that it reflects my prior understanding of the affective domain of reading in preservice teachers, methods of researching the affective domain, and what is still needed in this field. As explained in chapters one and two, the process of combining reflections on my experiences in the field of reading instruction and teacher education, as well as analysis of quantitative and qualitative research conducted in this field, I was equipped to determine research questions of significance and interest. In addition, my review of the literature contributed to determining the appropriate research design of my proposed study.

Traditional Quantitative Elements of Construct Validation

Design-Related Elements

Internal validity from the quantitative research perspective in this study derives from development and standardization of the administration of the online rating scale as a result of data collected from the pilot study of the rating scale. I administered the identical online rating scale to students in all three classes in the same method (i.e. online), and within similar contexts as the pilot study (i.e. during course instructional time, in a computer lab at the corresponding institution). I also consistently described the study to participants,

Establishing external validity in the quantitative research in this study involved a two phase, purposive participant selection. It is expected that the quantitative data from

this study will help to inform other preservice teachers enrolled in children's literature courses within undergraduate elementary or early childhood education programs, though inferential statistics will not be used in this study, preventing generalizability. The predicted usability of the descriptive statistics is based on the first phase being the selection of all students enrolled in three different children's literature classes offered by early childhood and elementary education programs within three different institutions. The second phase of purposive participant selection involved a variety of sampling procedures (see the beginning of this chapter) and resulted in the inclusion of one student representing the low affective domain in reading, one student representing the high affective domain in reading, and one student representing the typical affective domain as determined by their performances on the rating scale. In addition, students' performance on the rating scale also contributed to identifying three unique cases. This two phase, unequal sample size participant selection procedure from varying contexts contributes to the external validity of this proposed study in that it represents 1) two and four year institutions, 2) elementary and early childhood preservice teachers, and 3) low, high, typical, and unique affective domains.

Measurement-Related Elements

According to Schutte and Malouff (2007), the four subscales of the AMRS assessing dimensions of reading motivation were reported to have acceptable to good reliability, reporting the total reading motivation scale at a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Subjects were a population of adults in the general population, approximately half of which were undergraduate students. The results of the pilot administration of the AMRS was consistent according to Cronbach's alpha for both administrations at .88 and .79,

particularly considering the small n sizes ($n = 14$, $n = 17$ respectively). While there is some indication that higher Cronbach's alpha ratings could have been achieved by the deletion of items 17 and 19, the increase in alpha would not be large enough to warrant the deletions.

Schutte and Malouff (2007) reported acceptable internal consistency of the measure, with an alpha of .85. They went on to state that "the scale related in expected ways to enjoyment of reading and time spent reading, providing some evidence of validity of the measure" (p. 485). To provide substantiation of this claim, Schutte and Malouff calculated the correlation between total reading motivation and enjoyment at .65, and correlation between total reading motivation and frequency of reading at .62. Data from my pilot study with the AMRS indicated validity evidence found for two administrations of the measure, using the same test for validity that was employed by Schutte and Malouff on adult motivation for reading (2007). The summed test score for the 21-item measure was correlated with the scores for enjoyment of reading and frequency of reading. The resulting correlation coefficients for one administration of the measure indicated moderate to high correlations between the measure and the self reports of enjoyment of reading ($r = .72$, $n = 14$) and frequency of reading ($r = .77$, $n = 14$). This validity test for another administration of the measure indicated moderate to high correlations between the measure and the self reports of enjoyment of reading ($r = .70$, $n = 17$) and frequency of reading ($r = .62$, $n = 17$). Furthermore, the content analysis of the AMRS indicated sufficient measurement of the affective domain of reading. Each item of the scale and the four additional correlated questions addressed attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading elucidated in chapter two of this proposal.

Given the acceptable reliability and internal consistency and content validity of the measure reported by Schutte and Malouff (2007) and then supported by my pilot study in 2009, I proceeded with this measure as one indicator of preservice teachers' affective domains. The results of this measure were analyzed once again to determine reliability and internal consistency validity with this administration of the survey to my sample of preservice teachers ($n = 51$). According to Cronbach's alpha at .82, the measure demonstrated acceptable reliability. In addition, correlation coefficients of .68 and .78 indicate that the measure maintained acceptable internal consistency validity in this study.

Traditional Qualitative Elements of Construct Validation

Primary Criteria

The primary criteria for establishing construct validation using qualitative data involved credibility, triangulation, and confirmability. Credibility of the second phase of this study was established through member checks from the six student participants. These participants were offered the opportunity to read the narratives derived from the data analysis, and to contribute clarification of their perspective if they desired or saw it as necessary. In addition, instructors of children's literature courses also reviewed a summary of the conclusions of the instructor perspective of this study to improve the accuracy and usability of the resulting report.

Triangulation within qualitative research is also of primary importance (Creswell, 2007) in establishing construct validation of this study. Therefore perspectives, methods, research sites, and analysis techniques are integral parts of this research design. First,

through the investigation of student, instructor, and researcher perspectives, an in-depth understanding of the affective domain of reading within preservice teachers in children's literature courses was established. Second, through the implementation of a variety of methods, including multiple observations, multiple interviews, and various written artifacts, a firm grounding of each of these perspectives was achieved. The inclusion of both self-report and objective methods was also necessary for this grounding. Third, the investigation of three different children's literature courses within three different institutions also contributed to the validation of the construct established in this study. Finally, the use of a variety of analyses, including thematic narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008), constant comparison (Merriam, 1998), and M.L. Smith's (1997) warranted assertion method assisted me in further supporting the research construct.

In order to establish confirmability of this qualitative phase of the research, I included peer debriefing, an audit trail, and my researcher reflective journal (Merriam, 1998). My research advisors and three other faculty members that have or were in the process of teaching a children's literature course also reviewed my analyses, thus achieving the peer debriefing needed to establish confirmability of the findings. An audit trail, containing organizational information for digital documents, observational notes, and artifact collection, assisted me in data collection and analyses as well as establishing confirmability of results upon conclusion of the study. In addition, my reflective researcher journal not only provided pertinent data solidifying my perspective in answering the research questions, but also contained other data, such as details regarding the context of data collection, evaluation of interview methods, and other details to support confirmability of findings.

Secondary Criteria

Other qualitative research construct validation includes criteria such as explicitness, creativity, and thoroughness. I used thematic narrative analysis and the resulting six narratives exemplifying the student participant perspective in this study to provide thick, rich description of data collected. I also used excerpts from interviews and written logs. These processes supported my aim to write narrative research that is characterized by going beyond the facts, striving for “accuracy in academic work”, as well as “language that shakes our world up, rearranges it, and makes us pause and look again” (Pagnucci, 2004, p. 50). This style of writing also required significant creativity, especially when combined with quantitative data, therefore I incorporated a variety of visuals, such as graphic models and tables as necessary to complement and extend narrative results further supporting construct validation. Finally, the thoroughness resulting from the melding of multiple data sources assisted me in providing a thorough narrative.

Mixed Methods Elements of Construct Validation

Within the mixed methods paradigm, researchers have offered up a variety of terms to represent those often used in discussions of quantitative and qualitative validity. For example, Dellinger and Leech (2007) noted researchers’ use of terms such as legitimization, consistency, suitability, and distinctiveness in their review of mixed methods literature. The consensus among many of these researchers is to utilize terms that are similar to those used in quantitative and qualitative research whenever possible. Because both quantitative and qualitative researchers make inferences throughout the

research process, Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) recommend using the term “inference quality” for discussion of mixed methods validity. This broad term is broken down into three categories outlined in Figure 3 and explained in the following sections: Design Quality, Legitimation, and Interpretive Rigor.

Design Quality

Design quality refers to “the standards used for the evaluation of the methodological rigor of the mixed research study” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 55). According to Tashakkori and Teddlie’s integrative model (2006, as cited in Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006) design quality is comprised of four components. Two of these apply to my study: design suitability and within design consistency.

Design suitability is determined by “whether the methods of a study are appropriate for addressing the research questions and the design is consistent with the research questions” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 56). The methods I have used in this study resulted in an in-depth understanding of multiple perspectives. Inferences made throughout the study were supported and refuted with information gathered from self-report quantitative measures and qualitative measures, as well as observed qualitative measures. In this way, both complementary and dissonant findings yielded quality inferences.

Furthermore, the design of this study was consistent with the research questions in that the quantitative phase provided introductory information about the participants that was drawn into the remainder of the study. This introductory information serves two purposes, 1) providing a means to selecting the most appropriate participants for further investigation, and 2) a precursory understanding of dimensions of preservice teachers’

reading motivation. As the study continued into the second phase, this understanding was important to investigating the instructor's perspective on the affective domain within each class. In addition, the design of the qualitative phase of this study provided sufficient data to answer each of the research questions. The triangulation of contexts, participants, and methods over the span of thirteen weeks was another facet of the study design resulting answers to the research questions. Finally, as suggested by Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006), I analyzed data continuously throughout the thirteen weeks so that each phase and data source provided conceptual and methodological grounds for the next one. This lead naturally to quality inferences.

Within design consistency is determined by assessing the procedures and design of the study. For example, reviewing observation, measures, interviews, transcriptions, artifact collection, and data analysis techniques for sufficiency and quality all contributed to within design consistency in this study. This facet of validity within my study was accounted for by using an observation protocol, the piloted rating scale, a thorough literature review covering interviews and use of artifacts, and finally my past experiences as a qualitative researcher. Through reflection on past research studies, I continued to improve the quality of my interview, transcription, and analysis techniques. This improvement prepared me to establish within design consistency in this investigation.

Legitimation

Legitimation is a term that replaces those that have traditionally been associated with either quantitative or qualitative research. "Using a bilingual nomenclature" (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 55) ensures that both research communities find the term acceptable (Creswell, et al., 2008; Greene, 2007). Employing this term also opens

discussion of the overall criteria for assessment of mixed method research as a continuous process, iterative and interactive (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2004). Of the nine types of legitimation noted in various reviews of mixed methods research (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007; Dellinger & Leech, 2007; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2004; Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2008), four contribute to the validity of my study: sample integration legitimation, weakness minimization legitimation, inside-outside legitimation, and commensurability legitimation. The purpose of each of these legitimation types was to ensure the quality of meta-inferences derived from the study. Meta-inferences are those made from pulling together the inferences from qualitative and quantitative phases of a study (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006)

Sample integration legitimation is “the extent to which the relationship between the quantitative and qualitative sampling designs yield quality meta-inferences” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 57). If the samples are significantly different within various stages of a study, meta-inferences become less powerful and even problematic. Because my study was designed to maintain the same participants throughout, with the second phase participants drawn from the first phase sample, meta-inferences were strong. The sampling methods employed were designed to identify extreme cases of low and high affective domains of reading, a typical case of affective domain of reading, and three unique cases reflecting the individuality of the affective domain of reading. These sampling techniques contribute to population transferability (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2002).

Weakness minimization legitimation is “the extent to which the weakness from one approach is compensated by the strengths from the other approach” (Onwuegbuzie &

Johnson, 2006, p. 57). This legitimation type is best communicated through the table below (*Table 2*) in which approaches within my study on either side of the table are designed to compensate for one another.

Table 2

Weakness Minimization Legitimation

Quantitative Approach	Qualitative Approach
Self-report data from rating scale, weekly written logs, interviews	Researcher reported/derived data from observations, artifacts, interviews with instructors
Quantitative representation of thoughts/reflections on self as reader communicated through numerical data, out of context	Qualitative representation of thoughts/reflections on self as reader communicated through verbal and written data, naturalistic
Survey rating scale providing brief, one-time explanation of affective domain	Multiple information sources repeated over several weeks explaining affective domain
Objective, impersonal, passive survey rating scale as information source	Subjective, personal, interactive seeking out of information
Narrow, single perspective on affective domain (the preservice teachers' perspective)	Multiple perspectives on affective domain (the preservice teachers', instructors', and researcher's)
Data from rating scale describing what is already inherent in preservice teachers	Data discovering what is growing from continuous experiences preservice teachers engage in

The strength of this design is evidenced by the balance of approaches in sampling, data collection, and data analysis. This overall design balance assisted me in forming powerful meta-inferences.

Inside-outside legitimation is “the extent to which the researcher accurately presents and appropriately utilizes the insiders’ views and the observer’s views for purposes such as description and explanation” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 57). This type of legitimation is evidenced in my study through attention to multiple perspectives on the same phenomena. The design of this study sought both the emic viewpoint (that of the insider or researched) and the etic viewpoint (that of the researcher) (Merriam, 1998). A visual diagram (Figure 4) represents the framework which guided this objective.




Figure 4. Inside-Outside Legitimation Framework

In order to establish the emic viewpoint, I used multiple data sources from each participant in the study. The preservice teacher perspective was discovered through the

rating scale, interviews, written logs, artifacts from the course, and observation. I also requested that preservice teachers read their own narratives constructed from the research data and contribute feedback regarding the accuracy of my representation of the story of their affective domain. Although each preservice teacher participant was sent his/her narrative, not all participants contributed feedback. This member checking (Merriam, 1998) was imperative to establishing the emic viewpoint. The course instructor perspective was discovered through the interviews, course materials, and observation. My own perspective was discovered through my researcher journal, notes taken during observations (see Figure 2), and transcripts of interviews with both preservice teachers and course instructors. While it was important to establish each of these emic viewpoints singly, I also united these three perspectives to determine an overall emic viewpoint and meta-inferences about the affective domain within children's literature courses.

In order to establish the etic viewpoint, I utilized reflexive journaling (Schwandt, 2007) in written and oral forms, critically self-reflecting on my own biases, theoretical predispositions, and preferences throughout the study. In addition, I used peer review at various points in the research process and at the conclusion of the study, thereby having my inferences examined by outside credible sources (Merriam, 1998). This process challenged me to evaluate my research techniques carefully and to communicate my understandings clearly. Finally, use of M.L. Smith's (1997) warranted assertion method as part of my data analysis guided my rereading of my researcher journal and other data sources. This process also added to the inside-outside legitimation of this study.

Commensurability legitimation is "the extent to which the meta-inferences made reflect a mixed worldview based on the cognitive process of Gestalt switching and

integration” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 57). This type of legitimation is possible because of my paradigm stance as described in the beginning of this chapter. According to Howe (1988), “Paradigms must demonstrate their worth in terms of how they inform, and are informed by research methods that are successfully employed” (p.10). This understanding prompts qualitative and quantitative data to be analyzed concurrently throughout the investigation.

Although quantitative methods were applied only at the beginning of the study with the administration of the rating scale, results of this research are not confined to inferences made only at the beginning of the study. The findings of that quantitative phase impacted the subsequent qualitative phase by instigating specific interview questions, weekly written log prompts, and the focus of observations. This use of qualitative data to extend and explain quantitative findings follows Creswell and Plano-Clark’s (2007) definition of sequential explanatory mixed method design. Furthermore, the various data sources used throughout this study represented the affective domain differently and therefore are necessary for thorough analysis of this complex phenomenon. Clearly, building of meta-inferences was dependent on the commensurability of quantitative and qualitative findings.

Interpretive Rigor

Unlike legitimation, which focuses on the validity of the process of research (i.e. data collection and data analysis), interpretive rigor “pertains to the standards for evaluating the validity of conclusions” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 55). I used Tashakkori and Teddlie’s model of quality to clarify interpretive rigor in my study. Their model is comprised of interpretive consistency, theoretical consistency, integrative

efficacy, and the inferential consistency audit (2006, as cited in Onweugbuzie & Johnson, 2006).

Interpretive consistency consists of two parts, 1) “whether the inferences closely follow the relevant findings in terms of type, intensity, and scope”, and 2) whether the “multiple inferences made on the basis of the findings are consistent with each other” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2006, as cited in Onweugbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 56). In order to achieve this interpretive consistency, I maintained an audit trail (Merriam, 1998), noting time spent collecting and analyzing data in each of the three contexts and with each of the participants. In this way, I ensured similarity in type, intensity, and scope of the processes leading up to conclusions drawn from the study. As a result, preservice teachers’ stories were similar in depth and insight. Given my past experiences as a special education teacher, I recognized my potential tendency to bias my attention toward those students with a low affective domain. Recognizing this prior to beginning data collection, and preparing to log my research process helped prevent this bias from impacting data collection and analysis.

In making meta-inferences about preservice teachers, I was cautious to separate inferences that are applicable to only one specific preservice teacher from those that are common among all preservice teachers. In doing so, I discovered and described findings that are consistent with one another and also identified and explained opposing findings among participants. This process resulted in meta-inferences that took into account divergent data, providing explanation when sources of data did not uncover similar findings.

Another aspect of interpretive rigor, theoretical consistency, is defined as “whether the inferences are consistent with theory and the state of knowledge in the field” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2006, as cited in Onweugbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 56). As meta-inferences developed, I returned to the literature review, looking for and seeking to understand similarities and differences from conclusions drawn from similar studies. In addition, I also needed to revisit the literature periodically throughout the study to see if authors of other studies were putting forth inferences that may connect or compare to my own.

Integrative efficacy, “whether the meta-inference(s) adequately incorporate the inferences stemming from quantitative and qualitative phases of the study” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2006, as cited in Onweugbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 56) is yet another aspect of interpretive rigor established in my study. This integrative efficacy was secured in part through my attention to commensurability legitimation, as discussed above. The return to quantitative data as I acquired increasing amounts of qualitative data resulted in meta-inferences that stemmed from all data sources. As I proceeded through this process, records of how quantitative data continued to inform qualitative data were maintained in my researcher journal. In addition, creative rhetoric, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, was also necessary as I melded quantitative data and narratives.

Inferential Consistency Audit

This stage of the validation process occurred at the completion of the study. At this time, I returned to the research questions and methodology I used to determine the extent to which the research questions were answered and if there were any methodological holes, asking myself, 1) what other data did I need to more thoroughly

answer the research questions, 2) how could I have improved my research design and/or research procedures to more accurately determine the answers to my research questions, and 3) what, if any, additional analysis techniques could have been used to procure more powerful inferences. This follow-up phase of the validation framework was essential in carrying out successful future research in this field.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have provided a detailed description of my researcher stance, the procedures I used to answer each of my research questions, the analysis I employed, and a description of the construct validation used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of my study. In the next chapter, I present the results of this study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Overview

The purpose of this study was to investigate the affective domain of preservice teachers enrolled in required children's literature courses. I collected data from three different yet contextually connected perspectives; the preservice elementary teacher, the children's literature course instructor, and myself. Four research questions guided this study:

- Q1 How do preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values about reading characterize their views of reading and themselves as readers?
- Q2 Under what circumstances do preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers become evident, if at all, in a children's literature course?
- Q3 What perceptions, if any, do children's literature instructors have of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers?
- Q4 How might instructors' perceptions of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers contribute to their instructional decisions?

In this chapter I report the findings in five sections. In the first section, I report findings to the first research question using quantitative and qualitative information. In the second, third, and fourth sections, I report the findings of the remaining research questions. In the fifth section, I provide a brief chapter summary.

Research Question 1

Q1 How do preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values about reading characterize their views of reading and themselves as readers?

Descriptive statistics describing the results from the administration of the Adult Motivation for Reading Scale (Schutte & Malouff, 2007) (AMRS), constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) coding of all quantitative and qualitative data collected on the preservice teachers, followed by thematic narrative analysis of all qualitative data were used to answer this research question. Findings are reported in four parts: a) Descriptive Statistics of AMRS Results, b) Themes Across Sources, c) Typologies of Preservice Teacher Readers, and d) Preservice Teacher Participant Narratives.

Descriptive Statistics of AMRS Results

The Adult Motivation for Reading Scale (Schutte & Malouff, 2007) was administered to 51 undergraduate preservice elementary teachers enrolled in required children's literature courses. This scale describes four dimensions of reading motivation. (See Table 3: Description of Dimensions).

Table 3

Description of Dimensions

Dimension of Reading Motivation	Description
Reading Efficacy Versus Reading Avoidance (RE)	Describes participant's confidence in reading ability, acceptance of challenge in reading, and perceived skills as a reader.
Reading as Part of Self (RPS)	Describes participant's judgment that reading is an essential part of the self, part of one's identity as a reader in relation to the social world
Reading to Do Well in Other Realms (DW)	Describes participant's tendency to read as a way of achieving good outcomes in school or work, complying with others' purposes for reading and performing well in reading
Reading for Recognition (RR)	Describes participant's desire for their reading to be acknowledged by others

The results for all 51 preservice teachers across all three children's literature courses are reported in Table 4 Rating Scale Means and Standard Deviations. The average score for Total Reading Motivation (TRM) was 70.57 ($SD = 10.20$), with a range from 43 to 95. All items within each dimension (RE, RPS, DW, and RR) were rated by preservice teachers on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Preservice teachers' self-reported average enjoyment of reading (ENJ) was measured on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much), while their self-reported average frequency of reading (FRE) was measured on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Their self-reported average number of hours spent in recreational reading per week (REC R) ranged from 0-30 hours per week, an average of 6.93 hours per week, and a mode of 2 hours per week.

Table 4

Rating Scale Means and Standard Deviations

Survey Rating Scale Categories	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total Reading Motivation (TRM) = 21 items	70.57	10.20
Reading Efficacy Versus Reading Avoidance (RE)= 6 items	20.12	3.01
Reading as Part of Self (RPS)= 8 items	29.53	6.20
Reading to Do Well in Other Realms (DW)= 4 items	12.80	3.41
Reading for Recognition (RR)= 3 items	8.22	2.28
Self-Reported Enjoyment of Reading (ENJ)	4.31	1.03
Frequency of Reading (FRE)	4.02	.93
Average Number of Hours Recreationally Reading Per Week (REC R)	6.93	7.46

The six purposefully selected preservice teacher participants' scores are reported in Table 5 Participant Survey Rating Scale Results.

Table 5

Participant Survey Rating Scale Results

Name	TRM	RE	RPS	DW	RR	ENJ	FRE	REC R
Richard	95	23	40	19	13	5	5	15
Helen	84	21	31	20	12	4	5	6
Maria	74	15	31	16	12	5	5	15
Catherine	71	23	35	9	4	5	5	20
Rachel	68	20	28	14	6	4	4	2
Denise	43	11	16	10	6	1	2	1.5

Note. TRM = Total Reading Motivation; RE = Reading Efficacy Versus Reading Avoidance; RPS = Reading as Part of Self; DW = Reading to Do Well in Other Realms; RR = Reading for Recognition; ENJ = Self-Reported Enjoyment of Reading; FRE = Frequency of Reading; REC R = Average Number of Hours Recreationally Reading Per Week.

The results of this measure were analyzed to determine reliability and internal consistency validity. According to Cronbach's alpha at .82, the measure demonstrated acceptable reliability. In addition, correlation coefficients were calculated for total reading motivation and enjoyment ($r = .78$) as well as total reading motivation and frequency ($r = .68$), supporting the internal consistency validity of the rating scale.

*Nine Themes Across All Preservice Teacher
Participants*

The results from the constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) of all quantitative and qualitative data yielded sixteen themes. Nine themes characterized all participants and seven characterized groups of participants, or a single participant.

Theme One: Valued the Children's Literature Course

All preservice teachers reported valuing the children's literature course. All reported being grateful for the content of the course, stating an appreciation for knowledge about authors, genres, how to determine the quality of children's literature, and how to choose literature that is appropriate for various ages. Preservice teachers often commented that they "had no idea there was so much out there" and how they "learned so much...gained a lot more understanding and appreciation for picture books and children's literature." Participants also valued other aspects of the course, such as time to practice speaking and reading aloud in front of one another and to children, which resulted in increased confidence.

Another valued aspect of the course was the opportunity to enjoy reading. Denise, the participant scoring lowest in the affective domain of reading stated, "This class has opened my eyes to how fun books can be...has shown me that maybe I do like to (read). I just need to find the right books!" In addition, Helen, already an avid reader that devoted much of her reading time to her young children also showcased her increased enjoyment of reading when she stated:

I liked it (the course) a lot because it's brought back a lot of the reading that I loved to do when I was younger...so I've found the love of reading for myself again. It's opened the door of fantasy that I haven't had opened for a long time, and I do owe it to that class.

Theme Two: Desired and Appreciated Discussions

All preservice teacher participants agreed with a desire for discussions about texts and other content in their children's literature courses. While some students, such as

Catherine, Paul, and Helen, reported just enjoying talking about books because it is interesting and entertaining, other students, like Denise and Maria, reported needing more discussion to improve their understanding of the texts and/or other course content.

Denise, who described many struggles with reading comprehension throughout this study, explained how small group discussions and whole group discussions in her high school and college courses have helped her to understand more of what she was reading. She stated, "...it was kind of nice, because we would do a lot of group work, so I could read it and then discuss it...(and) in the discussions, or after, I'd be like oh...I get it!"

Denise also explained how the possibility of discussing a text with me also motivated her to read texts that she might not normally have read for the course. She stated:

...it (being part of this research) kind of encouraged me more to read what was assigned because I know I could talk to you about it, so then again, it was still another goal of why I'm reading the book...to give you more of my knowledge or my thoughts on it...

Maria, an English Language Learner, explained how small group discussions gave her the opportunity to ask more questions because she felt more comfortable and felt that classmates were really listening to her as she spoke. Furthermore, observations throughout all class sessions in each of the children's literature courses revealed all preservice teachers interacting within small group discussions.

*Theme Three: Desired to Improve
Knowledge of Children's
Literature*

All participants expressed desire to improve their knowledge of children's literature. They reported a need to learn about more authors, titles, and become more familiar with elementary students' favorite texts so as to be more prepared to make

valuable recommendations to their students. Regardless of their current level of knowledge and experience with children's literature, all reported the importance of continuing to become better acquainted with ways to use children's literature in their elementary classrooms, improve their read aloud skills, and discover ways to motivate elementary students to read. For instance, Richard, the participant with the highest affective domain score, explained his desire to learn more about children's literature and "to be exposed to literature that I (he) wouldn't otherwise be exposed to. I want to have books the kids relate to." Other participants echoed his comments.

*Theme Four: Limited Choice In
School Had Negative Effects
On Affective Domain*

All participants reported that limited choice in texts in their schooling had negative effects on their attitudes, beliefs, and/or values of reading either temporarily or permanently. While some students reported frustration with reading nothing other than assigned texts throughout their schooling, others recalled a complete shift in attitude about reading based on a specific year of school in which a teacher eliminated some or all opportunities for free choice in reading. For example, when asked if she was given the opportunity to have choice in what she reads or if books were dictated by someone else, Denise responded:

Mostly it was required readings...I was never shown how to find enjoyment in it (reading), because I always had to read the boring books. That's what kind of sucks about required reading. Not everybody is going to like it, so why can't you just find a book or get a chance to find a book that you're gonna like? Why does it have to be one book that everybody reads?

Catherine, a very enthusiastic and prolific reader who established a passion for reading at a young age, also talked about the negative effects that limited choice had on her attitudes

about reading when she told the story of her fifth-grade teacher who controlled all text selection for all students. Catherine exclaimed, “I HATED reading in fifth grade! I couldn’t stand it because I didn’t get a choice. I did not get a choice, at all, ever. My fifth-grade teacher made me not want to read.” Richard reiterated Catherine’s fervor. When asked, “Do you like to read what and when someone else tells you to read?” he stated, “Oh, hell no, nobody does...”

*Theme Five: Reading Enhances/
Improves Quality Of Life*

All participants believed that reading can enhance or improve the quality of one’s life. All shared stories of how they or someone they knew were able to manage, understand, or persevere through something in their personal lives with the assistance of reading. Some participants, such as Rachel, explained how a novel, *Pack up the Moon* helped her to understand a family member’s loss of a spouse, whereas Richard described how *Freakonomics*, a nonfiction text presenting theories combining economics, psychology, and sociology opened his mind to new insights about his future role as an educator.

*Theme Six: Reading Comprehension
Processes (i.e., Visualizing And
Connecting) Increases
Enjoyment*

Preservice teacher participants described the importance of various reading comprehension processes to enjoy reading. Participants most frequently described visualizing and connecting their own lives to texts as adding to their enjoyment of

reading. For example, when Helen was describing how her life wouldn't be the same without reading, she stated:

I would feel very void looking at life without words, because words can be very meaningful, very colorful. You can get a lot more imagery off of reading. The same kind of imagery you get off of reading, you can get off of looking at something for the very first time.

In yet another example, Catherine described how authors skillfully craft visualizations:

Like with Shakespeare, the way he says everything paints this gorgeous picture of everything. If you change the words, you change the picture that you see...the words, they stop being words that I'm reading and start being a picture that I'm living in.

In addition, Maria explained, "...when you read, you can travel to a different universe.

When I'm reading, I'm in other places."

Although most participants discussed visualizing and connecting with literature as processes that enhanced reading, making it more pleasurable, Denise described visualizing as an absolute necessity to reading, stating, "I struggle to get a picture in my mind, and if I don't have a picture in my mind, I don't understand what I'm reading." As Denise attempted to determine what kinds of texts she would like to read, she determined that realistic fiction or non-fiction may be her preferred texts, reiterating, "...because I can picture it. If it's something way out there and crazy (such as fantasy), I can't picture it...and I don't understand it."

*Theme Seven: Valued Readers'
Influence On Their Own
Reading*

Throughout multiple sources that contributed to the data, preservice teacher participants shared an appreciation for the influence that other readers have had on their own reading. All conveyed the importance that parents, teachers, siblings, friends, their

children, and others have had on their reading throughout various times in their lives. While some, such as Richard, Helen, and Catherine recalled their parents as readers and frequent family reading times as foundational elements in their upbringing, others such as Rachel and Denise recalled that it was only their mothers' efforts to provide consistent reading models and text exposure through libraries and summer reading programs in their elementary years. Maria, having a significantly different background growing up in a small village in Mexico with little access to books, recalled her father as a model of reading in her younger years, and her children as a source of inspiration for reading in her current life.

Two participants, Helen and Catherine, recalled teachers as key influences on their attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading. Helen described her third-grade teacher as, "by far one of the most phenomenal teachers ever, I could ever think about." She repeatedly described her teacher's passionate daily read alouds and dedication to exposing students to lots of different books. Catherine echoed this adoration when she discussed her experiences in her seventh-grade English course, "...my Language Arts teacher was very passionate about reading. He read so many books to us (of all genres) and introduced us to lots of different authors...Sitting in that class made me think and relate books (to one another)."

*Theme Eight: Concerned About
Elementary Teachers' Affective
Domain Of Reading
(Their Own And
Others)*

Participants were concerned about elementary teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading. Some expressed concern over their own affective domain of reading,

whereas others expressed concern over their peers' and/or practicing teachers' affective domains of reading. For example, Rachel relayed a story of her inner thoughts as she encouraged young elementary students to check out books from the school library to read at home. She divulged, "And that gets me thinking, well I'm sitting here, 'you guys should go home and read that tonight!' and trying to get them excited about it, and I was like well maybe I should go home and read tonight!" Rachel also discussed how, as a future elementary teacher, she feels a certain amount of pressure to be a reader. She explained:

I think definitely (I feel pressure) because I think it's important to know about authors and (to be) excited about reading and (be) a good reader, to set an example for your students and I feel like if I read more, become a better reader, it might help me out and benefit me more.

Other participants expressed concern about elementary teachers' reading more generally, making statements such as Catherine's, "The teachers that really affected my reading, loved reading themselves, so I guess if they didn't like reading, their students would probably never pick up on it," and Helen's, "You have to love reading if you're going to learn...in the beginning (elementary grades) it is really about trying to get their interests, because it really is (about) a love for reading."

This eighth theme was accentuated when one of the children's literature instructors invited children of various ages to participate in a panel discussion in which the preservice teachers interviewed children about reading, including what kinds of texts they liked to read, how often they read outside of school, and other such topics. The preservice teachers were taken aback when the children decided to ask the preservice teachers to respond to their own questions. In the debriefing that followed this activity, preservice teachers revealed how they were embarrassed to discuss their lack of

recreational reading and even distaste for reading. An in-depth class discussion about whether teachers need to be avid readers in order to be an effective teacher of reading ensued. Although various beliefs were expressed, the overall consensus was that children are highly perceptive and can detect false or faked appreciation for reading, thereby causing some preservice teachers in the class to carefully consider who they are as readers and how that may affect their elementary students.

*Theme Nine: Varied Amount
Of Choice And Accessibility
To Texts Outside
Of School*

Participants, with the exception of Maria reported having some choice and accessibility to texts outside of school, at least in the elementary years. Regardless of the scores reported in their survey rating scales, preservice teacher participants all relayed stories of going to the library as children, if only for the summer reading program. All of these participants recalled fondly a parent, usually their mothers, who brought them to the library and allowed them to pick books for themselves. Some readers, such as Paul, Catherine, and Helen recalled receiving books as gifts, and having a plethora of books at home, some residing in their own collections and many in their parents' collections. Rachel and Denise, on the other hand, did not recall having or being given many texts, and rarely went to the public library other than for the purpose of the summer reading program. Maria, having grown up in Mexico until the age of fourteen, explained that there was very limited access to books throughout her childhood. Her parents did not own many books and there wasn't a classroom, school, or public library from which she could borrow books.

Seven Themes Within Groups and Individual Participants

*Theme One: Varied Comfort In
Finding And/Or Selecting
Texts*

Preservice teachers scoring within one standard deviation or above the mean in the dimension Reading to Do Well in Other Realms (DW) and below the mean in Reading Efficacy vs. Reading Avoidance (RE) reported difficulty in locating and selecting texts to read for recreational purposes. These participants, Rachel, Denise, and Maria, all conveyed feelings of being overwhelmed by the quantity of texts available, lost in the sea of unknown authors, types of texts, and titles, as well as feelings of apprehension and self-doubt in their ability to select texts for themselves. Maria shared:

I don't know which is a good book, or who's the best author. Sometimes I go to the romance because I know (these books), it's hard for me...if I want to read something else, I don't know where to go or which author I should go for. I want to read something else, but I don't know what to get...I don't know where to go (in a library or bookstore).

Denise experienced a great deal of frustration in finding texts she would enjoy and understand given her difficulties with comprehension. She proclaimed:

I've never been shown how to find a book. I think I would read more and I'd want to read more whether it was required or not...I know there are millions of books out there (that I could like), but I don't know which ones they are. I don't know where they're at. I don't know what they are. I just feel like I've read all these books and I've only found one, maybe two that I like and that I understood and that I'd read again, but how do I find another one? I don't want to read another 50 books to find one other one.

Revealing few, if any, opportunities to discover what their reading interests were or having guidance in finding texts they'd enjoy reading, these participants continue to rely almost completely on recommendations provided by media, family members, and/or friends as well as required readings assigned by teachers.

On the contrary, preservice teacher participants scoring at or above the mean in the dimension Reading as Part of Self (RPS) and Reading Efficacy vs. Reading Avoidance (RE) reported numerous ways of finding texts they'd enjoy reading, often times describing stacks of books or lists of texts they have a strong desire to read. These participants, Richard, Catherine, and Helen, characterized themselves as varied in their interests, able to pick up almost anything and find value in it, while at the same time having specific interests exemplified by favored authors, series, and genres. These participants also described behaviors and habits not mentioned by Denise, Maria, or Rachel, such as a variety of online searching strategies, relying on past experiences reading authors' works, and frequent visits to public libraries and bookstores as sources for titles of interest.

Also in opposition to Denise, Maria, and Rachel's experiences, Richard, Catherine, and Helen recalled experiences in their past that likely led to developing their reading interests, such as exposure to a wide variety of texts through working in libraries as high school students, mentors that taught them and modeled for them how to find books for themselves, and school assignments in which they were exposed to a variety of texts. For example, Catherine told the story of an assignment to create a poster showing a chain of connections among a variety of texts, which she claims has had a longstanding impact on her comfort in finding texts for herself: "...we had to just dig through tons and tons of books, spending 4-5 weeks straight every day in the library, just digging through piles and piles of books."

*Theme Two: Difficulty Setting
Their Own Purposes
For Reading*

Rachel and Denise reported rarely, if ever, reading for their own purposes, thereby limiting their opportunities to self select texts. Rachel described herself as “...someone who does not make reading a priority, unless it is for a class...if I’m reading, it’s to fulfill something for a class or for a grade or something like that.” Denise reiterated this in her explanation of how quizzes, class discussions, and assignments were and are often her only reason for reading, stating, “I especially (need) a purpose to read, cause without it, I’m not going to.”

*Theme Three: Presence And
Impact of a Reading
Community*

Participants characterized by above average scores in Reading as Part of Self and Reading Efficacy vs. Reading Avoidance reported the presence and impact of a reading community. These reading communities were composed of parents and peers when they were elementary and high school students. Helen illustrated this theme stating, “...one of the best things about my childhood that I could remember (is when) my parents would read to me...my dad would read to me poems, like Robert Frost and Edgar Allen Poe.” Catherine, on the other hand didn’t recall being read to very often, but rather watching her parents read, spending time with friends reading, and being surrounded by literature. She described routines in her household, sharing:

...she (mom) didn’t sit down and read to us...she just always took us to the library. We went once or twice a week to get new books. If there were times when you’d finish all your books and you had nothing left to read, she would pick up right

then and take you to the library to get new books so that you always had something to read. It was a really big thing at my house.

The impact of reading community was also present in the current lives of these participants, as evidenced by their talking of browsing bookstores, trading texts, and discussing books with friends, spouses, and family members. Richard exemplified the significance of this factor on his readership when he described his desire to have more readers to relate to, and was observed frequently interacting with other readers in his children's literature course. In addition, Catherine shared many stories of time spent with friends reading aloud to one another, searching for books for and with friends, and animatedly discussing specific events in books they've all read. She described her close friendship with a fellow preservice teacher in the children's literature course, stating, "Oddly, I think one of the things that makes us such good friends is our love for reading and our favorite styles of writing."

Belonging to a community of readers seemed to also contribute to these participants' extensive background knowledge of texts. Not only did Richard, Catherine, and Helen describe experiences reading a variety of texts within their reading communities, they also had built up a large store of titles, recalling specific authors and contents of texts within interviews. Helen, Catherine, and Richard also frequently applied their knowledge in class discussions and assignments, using titles to support their comments, and authors to explain their points. These participants tended to relate to others in their courses, including their instructors, using their knowledge of texts. They contributed more frequently to class discussions, often sharing opinions about texts brought up by others, connections among various texts, and/or recommendations for texts related to those discussed in class. For example, Richard was often approached by other

students in the class for information about various titles, publication dates, authors of particular titles mentioned, and sequences of titles within a series.

*Theme Four: Varied Understanding
of the Effects of Recreational
Reading*

Helen, Richard, and Catherine also communicated a clear understanding of various effects of recreational reading. Discussions with Helen revealed a reverence for reading, as she proclaimed, “I value reading a lot. It’s very essential to life, to success in life...not only are you learning what you’re reading, but you’re also building a vocab list, so you’re learning different words and different terms.” Helen also recognized the value of reading beyond education and employment, voicing her passion for reading with:

I am an avid believer in the power and magic of the written language. I trust in the value and experience of a good book. I understand and embrace the countless benefits of reading...Reading is good for the soul because it gives you time for yourself...it prompts your mind, opens up a whole new intellect, and a different appreciation (for life).

Helen’s appreciation for recreational reading resounded in Richard’s words:

Reading sets you up for success. You learn different things to think and how to think when you read. Reading is entertainment, reading is information, reading is communication. Reading got me where I am. It’s something I love, brings me comfort, brings me happiness.

Catherine reported spending almost ten times as many hours reading recreationally (close to 20 hours per week) than she did for her classes (close to 2 hours per week). She stated, “Anything can happen, you can fly if you want to fly, you can swim without ever having to breathe again...that’s what reading is for me...living in another world for awhile.”

Other participants, Rachel, Maria, and Denise, were all unsure about the effects of recreational reading. In multiple discussions on this topic, they restated similar points

multiple times, such as, “reading gives you information,” and, “the more you read the better you’re going to be at it.” Denise revealed her lack of understanding of the effects of recreational reading when she stated, “I don’t know, personal fulfillment maybe? I don’t know because I don’t do it for fun.” Maria’s comment appeared to be very much tied to her experiences as an English Language Learner. She stated, “If you read, it’s going to help you in your writing...as I am reading new words, I can go back in the dictionary and find the definitions.”

*Theme Five: Consistency/
Inconsistency in Affective
Domain Throughout
Life*

Another theme was the consistency and/or lack of consistency in one’s affective domain of reading throughout participants’ lives. Some participants, such as Richard and Helen, reported very consistent affective domains of reading throughout all ages. Helen credited her ability to persevere through some early decoding difficulties to this consistency in attitudes, beliefs, and values. She shares, “...it definitely was my beliefs and my like for reading and literature that helped me strive, helped me gain confidence.”

Rachel, Denise, Maria, and Catherine all reported changes in their affective domains of reading, though there are little similarities among these participants’ experiences. Rachel explained that her attitudes, beliefs, and values changed throughout her life, stating:

I guess it depends on how busy I am with school or other things in my life. I think it changes all the time, probably just because...like this class has made it change a lot. Reading, in my life, is usually the first thing to get cut when things get too busy.

She described a very positive affective domain of reading in her earliest years, in which she was enthusiastic about learning to read and practicing reading big books that her mother brought home for her. She then explained that this dropped off in her intermediate elementary years, and then picked up again in her high school years when she started to get into the murder mystery genre as a result of getting the opportunity to choose one of these texts for a book report in junior high school.

Denise recalled appreciating time spent with her mother and sister selecting books from the library and participating in the library's summer reading program. She shared:

I know I read a lot when I was a kid. My mom and my sister and I would always do that little summer program at the library. (We'd) get the little card and you get prizes for how many books you read. That was the thing that was the most fun to me, but now, I'm not really getting rewarded for what I read, so like, why read?

Denise didn't recall having ever gone to the library to pick out books for herself again and/or to read recreationally once she moved to a different town in fifth grade. She also recalled struggling more with reading comprehension as she progressed in her school years, which she claimed contributed most to her lack of enjoyment for reading.

Maria's affective domain of reading also went through various changes throughout her life. She recalled enjoying reading as a young child, reading magazines with her sisters and cousins, but then experiencing a strong distaste for reading upon moving to the United States. She shared her struggles to learn English, which resulted in her dropping out of school at about 14 or 15 years of age and rarely, if ever, reading for pleasure. As she worked and gained greater understanding of English, she began to read texts written in English and developed an enjoyment of reading once again. This ability led to her eventually earning her GED and then enrolling in college, which she said improves her frequency of reading and her enjoyment of reading. Maria also credited her

three school-age children for her increased enjoyment of reading and exposure to various texts.

Catherine's affective domain of reading, though very positive throughout the majority of her life, also went through a significant temporary change. Catherine shared an early childhood in which she was delighted with stories and enjoyed reading experiences with her family. She recalled how her second grade teacher made reading part of everything they studied, while her fourth grade teacher sticks in her memory modeling a true love for reading and books. She stated:

...you could tell that she loved reading. She talked about loving reading and how important books were to her, but she didn't even have to say it...just sitting there watching her read the book...she would be up on the edge of her chair, bent over, gingerly turning the page, so into it. You could tell that she loved the book, not just the story, she loved the book itself.

Catherine's fifth-grade teacher chose every text Catherine and her classmates would read. This upset Catherine deeply and resulted in her having extremely negative attitudes about reading both in and outside of school. She reported that this negative attitude resulted in her rarely, if ever, reading recreationally throughout her fifth grade year and most of her sixth grade year. Catherine shared her experiences with a seventh grade language arts teacher whose influence she still claims to have made her into the inexhaustible reader she is today. She recalled being read snippets of texts aloud each day in his class, and described in detail this teacher's expansive classroom library in which he had several copies of each book that he would lend out to anyone that wanted to borrow them. Catherine felt that the meaningful assignments for this class and exposure to many, many texts gave her the confidence to read all types of texts, the ability to find texts of interest to her, and the passion to read as many as she could.

*Theme Six: Believed They
Should Read More*

Regardless of measurement of their affective domain of reading, five of the six participants shared the belief that they should be reading more. They had various reasons for this belief, many of which related to the desire to become more familiar with a variety of literature for children so that they'd be better elementary teachers, but also as a response to the recognition of various effects of recreational reading. For example, Denise confided, "I don't know a whole lot about anything and there's people out there that know everything about anything. Or a lot about most things...I think maybe if I had understood books more, I'd understand more about everything else in life." Yet even avid readers, that do read widely and frequently, such as Helen and Richard, shared a belief that they should be reading more. For instance, Helen was inspired to read the Harry Potter series and other young adult novels during the semester, knowing that many of her future students will likely have read or want to read these novels. In addition, Richard shared a desire to become more current in his knowledge of children's literature, fearing being "the old man with old books". Yet Richard also expressed his desire to read more books for other reasons, describing specific characteristics of books within piles he wished he would get to more often. Catherine made no mention of believing she should read more.

*Theme Seven: Possibility For
Improved Affective Domain
In Adults*

One theme that was not consistent across all participants was the potential for someone to become a reader with a positive affective domain of reading later in life,

meaning beyond childhood. Overall, participants seemed conflicted in their responses to this topic, occasionally responding negatively and then later making statements that indicated that people could be turned on to reading later in life. Some participants, such as Helen and Richard, proclaimed that many adults are “very set in their ways”, while other participants were hopeful that this could occur, often times stating that those who do not have a high affective domain of reading would need a relationship with a passionate reader to influence their attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading, and that it would require “the right text at the right time”. There was also much discussion with multiple participants about how to find that “right text” for someone, with participants offering prompts questioning favorite movies, hobbies, TV shows, games and other interests as the impetus for finding texts that might grasp a non-reader’s interest.

Participants also reflected on their own affective domain of reading in these discussions, revealing a hope for a better relationship with reading in the future. In a conversation with Denise about when someone could become an avid reader and what elementary teachers need to do to make that happen for children, she shared, “I think it can happen with me...I just need to find the right books. I just need to find what I am really interested in...I need to find the fun in reading, because I haven’t found it yet.” Rachel also shared this desire in her last e-mail response for the study, writing, “I hope to become a more active reader, and am putting forth effort to make this happen.” This reflection on one’s own affective domain of reading also arose in conversations with Catherine and Helen, as they told triumphant stories of searching and finding the perfect book for a friend, parent, or sibling that was formerly not an avid reader.

Typologies of Preservice Teacher Readers

Constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) analysis across all data sources and all participants led me to create three typologies of preservice teacher readers: Confident Established Readers (CER), Apprehensive Prospective Readers (APR), and Striving Isolated Readers (SIR). I summarize these typologies in *Table 6: Typology Descriptions*.

Typology I: Confident Established Readers

These readers have a high affective domain of reading, proclaiming a passion for reading and texts, exemplified by emotional reactions/attachments to texts and/or characters in texts. They are frequently characterized with reading as a central facet of their lives. These readers employ reading skills and strategies instinctively and use reading flexibly for various purposes, including their own. They maintain and expand their readership throughout various aspects of their lives, including challenging themselves with reading, building relationships with other readers, and taking risks in their reading pursuits. Statements characterizing these readers include, “Reading is on the hierarchy of needs,” “I am a major advocate in the power of literature, and the impact that it can have on children and adults alike,” and, “How do people put books down?”

Typology II: Apprehensive Prospective Readers

These readers have an average affective domain of reading, revealing a belief in the importance of reading and valuing reading for success in life (i.e. education, employment, etc.). They are rarely characterized as avid readers, though they maintain a sporadic interest in reading in their lives. These readers can lack confidence in their skills

and strategies showing some difficulty with more challenging reading tasks. They often have a desire to read for various purposes, yet lack experiences that would facilitate this desire, such as exposure to a wide variety of texts, insight into readers' habits and behaviors, and membership in a reading community. Statements characterizing these readers include, "Reading in my life is the first thing to get cut when things get too busy," "For the most part, if I'm reading, it's to fulfill something for a class or for a grade or something like that, but I do think it's important," and, "I want to read, but I don't know what to get...I don't know which is a good book, or who's the best author."

*Typology III: Striving
Isolated Readers*

These readers have a low affective domain of reading, revealing negative attitudes about reading, and lacking a strong belief in the value reading could have in their lives beyond employment and/or meeting basic needs. They may be mistakenly characterized as non-readers or reluctant readers. These readers can be anxious about their lack of skills and strategies, often experiencing significant difficulties with essential reading tasks in their lives (i.e. reading legal paperwork, current events, and assigned reading for classes). They may not have had the opportunity to develop various purposes for reading, be exposed to a wide variety of texts, have relationships with other readers, or be invited to other aspects of a reading culture. Statements characterizing these readers include, "I don't like reading at all...so it's hard that I'm being forced to read...I never read just for fun," and "I think maybe if I had understood books more, I'd understand more about everything else in life," "I've never been shown how to find a book...I've never been shown how to find enjoyment in it," and, "I know reading is important and valuable, but I

don't know how to teach my upcoming students *why* it is, since I don't find enjoyment in it."

Table 6

Typology Descriptions

Features	Typology		
	Confident Established Readers [CER]	Apprehensive Prospective Readers [APR]	Striving Isolated Readers [SIR]
Affective Domain	High	Average	Low
Reading Status in Identity	Central facet	Sporadic interest	Necessity only
Reading Skill Efficacy	Confident and capable	Hesitant and progressing	Anxious and struggling
Purpose for Reading	Multiple, varied, determined by self	Limited, narrow, determined by others	Few, rigid, determined by authorities
Reading Presence in Daily Life	-Belong to a community of readers and interact with them frequently -Environment contains frequent opportunities to read and exposure to many, varied texts	-Recognize a community of readers and may be acquainted with some readers -Environment contains limited opportunities to read and exposure to texts is infrequent	-Isolated from a community of readers and may have little contact with any readers -Environment contains few opportunities to read and exposure to texts is rare
Identifying Statements	“How do people put books down?”	“Reading in my life is the first thing to get cut when things get too busy.”	“I don’t like reading at all...I’ve never been shown how to find enjoyment in it.”

Typology Narratives

*Typology I: Confident Established
Readers – Richard, Helen, and
Catherine*

Richard.

Richard recalls a favorite family photograph, the image burned in his memory, both from viewing it numerous times over the years and from repeatedly reliving the experience captured there. He sits nestled on the couch between his brother and mother, their faces hidden within their books. He pauses before responding to the latest e-mailed research question, fingers poised over the keyboard. As he ponders over this childhood memory, he is once again reminded of that which has carried him forth to a career in elementary education. Reading, for Richard, goes beyond utility and desire. Reading is a necessity; an addition to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. As a future elementary teacher and current classroom aide, Richard is troubled by the challenges he knows he will face in his role as a teacher desiring to spread his passion for reading and books. He fears being the "old man with old books", yet maintains hope that if his students see him loving reading and loving books, they too will pick up this passion.

Richard begins typing his response, conflicting messages, though, replay in his mind. In his position as a classroom aide, he witnesses the direction education has taken, experiencing the deluge of assessment and students' setbacks as a result of low socioeconomic status, language differences, and home environments void of literature. These are not the only recent experiences influencing his responses in this research. He also wrestles with the authors of Freakonomics, fearing their theories minimizing the

influence of education are fact, and that his efforts will be fruitless. Despite all he credits to reading, from communication skills and intelligence, to his enjoyment of life, Richard's view of reading education has been shaped by his consumption of media, and most prevalently his current classroom experiences, revealing curriculum emphasizing skills, fluency, and proficiency measured in numbers as opposed to words.

Richard's extensive knowledge of authors, titles, characters, and plots seems lost within these confines of accountability and high stakes testing. The love of reading, at one time inspiring him to devour texts of all kinds, is now receding in importance, seemingly unrelated to his teaching career. He finds the words he needs to express these conflicts in his mind, typing: "I want to be able to grow readers in my classroom. How do I relate the love and ability that I feel I have, to teaching students how to read and read well?"

Later, Richard steps out of the coffee shop into the frigid air, reflecting on the research interview experience, "No one has ever asked me this stuff before? Sometimes I really don't know how to respond because I'm not yet a teacher. Should I already know how I'm going to motivate young readers?" Richard turns his thoughts to his faith in books. He calls up his new knowledge of children's literature, current authors, and popular titles, to draw the interest of young potential readers. The interview brought to mind his relationships with texts, characters, and the movies of the mind. "If kids could just experience what I experienced...if I could make that happen for them, that would do it," he thinks. He questions though, "Will I even have the freedom to use the books that would work though?" This is a fear he has for his future in teaching. He also considers the influence of peers on readers, remembering friends' book recommendations in his

youth, and describing date nights with his wife at Barnes & Noble. However, translating this social influence on reading to the classroom presents further challenges. Richard pictures the classroom routines he sees every day. He's bombarded with visions of kids broken up in the same low, medium, high groups every day. He recalls the constant stream of skills worksheets, the focus of much of the kids' efforts and the teachers' time. "They always seem to be pushing just to make sure they cover the demands of the curriculum. Where in the world would I fit books into that day?" Richard thinks as he trudges toward home, the snow sticking to his boots.

Richard realizes that all this talk of reading has built up the temptation in him for far too long. It's been two days since he finished Freakonomics, and he's itching to dig into that new one by Chuck Klosterman that he picked up at Barnes & Noble a couple of weeks ago. Knocking the snow off his boots, and shedding his gear, Richard walks past his school bag propped on the floor, pauses to consider the math assignment waiting for him, then shrugs and heads for the living room. "I've pushed this aside **far** too long," he thinks.

In the moments Richard takes to get warmed up and settled in, he considers the skepticism he expressed in the interview. "I know I'm an anomaly, especially among the rest of the students in that class...probably the teachers at my school too...unfortunately," he thinks, wishing that stimulating conversation over texts was more the norm in his life. Eagerly gearing up for an afternoon of the provocative words of Klosterman, Richard glances over at the old family photograph propped by the computer and closes his thoughts on the research project, "I can hold out hope. Maybe those kids won't have what I had, but I'll give them what I can."

Helen.

“Okay guys, we’ve already read two extra books. It really is time for naps. No more for now,” Helen urges the little ones, who are still begging for yet another story. “Yes, I promise we can read that one again after naptime.” Exasperated, she stacks the books on the floor and tucks Nathan in with one last squeeze. She turns to Ellie, and unearthing a book hidden in the blankets, scowls slightly and puts the book on the shelf before pulling the covers up around her and grinning at Ellie.

“Whew! Not a moment too soon. Finally I can finish this chapter,” Helen thinks as she grabs Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix, and plops into the recliner... Her reading is silent, punctuated with the occasional chortle in response to Hermione’s sharp wit. Helen glances at the clock as she reads the last line of the chapter, wanting to continue reading. She reconsiders, “I’d better not...I really should get started on that paper for class.” Reluctantly, she places her bookmark into the novel and sets it next to the mound of newspaper and magazines on the coffee table.

Helen grabs her Children’s Literature notebook, perusing the assignment description for the final paper due in three weeks. She’s been toying with the idea of writing about reading aloud to children. “They say, write about what you know!” she remarks to herself as she boots up her computer. Helen reflects on the preschool class she’s been reading to, Nathan’s constant requests for more stories, and Ellie’s recent cunning attempt to bury books beneath the covers for some naptime entertainment. She also recalls her complete captivation as her Children’s Lit. instructor read aloud to the class yesterday. “She didn’t just read that book, she performed it. Watching the effect that had on the class was amazing! Totally worth it,” Helen thinks as she chalks up yet

another benefit of face-to-face college classes. Once again, her decision to confront her fears and transfer to the bustling college is reinforced.

Helen's eyes catch the poem taped to the wall just as the words surface in her mind, "Two roads diverged in a yellow wood, And sorry I could not travel both..." She recalls her father's booming voice as he read them aloud over and over years ago. This gripping memory reinforces her belief in the impact of reading aloud. Helen feels called to inspire others to recognize the value of it, maybe even the need for it. Desiring to support her beliefs with more than just her ample personal experience, Helen begins searching the online databases for journal articles and texts. She skims the numerous abstracts and pages within GoogleScholar, deciding to swing by the university library next week when she makes the trip to campus.

Pleased with her progress, and feeling confident in her topic of choice, Helen begins to outline the final paper, taking note of the page limit she's been given. The ideas flow easily and Helen is excited with how the paper is evolving, with the references fitting in superbly. Lost in concentration, she is startled by the plunk of a book upon her desk. Ellie's long hair is a mass of tangles, eyes still half-closed, as the little one scrambles up on Helen's lap, grasping the book and holding it up in front of Helen. "Why hello sleepy-head," Helen laughs as she accepts the invitation and opens the book. Ellie nestles in, delighted as her mother's familiar voice breathes life into her favorite story.

Catherine.

She barely hears the biology professor droning on, his voice replaced with those of Edward, Jacob, and Bella as Catherine pours over the novel, New Moon, concealed on her lap. Without warning, Catherine's chair is jostled by students starting to file past

toward the exit. Her eyes remain glued to the text and she tosses her notebook, textbook, and pen into her bag. She strolls out into the morning air, still reading, her eyes welling with tears. "You'd think after reading this six times, I'd hold it together, jeesh,"

Catherine mutters, wiping away the tears, and replacing the book in her backpack.

Sauntering into her dorm, Catherine considers plunking herself onto the couch to finish the last 200 pages before lunch, but stops herself, knowing that if she doesn't do the math assignment now and at least scan over the biology chapter, she'll forget by Monday. Like mind gum, the math problems are engaging, and Catherine finishes them within the hour. She glances at the clock, figuring she'll only need twenty minutes or so to scan over the biology chapter, leaving plenty of time to get in at least 100 pages or so in her novel. Catherine glosses over the text, noting boldface terms, studying diagrams, and reading captions. "That oughtta do," she murmurs. Snapping the text closed, she shoves it aside and digs out *New Moon*, enveloped within moments.

Later that evening in the student lounge, Catherine sifts through the pile of books she's taken out from the library. Although the Children's Lit. assignment only required a few examples, she couldn't resist and got out the entire Roald Dahl collection. She picks up *James and the Giant Peach*, remembering the first time she read it in her fourth-grade teacher's classroom. "She absolutely loved this book!" Catherine thinks. She reminisces, picturing Mrs. Turner's hands cradling the book against her chest, broadly smiling, and excitedly describing her favorite parts. Tom ambles into the lounge, "Still reading?" he asks. "Not the same thing. I finished it after lunch. I'm working on a project for my class," Catherine replies. "Hey, isn't that a movie?" Tom proclaims. Looking down at the novel, Catherine's eyes are wide, "What? You've never read this?!" Tom responds,

“You know I’m not into that. I think I’ve read like two books in my life. So, no, I haven’t. I didn’t even know it was a book.” In shock, Catherine ponders this, debating if she should attempt to convince him, but before she’s looked up, he’s wandered over to the TV which is blaring a rerun of American Idol.

Catherine meets up with her friends at the dining hall for a late dinner and agrees to stop over at their dorm afterward to pick up the last two books in the Cirque du Freak series. Emily warns, “You might not like #11, but you HAVE to read it tonight and call me as soon as you’re done!” “Does he die?! Please don’t tell me he gets killed off, or I’m not going to read it,” Catherine asserts. Emily laughs, “Yes you will. Don’t kid yourself. Do you still want to meet for breakfast and then come over in the morning? Why don’t you bring your copies this time, mine are all beat up.” Catherine confirms the plan, and looks forward to continuing their Harry Potter read-a-thon, another chance to hear Emily’s great Dumbledore voice.

“Sorry I’m late,” Catherine apologizes the next morning, “I was going to try that new novel Stacy gave me the other day, but I stayed up until two-thirty to finish #12 instead..., though I didn’t want to. How could Shan do that? Grrr...good thing that’s the end of the series, or I would never have read another single book by him!” Emily chuckles, recalling their animated phone call last night. They finish breakfast and head over to Emily’s room to read the day away, both hoping there aren’t too many interruptions this time. Although, they agree it is kind of fun to watch her roommates’ fascination when they pause in the doorway to listen. “Maybe we’ll win over another one!” Catherine jokes, nudging Emily in the side.

*Typology II: Apprehensive
Prospective Readers –
Rachel and Maria*

Rachel.

She hears their footsteps and giggles approaching her room, but ignores her roommates, trying to reread the paragraph again. “Come on, Rachel. It’s 4:00 on a Friday. Time to have fun, not study!” they whine for the second time in the last hour. Rachel gets up, smiles at them, and closes the door, listening to their groans. “Just give me 45 minutes, I promise!” she shouts through the door. Rachel picks up the textbook and continues reading the chapter, underlining a few things and taking notes to study for the midterm on Monday. Once finished, she organizes her things, placing her notebooks, textbooks, and pens back on the shelf. She grabs her novel, Pack up the Moon, and places it amongst the folders for her Children’s Lit. class on Thursday. “It will be interesting to find out what Emma decides,” Rachel thinks, knowing she won’t pick up the book until silent reading time in class.

Pushing aside the foul gym clothes from this morning, Rachel recovers her black shoes and slides them on, checks her hair and makeup in the mirror, and hears a rapping on the door. “I’m coming!” she hollers. “Man, you’d think they had a stopwatch or something!” she whispers to herself. She grabs her purse and keys, looking forward to some down-time relaxing with friends. They head over to Old Chicago’s for an early dinner and decide to stop at Showtime Video to grab a movie afterward.

Wandering around the video store, Andrea makes another suggestion, asking who’s seen it already. “We know you haven’t!” Andrea laughs, looking at Rachel. Lindsey, new to the group, asks, “Oh, do you not watch movies or something?” “It’s not

that,” Rachel explains, “I just grew up kind of in the middle of nowhere. My family has a big ranch east of here and we didn’t really watch movies much. Too many chores and stuff.” As they wander around, Rachel picks up the latest Harry Potter movie and reads the back, recalling when she read the book a few summers ago. Lindsey asks, “Did you read those books? I thought about it, but they’re really long.” Rachel responds, “Yeah, but they’re actually really good. They go fast too. I really liked them!” Rachel is interrupted with the sound of her cell phone going off. She answers, smiling at the sound of her mother’s voice. They confirm times for Eric’s birthday party on Sunday afternoon and Rachel hangs up the phone. She decides to text Josyln. Maybe she’ll be able to shoot hoops with her Sunday morning before the party, she hopes.

Rachel arrives early for work the next day, and hears it has been pretty slow at the shop so far. “Excellent!” she thinks, “I’ll have time to try that article again for Sociology.” She heaves her schoolbag on the counter, laden with notebooks and texts, taking out the article, her dictionary, highlighter and other necessities. She takes a few moments to straighten up the cards, stuffed animals, bookmarks, and other items around the store and then plants herself at the counter to get started. This is the second time Rachel has tried to read this article. This time she’s prepared with her dictionary. She highlights a few lines, stopping to look up a word in the dictionary and jot some notes in the margin. “Man, I hope there aren’t too many questions on the midterm about this. Ugh.” Rachel’s cell phone bings in with a text message. It’s Josyln, saying she’ll see her at softball after work and that hoops on Sunday at 7 sounds great. Rachel decides to ignore the text message for now, wanting to get this article done so that she can

concentrate on the game later, instead of worrying about school work. She wants to stay on track, keeping up the straight A's she's earned so far.

Maria.

"Thank you, Gracias!" Maria says, graciously taking the small collection of books the librarian helped her to find. "How does she know where they all are? Every time?" Maria wonders. She gazes around the elementary school library, repeatedly amazed at all the resources available for her kids here in the U.S. Maria pauses to look at another book propped up on the shelf, recalling her primary school in Mexico. She wonders if the school has a library now, or if maybe the village has some kind of library. Maria considers herself very fortunate to be here, where accessibility to books and education seem to be taken for granted by so many.

Maria thanks the librarian again before leaving and heads out to her car. She's anxious to get home and get dinner made for the family, knowing that she has many hours of schoolwork to do afterward. Driving past the greenhouse, Maria's thoughts turn from class assignments to her friends still working there. Twenty-five years was such a long time. "So many memories," she whispers. At first, the change was so hard. Going back to school after leaving high school so young, Maria was fearful that it would be too hard. It is challenging, but now she reasons, "It's getting easier. I'm getting better." She recalls her latest short writing assignment for the Children's Lit. class and is proud of the A- she's earned. It was well worth the hours spent writing, revising, and editing over and over. Maria is brought back to the present as she pulls into the driveway and unloads her bags from the car.

Ernesto is waiting for her when she enters the house, eagerly digging into her schoolbag the moment she puts it down. He sets aside Mom's romance novel, uncovering several children's picture books. He's curious about her books again this week, wondering what kind of book this one is supposed to be. Maria loves sharing the books with her kids, having few others in her life that take such interest in books or reading. She explains, "It's historical fiction. It's a story that could have happened a long time ago." Ernesto starts turning the pages, taking the time to look at the pictures carefully as he flips through. "Sounds dull," remarks her daughter, Inez, as she steps over him to enter the kitchen. Maria counters, "No, no! The librarian said it's a good, sad story, like we both like. It just happened a long time ago." Inez glances down at her brother on the floor, curious. As Maria prepares supper, she listens to the two of them in the other room reading Pink and Say. She catches bits and pieces of the story, getting more eager to read it herself that evening. "Mom, will you read this to us later?" Ernesto cries from the hallway. "Yes, now get washed up for supper. Let's go! Andale!" Maria exclaims.

After dinner, Maria gets the three kids settled around the table with their homework, and then pulls out her psychology binder and textbook. Her eldest daughter, a bit ornery tonight, whines, "Mamá, I don't want to do this. It's too hard!" Empathizing, Maria takes a look at her daughter's math homework and attempts to help her. "Believe me, Gabriela, I know. I live it every day too, remember?! But this is our jobs, both of us." Together, they use the textbook and figure out how to solve the problem. In this moment, Maria is reminded of why she is working so hard. She imagines herself helping young students who struggle to learn the language, just as she had thirty years ago. She knows she can help them to succeed in school using her experiences to improve their lives.

Maria flips back to the beginning of the psychology chapter to reread it once again, this vision in her mind, motivating her to press on.

*Typology III: Striving
Isolated Readers –
Denise*

Denise.

The last few students scurry in just as the professor finishes writing the agenda for class on the board. Denise looks up, sensing the increased tension in the room. She reads: a) Quiz on Article from Harvard Political Review, b) Small Group Discussion: Campaign Reform, c) Lecture: The Next Presidential Campaign, d) Reading Assignment: The Economist. Denise, frantically opens her binder and takes out the article, scanning over the jumbled notes in the margins, the highlighted sections, and the questions she's written at the bottom that she'd hoped to have time to discuss with the girl sitting in front of her. "Everything put away please," insists Dr. Stately as he proceeds to hand out the quiz. Feeling a tad nauseas, Denise slides her article back into her notebook now buried in her bag. "Great. If I could just use my notes... He'll never know that I read the thing twice," she grumbles, "Unlike half the people in this class that probably barely even skimmed the thing and will ace this quiz." Within minutes, most of the class has finished. Denise attempts to read and reread the questions faster, feeling pressured by the whispering of others that are obviously waiting for class to resume. Exasperated, she reads the last one only once and takes a wild guess.

Throughout the rest of class, Denise listens and attempts to follow along with the various discussions. Half the time she's still trying to determine what the professor is

talking about, when someone pipes in and changes the topic. Denise leaves another class session feeling exhausted and defeated. “How many of these are left?” she huffs.

Heading over to her Children’s Lit. class, she feels a bit more at ease. Although she knows that the class is starting with an oral quiz on the novel, she actually read and understood this one, The Tale of Despereaux. Even better than that, she loves it, surprising even herself.

Denise takes out the notepaper she knows she’ll need and starts numbering from 1-10. This time, she feels pretty confident that she’ll do well. As her instructor reads each question aloud, Denise pictures the scene from the novel in her mind, helping her to answer every question. “Yes! This was a cinch!” she thinks, writing down the answer to the bonus question at the end. “Why can’t they all be like this? This, I would love,” Denise utters to herself. Within minutes, the class engages in a discussion about the novel, Denise thinking her comments to herself instead of saying them out loud. Then someone brings up another book with a mouse, something about a mouse riding a motorcycle? Denise struggles to make a connection, but honestly can’t remember any book with a mouse and a motorcycle. Although it appears to have been an entertaining book, based on the students’ laughter, Denise really has no idea what they’re talking about. She begins to tune out, once again wishing she’d had the chance to pick some of these books instead of all the books her teachers had made her read.

By the end of class, Denise is ready to head out the door. “Friday Freedom!” she thinks. Her joy is punctuated by the chance to lounge for awhile on the couch since her shift at work was switched from Friday to Sunday. Denise stops by the store on her way to the bus stop to pick up the latest Cosmo magazine. She arrives, her apartment silent

except for the bubbling fish tank. Clicking on the TV, Denise sprawls out on the couch, Cosmo in hand. She flips through the glossy pages, reading headings, a few captions, and parts of articles here and there. After awhile, Denise feels the nag of schoolwork, knowing she has only one week to finish the next novel for class, and Friday will be here again before she knows it.

Remembering how much she loved The Tale of Despereaux, Denise is hopeful as she trudges off to her room to find the next book, Bud, Not Buddy. After rereading the first two pages three times, losing the battle against her wandering mind, Denise sets the novel down. She rationalizes, "It's only a little ten point quiz and one class session. No one will be able to tell. I never say much anyways." She picks up Cosmo and vows to try the novel again tomorrow if it's slow at work.

Research Question 2

Q2 Under what circumstances do preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers become evident, if at all, in a children's literature course?

Preservice teacher participants' views of reading and themselves as readers became evident when I used qualitative data to examine participants: a) perceptions of assigned reading, b) performance in assessment and/or assignments, c) behaviors within and perceptions of class activities, d) perceptions of and responses to instructors, and e) general engagement and participation in the course. I use the three typologies explained earlier (Confident Established Readers, CERs, Apprehensive Prospective Readers, APRs, and Striving Isolated Readers, SIRs) to report the findings of this research question.

Perceptions of Assigned Reading

Confident Established Readers often perceived the assigned reading for the course as enjoyable, though lacking challenge. They completed course readings on time and often had positive things to say about the assigned reading, such as, “I liked every book that we read for class,” and speaking in reference to the textbook, “(it’s) a very interesting book...It’s simple and straightforward with little stories in it.” Information that I recorded provided evidence that these participants comprehended the required reading. They brought up questions or comments connected to concepts covered in the textbooks and required articles, yet not addressed by the instructor. In addition, CERs did not voice concerns about the quantity of reading or the time needed to complete course readings.

Confident Established Readers thoroughly appreciated the chance to read stories as opposed to textbooks. For example, Helen explained:

I loved going into the picture books...(it) has given me the chance to build a lot better understanding of and appreciation for picture books. And now, having read the novels,...it’s brought back a lot of the same reading that I loved to do when I was younger, but hadn’t had time to do. It’s brought back some of that same excitement. I found out how easy it would be to incorporate that into my life as much as I want to again.

My own researcher journal revealed an appreciation for the opportunity to read texts I had always wanted to read, and even had sitting neglected upon my shelves; classics such as *Alice in Wonderland*, and the *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, as well as newer titles such as *The Tale of Despereaux*.

CERs also enjoyed the opportunity to search for and select picture books for required presentations and read alouds, often showing difficulty choosing just one text to share with instructors and peers. For example, they often brought in old favorites and multiple new texts they’d found in libraries or bookstores, sharing these with their

instructors, peers sitting close by, and/or myself. Likewise, in two of the three courses, students were required to record free choice reading. An analysis of their reading logs revealed that CERs read far beyond course requirements in quantity of texts and time spent free reading.

Apprehensive Prospective Readers were also positive in their perceptions of assigned reading, accomplishing most of what was required on time, and reporting that they saw the texts as valuable, if not enjoyable. Unlike the CERs, who read for appreciation, APRs most often revealed a need to read to meet the instructor's requirements. For example, an analysis of Rachel's reading log showed her careful recording of the reading completed during the required fifteen minutes of sustained silent reading in class each session. This was the only time Rachel read for her enjoyment.

Both APR participants were expected to bring books to class for presentations. Both found that task to be challenging. Maria told multiple stories of the very helpful librarian that showed her where various genres were shelved and suggested titles to fit the course assignment requirements. She shared, "Every week I would go to the library, and ask the librarian. Every week she would ask how my book had worked out and I would say, 'yes, good', and she says, 'See, I always give you good books!'"

In addition, both readers reported rereading their selected text multiple times to ensure their success with class presentations. Maria shared, "The first thing I do when I get the book is read it twice, then write the summary, then read it all over again so that I know what I'm going to be talking about." Like CERs, these readers were enthusiastic about their exposure to many new authors and illustrators, many times showing their surprise about the variety of texts available that they hadn't known about prior to this

course. Rachel explained how she wasn't very familiar with many authors or titles due to not reading very often in her past, so she valued these opportunities in the children's literature course, stating, "... the more I get familiar with texts, the more it will help me to be more excited about it and more...comfortable."

The Striving Isolated Reader, Denise, struggled with required course readings. She attempted to stay motivated to keep up with the rigorous reading schedule, demanding one novel per week and course readings in the binder created by the instructor. Denise confided, "It's hard. Having to read that book in a week is hard...I thought I might be able to do it, but...it's hard to get them all read, especially with work and other classes." She even seemed hopeful that she might find a text that she'd enjoy. However, five of the six assigned novels were fantasy, her least favorite genre. She described her dread in attempting to read *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*, having failed her first attempt to engage in the popular novel years ago when her mother bought it for her. She welcomed the offer to listen to my audio CD version of the text, but admitted later that she had not finished listening to it. She explained that it was much longer than she had realized and turned down my offer to let her keep the audio book as she wasn't interested in finishing it. Denise described her attempts at reading articles assigned for the class, using annotation and other strategies to try to understand literary concepts within scholarly journal articles assigned by her course instructor. She disclosed, "I'm not good with big words, so if it's hard to read, I'm not interested. I don't know what it's saying, basically."

Despite these struggles, the SIR continued to put forth effort to complete course readings and was elated when her efforts paid off. In fact, when asked what she felt

affected her reading attitudes, beliefs, and values most positively, her response included, “I also loved her text book she created. It had such interesting contents and helpful contents that it was a good thing to keep on hand.” Another example of the SIR’s positive attitudes and efforts with required reading was evident from Denise’s description of rereading *Holes*. In this instance, the course instructor enabled her to choose one of six novels she wanted to write about and present to the class. She stated that her choice of *Holes* was very much dictated by her past positive experience reading the novel when it was required for a class in high school. She proclaimed, “I loved that book! This is the second time I’ve read it, and I loved it!” She also was surprised when she read *Tale of Despereaux*, excitedly sharing, “I got it! It was so cute. I loved it. I got through it in like 2 or 3 days. It was fantasy, but I could picture it and it was fun!” These incidences were exciting for her.

Nonetheless, there were numerous times when Denise came to class unprepared. She either had not read the required readings or when she had, she did not understand them thoroughly. In these instances, she was observed to be inattentive and in her words, felt “lost” and “left out” when fellow students discussed the assigned readings. Her feelings of being left out sometimes emanated from Denise’s lack of knowledge related to the other texts her classmates were discussing. She explained, “...a lot of people dropped names of authors or books that they knew...and they start talking about all these other books that they know...and I have no idea what that book is.”

Performance on Assessments/Assignments

The type of assessments and assignments varied among the three children’s literature courses, as did students’ perceptions and performances on them. Among

preservice teacher participants across settings, CERs generally exceeded their instructor's requirements and saw quizzes and assignments as an opportunity to gain knowledge and reflect on themselves as readers. Helen's *Folktale Comparison Chart* is one example. When analyzing it next to the stated expectations, she had gone well beyond those expectations. Instead of preparing a handwritten notepage with bulleted points to compare two versions of a folktale, she compared three different versions of Cinderella in a four page typed chart, detailing the setting, characters, problem, action, and ending of each version. Helen also viewed the ten question oral quizzes on novel reading as opportunities to extend her knowledge. She explained:

I believe that the oral quizzes had a good impact on my attitude about reading the novel, *Holes*, because it impelled me to be more prepared for the quizzes on the other novels. In response to last week's quiz, I decided to make a short overview of each assigned book.

Another example of CERs common perceptions of assignments and performance within assignments was the reading log, in which students were to record the title and a brief response to something they had read for pleasure each class period. Catherine's reading log was extensive in length (23 pages compared to an average of 2 pages written by others. It contained multiple entries completed outside of class, which chronicled her emotional reactions, critical analysis of texts, and even explanations of why she had chosen specific texts or portions of text to read that day. When speaking of this assignment, Catherine proclaimed:

I never realized how much I read, and how drawn into characters (I get). I was looking back through, and I thought 'Did I really read 8 hours that day?'...there's another part of my reading log where I have four days that I didn't read, and questioned it...I *had* to have written down something somewhere...and it was right after my favorite character died and I didn't read for four days. I refused to pick up a book. I was so mad at this author! I don't think I would have ever realized that I'd done that unless I had to keep that reading log for class.

On the other hand, another CER admitted that he only did the minimum of what was expected. Richard handed in all assignments on time and most were acceptable, if not high quality, but Richard did not see the assignments as challenging or impactful, admitting that routine assignments were “not my best work” and “done in the computer lab just minutes before class”. On several occasions he even shared ideas of activities that would make the class more fulfilling. He explained:

Could my life be changed by (this course)? Has it been?...I have felt no transformative effect, which makes me wonder if I am expecting too much. It has been a good class, with a dynamic instructor, and a great group of women, and I have learned of new books, and that my classroom library is going to have to be substantial and well used, and why...I think an activity that could be amazing would be to bring in a text that changed or affected us...any text. The problem is that not everyone would care.

As a researcher participant and CER, I was frustrated with assignments and assessments that lacked depth. For example, rereading my researcher reflections on the observation protocols revealed:

I’m feeling nervous about the oral quizzes on both books (*Holes* and *Bud, Not Buddy*). Not sure I’ve read with enough attention to detail and forgetting things because *Bud, Not Buddy* was finished a week ago. Also, since I had to start *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* already to have it done on time, I’m a little worried that I will mix the books up.

In a later entry, I recorded, “I hated those quizzes! (I) didn’t remember the tiny details that she asked for and then also feel like they invalidated the more inferential (comprehension).” I also found myself hoping that the routine summaries with follow-up presentations in one course would change at some point. I found myself getting burned out on the same format and wanting to get more out of the class time spent, preferring to talk to the person that had read the book and ask questions rather than listen to another presentation.

Apprehensive Prospective Readers' perceptions of and performance on assignments reflected their conscientiousness and desires to understand and then meet the instructor's expectations. Rachel divulged, "...sometimes he's (the instructor) not really clear on what he wants us to do...and what's due when,...I guess sometimes that's maybe one of the biggest issues." Rachel also explained how she valued various assignments, such as one in which students were required to observe read alouds done in the community. When talking about what she liked about the course, Rachel shared her thoughts on an observation assignment, "... (I) like being able to go to other classrooms and libraries and listen to those people read," as well as the children's literature notebook, "We're starting our binder where people (classmates) give you reviews of the books they've read, so that will be helpful in the future just to have that."

Maria also communicated her desire to understand what was expected of her and the challenges to performing up to expectations. While discussing the final paper, a literary analysis, Maria used me as a resource for clarification:

Me: How are you feeling about the literary analysis assignment?

Maria: It seems kind of hard. I have to choose what book I'm going to do, or maybe do one that I already read. He said anything, right? It could be anything, right?...That paper seems kind of hard, I don't know.

Me: Do you understand what he's looking for?

Maria: He doesn't want a summary, no. (Pauses, thinking.) He wants more about the characters or something? I'll pick a picture book because I think (a) picture book will...it helps to tell the story, like connections.

On several occasions, Maria explained the efforts she must expend as an English Language Learner to ensure her success. She reflected on herself as a reader and writer, working diligently to complete assignments for the course, "When I started reading something for the class, for a book review, I read like three books and I don't think it's a

good book because I'm not getting anything from the book." Despite these struggles, Maria's assignments were done well, as evidenced by positive feedback from her instructor and an A in the course.

The Striving Isolated Reader's perception of and performance on assignments was directly tied to her level of enjoyment of the texts she was reading. For example, Denise's well written paper on her favorite book, *Holes*, received an A-. In addition, she received full points on the picture books exam, and the oral quizzes for *Holes*, and *Tale of Despereaux*. When the interest wasn't as high, her performance was noticeably different. For instance, she received 6 out of 10 points on the oral quiz for *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*, and less than half of the points for the oral quizzes on other texts she said she was not fond of (*Alice in Wonderland*, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, and *Bud, Not Buddy*). She admitted that she did not complete these texts, but was able to discuss the parts of them that she did read, showing that she had made an attempt.

My analysis of Denise's reading log was another source used to determine her perceptions of and performance on assignments. Students were required to read and complete evaluative entries on 12 children's literature texts of their choice. Denise received full points for this assignment and showed enthusiasm in many of her entries.

One example from an entry about *Hatchet* revealed her perceptions:

This book is excellent. It is amazing to discover things and learn alongside Brian. It's easy to relate to him, but I'm glad I am not in his shoes! I would suggest this book to everyone to read!! A++ for sure!

Denise received full credit for her reading log. In another assignment in which students were to infer the ages of the authors of several different poems, Denise showed her understanding and excitement in her reflection on the assignment, proclaiming, "Hey! I

got most of them right!!” Once again, her level of enjoyment was tied to her perceptions of and performance on the assignment.

Behaviors Within and Perceptions of In-Class Activities

When analyzing observations of in-class activities and participants’ comments about their experiences, I found some similarities among all participants (CERs, APRs, and the SIR). For example, all participants whose instructors read aloud to them (CERs, Catherine and Helen, APR, Rachel, and SIR, Denise) were attentive and responsive to the read alouds. They watched their instructors closely, sometimes turning their attention away from a previous off-task activity (i.e. texting, writing in their planners, talking to a peer, etc.) so that they could attend to the read aloud. I also found myself captivated by both instructors’ talents, laughing along with the class, or getting teary eyed in response to a heartbreaking story performed with emotion, and skill. Like CERs, I recorded titles and authors in my notes, wanting to find the texts and reread them or use them for future teaching.

In addition, all participants reported enjoying the read alouds. Rachel shared, “One thing I thought that was very inspiring in this class was the read alouds performed by (the instructor). I liked to see the texts that he chose, and also how he would use them in his classroom.” Denise reiterated this sentiment as she described her instructor’s read alouds:

All of the picture books that she brought in are amazing and fun...her just being enthusiastic about it makes me want to read it...because she does things that are different, more than just telling me it’s good. It’s all about how she makes me feel about the book.

Helen also took note of the talents and skills evident in her instructor's read alouds, stating:

I think you can always tell if somebody really likes reading out loud, reading a good storybook when they're reading to a class. I think that a lot of emotion that she (the instructor) shows in her eyes is something that you couldn't act out... She knows how to bring her class into what she's saying, there's no doubt about that...

There were also differences among CERs, APRs, and the SIR's behaviors within the same in-class activities. For instance, although all participants shared their enjoyment of discussions about literature (a theme discussed in Question 1), their behaviors within discussions were significantly different. The structure for discussions about literature varied from setting to setting, yet CERs (Catherine, Richard, and Helen) were observed as active members, if not leaders, of both large and small group discussions regardless of the structure of the discussions. Analysis of observation protocols revealed that these participants offered multiple comments and/or questions during every class session in both whole and small group discussions.

As a CER myself, discussions in all of the courses provided much temptation to join class discussions. Reviewing my researcher reflections recorded on observation protocols revealed numerous times when I found myself having to hold back from making comments or asking questions during class and small group discussions. On a number of occasions, I recorded my struggles as I tried to maintain my observer participant role: "(I) can't help but make personal connections to (the) discussion about adults that live in (a) fantasy world through *World of Warcraft*, *Dungeons and Dragons*, etc.," and during a later class session, "I really can't help myself. I have such a drive to get involved in this class!" Within a different class, I recorded, "(I) find myself wanting to talk to other students as well as my participants."

Occasionally, I did allow myself to be pulled into a discussion, either by the course instructor or other participants and found these times to be extremely fulfilling. I also agreed with each of the preservice teacher participants in that I would have liked more discussion opportunities in the classes. Finally, like other CERs, I, too, would naturally assume a leadership position in discussions (i.e. asking thoughtful questions, sharing reading and teaching experiences, and sharing titles and authors of books connected to the discussion topic). Though the rationale for this is also likely connected to students' perceptions of me as an authority or expert in the subject being discussed, I also feel that my identity as a Confident Established Reader played a significant role.

The quantity and type of discussion participation was markedly different in CERs than the observed behaviors of APR and SIR participants, Rachel, Maria, and Denise, which were all quite similar. All three of these participants spoke less than two times each within whole group discussions throughout the entire semester, yet all three participated readily in small group discussions. Though none took on the role of leading a small group discussion, they would respond to peers' comments and ask questions on occasion. In a conversation regarding classroom discussions, Denise confided some of her reasons for her silence during these whole group discussions, explaining:

...a lot of people dropped names of authors or books that they knew...and they start talking about all these other books that they know...and I have no idea what that book is. I feel left out. I can't even tell you some of the examples just because I've never heard them before. They talk about authors, and know what books they've written, this series, and, 'Oh, that was good!' They can think of examples of what we're talking about or other authors and I just have no idea.

Another class activity in one of the courses was preservice teacher read alouds which they performed in small and whole group settings. Perceptions of and performance

with these read alouds differed. Catherine saw the read alouds as great fun and a chance to show off her talents, as evidenced by her enthusiastic account:

I like that we all get to read up in front of the class. I know most people don't like that because not a lot of people like crowds. I like it because I find it fun! I like theater too...plus I think getting up in front of the class is probably good preparation for (teaching).

Rachel, on the other hand, saw these read alouds as something she must prepare diligently for, rehearsing a book for her friend and roommate many times before her performance in class. Rachel reflected on her read aloud skills and felt she needed to practice in order to improve her skills. She shared:

I never even really thought about reading aloud to kids before. I wouldn't think that it would be a big deal, but it makes me realize that it is a big deal and important. I feel pretty good about it (the class), just working on my reading aloud. That's the big thing.

Catherine and Rachel's varying levels of confidence were evident when I observed their whole class read alouds. As Catherine read aloud, she often laughed, varied her volume skillfully, looked out at her audience, and used hand gestures and body position to emphasize the emotions within the text. When Rachel read aloud, her voice was consistently soft with some inflection, her eyes remained focused on the text, and she held the text very still.

Catherine and Rachel were in a class in which they had the opportunity to read silently at the beginning of each class session. They both appeared relaxed and focused on their texts throughout this time, although Catherine reacted to the text she was reading silently, unlike Rachel whose facial expressions did not change as she read. For example, I noted in the observation protocols several instances in which Catherine was laughing aloud in response to something she was reading silently, which she would then share with her friend and table-mate.

In reading their e-mailed logs and transcriptions from interviews, I deduced that Rachel appeared to treasure the time as something unusual and special in her week. She wrote:

Another thing that really made me more excited about reading was the silent reading that we did at the beginning of each class. This provided me time to just relax, and read a book of my choice. Since I do not often have that much down time to just read, this was very enjoyable and beneficial for me.

Catherine did not make any mention of this silent reading time, perhaps because she includes so much of this in her week already, even stealing time during other classes, such as biology, to read a novel. She divulged, “I have scribbles in a notebook in my class that show that I had read during class.”

Although I spent the majority of the silent reading time observing these two participants, I also brought a book with me to read silently on occasion during this time, and looked forward to it each week. For example, a note on my observation protocol reads, “(I) felt disappointed that there wasn’t silent reading time in the class today.” During the silent reading time, I found myself jotting down titles of texts other students were reading and began to pull texts off of shelves within the room that were close to where I was seated, observing. I often left the classroom with more books than I walked in with, and noted that I had to change observation positions, as sitting amongst the bookshelves was far too distracting for me. I was also thrilled to discuss the books being read during this time, noting “(I) had (a) great conversation with one of the students in the class about *Outlander* – (a) novel I’m listening to and she’s reading.”

Perceptions of and Responses to Instructors

Preservice teacher participants' perceptions of and responses to instructors were similar regardless of their identity as CERs, APRs, or SIRs. Participants recognized their instructors' approachability, enthusiasm, knowledge, and investment in students and the course, which contributed to participants' enjoyment of the course, belief in the significance of the course content, and recognition of the value of their experiences in the course. As Denise put it, "(the instructor) is kind of what makes this class."

Preservice teacher participants frequently discussed the approachability of their instructors as being influential in their learning, describing approachability with words like "open-minded", "helpful", "easy-going", and "friendly". Though I never observed Rachel speaking directly with her instructor, her belief that she could do so with ease was very important to her. She explained:

I think a lot of it is how they (instructors) interact with you in class. If you ask a question in class, how they respond to that question and maybe not make you feel dumb for asking the question...I think if I were to ask (the instructor) any question, even if he didn't know the answer, he'd be like, 'I'll get back to you on this', or 'We'll figure it out', or something.

Maria commented, "He's open to new ideas. He's willing to help...He's a nice guy, he was joking (with students)." She compared these characteristics to the professors who were teaching her other courses. She discussed how it was challenging and frustrating to work with professors who weren't as willing to help or be flexible with deadlines. This flexibility was important to Maria, because she often needed additional time to complete assignments to her best ability.

The observation of instructors and students during the 5-10 minutes before and directly after each class provided concrete evidence of instructors' approachability. My

recorded observations noted how some students in the classes would seek out the instructor before and/or after class to answer questions, assist them in text selections for projects and their own reading, and to clarify expectations. Those instructors who responded to students without hesitation helped students feel more relaxed and thanked the instructor. These students often returned to their tables or seats and shared the information with others.

When instructors were not available prior to or after class, students often relied on one another to answer their questions and ease their concerns about course content and/or expectations. Students voiced their frustrations with having no access to their instructor, especially when explicit answers to their questions could not be ascertained from their classmates. Their frustration played out in different ways. As noted in my observation protocol, when several students (including my participant, Maria) were unsure of the requirements for an assignment, they spent the first 10-12 minutes of class whispering and writing back and forth to one another while their instructor was lecturing.

Preservice teacher participants also pointed out their instructors' enthusiasm as a catalyst for their motivation and interest in the course content. Preservice teacher participants noted instructors' apparent enjoyment of the content, passion for various texts, and charisma with which they taught the subject. Denise discussed her instructor's enthusiasm, explaining:

I feel like she has found enjoyment in the books, (and) that she wants us to find (this enjoyment) and she obviously knows reading is important and that reading to her is especially important and she's just trying to show us that.

When asked what she thought would make it possible for a college instructor to make an impact on students, Denise stated:

It's all about how things are taught...I think they (instructors) need to be just like (my instructor)...they need to show them (college students) that it could be fun, and it should be fun, and sometimes dorky...the way she's excited about it, so dramatic!

Helen paid particular attention to her instructor's affect and use of experience in theater which enhanced the course content, stating, "She's very energetic... She's definitely not a drony teacher...She has a lot of nice charisma... Her real love in life, I think, would be acting, performing. This comes out in her reading too." Helen then emphasized, "...she wouldn't be a literature teacher or a drama teacher if she didn't love it."

Catherine also noticed and appreciated her instructor's enthusiasm, writing, "(My instructor) really did a great job of being excited about reading himself." In a discussion about what she thought contributed to her love of reading, Catherine explained how her past teachers' passions for reading contributed significantly to her own love of reading. She connected this to her current children's literature course instructor, explaining:

...obviously, (my instructor) cares about the books that we're reading, and the stories, you know? I don't think it would be a very useful class if the person that was teaching it was teaching it just so you could get the credit and they could get paid.

Rachel saw her instructor's enthusiasm as unique, stating:

I haven't ever had a teacher like him, because he was so passionate about teaching and everything...I think he's an inspiring teacher, so I really like his class. It seems like if we're enthusiastic and excited about it that kind of pleases him...

In my experiences observing each of the children's literature courses, I watched preservice teacher behaviors vary greatly depending on the enthusiasm of the instructor. Preservice teachers were engaged, actively listening, and responsive when their instructors communicated openly and honestly, used humor, shared how specific books affected them, and showed emotion (i.e. laughing, crying, contentedness, etc.) in response to class members' comments, course content, and/or their own reading. My own level of

engagement increased with these instructor behaviors, as documented in observation protocols.

Instructors' knowledge of course content and how they incorporated their life experiences to the teaching of children's literature encouraged preservice teacher participants' learning. Denise noted how her instructor's knowledge was important to her learning when she explained, "I think her (the instructor's) overall knowledge of it is just incredible, and it makes me more interested...I have trust in her that she's having us read these books because they're good, and because they're important." Helen repeatedly talked about the significance of her instructor's use of knowledge aside from literature, stating, "Her drama background and how she pulls that into the course is a very unique piece of her teaching that someone else couldn't necessarily bring because they haven't had the life experiences that she's had."

Rachel also recognized the value of her instructor's experiences in elementary teaching, explaining, "(My instructor) makes a really good point about how important teaching really is...he talks a lot about just teaching in general." Throughout a number of conversations with Rachel, she recalled her instructor's tips about teaching, stories about his own experiences teaching, and his feelings about teaching. Clearly, Rachel considered this sharing of experiences to be important for her success in the course and in her future career. Maria appreciated her instructor's knowledge of current events impacting education. She recalled the class session in which her instructor presented a list of books that had been banned as well as a recent article from an online magazine describing recently challenged books, such as *The Kite Runner*. She stated, "He lets us know what's going on in the news...he showed us things, like banned books, that I didn't know about."

An examination of my researcher journal and reflections written on observation protocols revealed my intense interest when instructors were able to extend my current knowledge of children's literature by making connections to their own life experience. On one occasion, I wrote, "(The instructor's) performance of this book, *The Zax*, is amazing!" My analysis also helped me to see my interest in some of the literary knowledge taught in the course. I recorded notes about the hero's journey as a plot device used within almost all narratives, yet something I was not familiar with prior to this study. I also noted how much I enjoyed relating my elementary teaching experiences to those described by one instructor and the importance of these connections to learner's lives and experiences to increase student interest. In addition, my ability to relate to texts and discover new texts increased my interest in course content and satisfaction with the time I spent researching. For example, I noted in one class session how excited I was when the instructor shared her extensive knowledge of children's literature. It provided me with several unknown titles by a favored author, which I later found at the public library, checked out, and read to my daughter. Another instructor recommended several poetry texts to me upon hearing of my former struggles with and apprehension to read poetry. These instructors were sources of knowledge who enhanced my academic and personal life. They heightened my engagement and enjoyment.

Preservice teacher participants also valued their instructors' investment in the course and themselves as students. They explained how this investment added to their enjoyment of the course, all the while increasing their interest in the course and willingness to apply considerable effort. Rachel made comparisons to other classes she'd taken, emphasizing how her children's literature instructor was different because, "You

can really tell that he (her instructor) wants to be there, wants to teach...he just really cares if we do well or if we're actually learning, and if we succeed, so that's cool." She explained how her instructor's obvious investment caused her to think about reading more in and outside of the class. After conversing about her teacher's personality characteristics, Rachel talked in generalities about college instructors, noting:

...if an instructor comes in and says good morning or something to kind of like open up the conversation or feel welcome, I think that definitely helps. I think acknowledging the students outside of just what you're teaching helps us (students) learn.

Denise and Helen also talked about college instructors and their course experiences. Denise explained, "I think I would be more motivated too, and more interactive with class discussions if I had a connection with the teacher. If they know my name, there's an instant connection." Helen reflected on the two instructors she had during the semester. She explained:

I do think it's important to show that you're (instructors are) interested in you (the student) as a person, and not just as a passing by student, somebody that is in your class for a few months but then will be gone... because if it is a class that the student has really looked forward to, then that attitude could hinder their academic success and their liking, their appreciation for that class, if the teacher doesn't take time to really get to know the students.

Helen then went on to describe a professor she had as very caring, a teacher who took the time to encourage a struggling student. She concluded, "That's how you really get to the soul of education. You have to grab their heart in order to get them to learn. And even at the college level, it's the same way. You've gotta grab that heart."

Instructors' investment in their courses and their students was also noted in my researcher journal. One example that stood out most readily was when I'd noted how one of the instructors would routinely come in and out of the classroom multiple times prior to the start of each class. Upon watching him more closely and listening to the

interactions he was having with students, I discovered that he'd been attempting to help students find texts they'd be interested in reading during the silent reading time in class, using his own personal collection of texts in his office as a resource. The note states:

After class-(the instructor) spoke about trying to model for other students how to advocate for a student's interest in reading through searching for books for them. (He) talked about having lent books to a student for about three years. (He) pointed out how (a student in the class) had said at the beginning of the semester (that he) was really not into reading at all, but seemed to really be finding an appreciation for it.

This note points to how the instructor's investment fueled his students' success in the course and in becoming readers.

General Engagement and Participation

I analyzed recorded notes on the observation protocols to determine preservice teacher participants' general engagement and participation in the children's literature courses. Behaviors such as eye contact, or body positioning, texting, notetaking, talking with peers, following along in texts, and asking questions were indications of engagement and participation in the course. These levels of engagement varied among participants in the three typologies.

Confident Established Readers were eager learners, often seeking to gather information or interact with the instructor for their own purposes. For example, Richard asked questions that were somewhat disconnected from the course content, yet revealed how the course content could be connected to other societal issues. He asked, "Doesn't that text reveal the deity-ism reflected in our society?" Catherine and Helen also appeared eager and to be seeking knowledge for their own purposes. For example, Helen often times responded to her instructor's questions out loud without being called on,

occasionally interrupting with her own interpretations of a text. Catherine frequently shared her read aloud experiences with the class without prompting. She rarely passed up the opportunity to share her thoughts when prompted and offer examples to illustrate many of her instructor's points in a lesson.

CERs appeared eager to acquire new titles. They each had lists of texts that they updated periodically in response to the instructor and other preservice teachers mention of texts or as a result of a text that was read aloud. There were multiple instances in which texts were circulated or provided by the instructor. CERs usually perused the contents, studying illustrations and becoming engrossed in reading the words within, often times becoming inattentive to subsequent activities.

Apprehensive Prospective Readers engaged and participated, albeit differently than CERs. For example, they rarely, if ever, spoke out within the whole class throughout the entire semester. Their attendance was very consistent, each only missing one class session due to sickness or poor driving conditions. In addition, both Maria and Rachel showed their attentiveness by occasionally nodding in agreement with the instructor or a student's comment, facing in the direction of the speaker, and recording notes when appropriate. They were always prepared for class with their notebooks, texts, and other materials, carefully recorded all announced assignment due dates and assignment expectations within planners or notebooks. The only time I observed either of these students interacting with their instructor was when they sought clarification about an assignment.

During small group activities, both students engaged with their peers to complete the activity or share experiences as had been requested by the instructor. As texts were

circulated, these students always glimpsed the contents, usually flipping through and taking in illustrations, but rarely reading the words within. On occasion, I observed Maria and Rachel recording a title and/or author of a text introduced by their instructors or discussed by a peer.

The Striving Isolated Reader, Denise, displayed many of the same APR behaviors. She rarely spoke out in a whole class setting, and participated in small groups with appropriate questions and comments. Denise's engagement and participation in class, however, was inconsistent, which was not characteristic of APRs. Her engagement and participation seemed to correlate closely with her enjoyment of the text(s) being discussed. For example, during the first half of the course in which picture books were the focus, Denise was very attentive, took careful notes, and appeared to be enthusiastic about the topic as evidenced by her laughter along with peers and brief positive comments shared with peers.

Her behavior changed drastically when the focus of class sessions turned to novels, more specifically novels that she confessed she did not enjoy or read completely. During this second half of the course, Denise was easily distracted. In reviewing my observation notes, I discovered notes that pointed to her texting intermittently throughout two entire class sessions and on occasion in other class sessions.

I documented and reflected on another incident revealing Denise's level of engagement and participation in my researcher journal. In this reflection, I described an activity called the "*Harry Potter* Scavenger Hunt." I partnered up with Denise to complete it. The activity required us to explain the connection of various objects, characters, and themes from *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone* to world mythology

and folklore. My written reflection documents that I found this activity to be extremely difficult, as did Denise, and that neither one of us felt motivated to complete it. We confided that we felt dumb, having received only 8 points of the 25 possible. Although I had read and listened to the book multiple times and she had listened to about three quarters of the book and seen the movie, neither one of us could connect the book to world mythology and folklore, which left us both feeling frustrated and unproductive.

Research Question 3

Q3 What perceptions, if any, do children's literature instructors have of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers?

Instructor's perceptions of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers became evident in my analysis of interview transcriptions and observation protocols. Constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) analysis revealed five views held by all instructor participants: a) Students' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading vary, b) Many students view reading as a job or obligation as a result of being college students, c) Elementary teachers should have a high affective domain of reading, d) Instructors hope or expect that all students' affective domains will improve as a result of taking the children's literature course, and e) Every student has the potential to develop a high affective domain of reading.

Belief #1: Students' Attitudes, Beliefs, and Values of Reading Vary

Although one instructor, Brian, assumed, "the vast majority of them...they know their stuff (children's literature), they've read this stuff, they're interested in this stuff," he admitted, "there are some that are quieter,...maybe feel a little intimidated, maybe

they're not as well read and comfortable with that stuff." In my observation notes, I recorded Brian asking the students, "How many of you like to read Shakespeare?" followed by a brief discussion about how although some people may feel comfortable reading that kind of literature and really enjoy it, not all people do, including himself, and neither will their elementary students all enjoy the same types of reading.

When talking about the survey rating scale data collected in his class, Brian could identify which students were most likely the highest scoring. He made several comments about these students, noting, "Some of their (higher scoring students') presentations were more thought out than others', were more thoroughly presented than others'." As Brian shared his own attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading, I asked him what percentage of his class he thought might share the same views. He explained:

I don't know that they've had the same experience,...but there were a lot of them in there, I think...like, I think (Richard) gets it, (Richard's) hugely into reading. I think (Lupe) gets it, (Anna) gets it...I would say that probably half of them really get it.

Brian noticed variability within class discussions as well, stating, "You could tell from the discussions which of them were really into this stuff and which weren't."

Alice, in thinking about her nine years of teaching the course, explained, "It's becoming more and more rare to talk to younger college students and hear about what books are their favorites, or what ones (they) are always coming back to." She continued, lamenting, "Several of them haven't read a whole book all the way through, ever...most of them aren't readers." While she recognized these truths, Alice also rejoiced, "There's usually a couple of me's in there that are like, 'Yeah! Reading! Yeah!'" Alice also explained student reactions to the course requirements:

I think a lot of them think, 'Oh my gosh! That's a lot of reading! I can't read that well,' and it's daunting. But then once they get into it, it's like, 'Oh, Wow!' ...In

this class, I find that a lot of them are just discovering that they *can* enjoy reading...And it's (building a passion for reading) so different, it's just so individual.

I observed Alice conversing with several enthusiastic students during the class breaks and then again after class was over. She and I discussed these instances and how students showed varying interest in children's literature. She shared, "(I) can see which ones just do whatever they want and just leave and which ones are like, 'So, (Alice)!'" In her attempt to understand lower affective domain readers, Alice stated:

I don't know if there's any cause in particular, they're just not so great a reader?...maybe they just go too slow and they just get impatient?...Maybe reading doesn't transport that person the way it transports someone who enjoys it, so they go other places for that...I think people who don't like reading are getting that same thing, only through media...

Chris acknowledged the variability found in his classroom, stating, "I view reading as an individual journey for students." Chris illustrated this view frequently in his stories about individual students and in his interactions with individual students. For example, Chris shared the story of a student that stopped him after class one evening, "He (the student) expressed himself as a reluctant reader, and that he actually hated reading. (That) was the term that he used (to describe himself) at the beginning of class (the semester)..." Chris described another student, "...rarely do you have a kid...like (Stacy), that will read anything. Like I say, 'This is amazing!' and she says, 'I'll read it tonight!'", a 500 page novel. That kind of student is rare..."

Chris also demonstrated his understanding of the various attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading held by his students throughout his teaching. I observed him conferencing with individual students before, during, and after class, often assisting students in finding texts to read for themselves and to read aloud to elementary students. In my observational notes, I recorded him stating, "Tell me about what you're interested

in,” and “Did you like that one or not so much?” In one instance, he asked the whole group, “How many of you had painful or insightful experiences reading biographies?” and, “Is anyone relishing this time to read?...or dreading it?...or is anyone searching for something to read?”

*Belief #2: Many Students View Reading as a Job or
Obligation as a Result of Being College Students*

Although each instructor emphasized this view in varying degrees, all described their students’ attitudes, beliefs, and values as being greatly impacted by their status as college students. The demands of being a student, they felt, caused students to view reading narrowly, in this case as a job or obligation. Brian explained, “It’s possible that there are those that really don’t like to read, but they do it because it’s class and that’s what they’re going to do, so they do it.” Brian emphasized this point when he spoke of himself as a reader during his undergraduate years, sharing, “I don’t think *I* read much recreationally, maybe for an entire semester, with 15-18 credits. If I was going to read something, it was going to be some text for class.” Alice also saw the influence college studies have on her students, explaining, “They read boring stuff for school because they’re made to...” Alice also reminisced about her own recreational reading in her undergraduate years, recalling, “I wished that I’d had more time for it, but I tended to fit it in...I read (the) Lord of the Rings books every year waiting backstage for lighting cues and such.”

When Chris and I discussed his predictions of his students’ scores on the rating scale, he was very adamant, declaring:

My overall (prediction) was that they view reading as a job and they're in a situation where reading has really served a significant purpose in the sense that they achieve what they're trying to accomplish here at college.

His perusal of the lowest scoring student survey was accompanied by this explanation:

Yeah, this to me...all these answers explain the hectic nature of college expectations, and the reason I say that is because they've told me that...so when I ask them the value of us being able to read silently in class, some are boisterous, some aren't, but they all tend to celebrate the opportunity to say why, because they never get time otherwise...

*Belief #3: Elementary Teachers Should Have
a High Affective Domain of Reading*

All three instructors agreed that elementary teachers need to have a high affective domain of reading in order to pass positive attitudes, beliefs, and values about reading on to their future students. Brian explained:

I think so often you really do lead by example. I would say that if YOU don't have a passion for reading then that is not going to guide decisions you make in your grade-school classroom that you make about reading, how often you have reading time, how you allow kids to read books from your personal library, how big a library you build up in your classroom, or whatever...I think obviously there's going to be repercussions based on how important you see it.

Brian emphasized his point by using himself as an example, stating:

Anything that I teach, students are, to a degree, going to come out of there somewhat indoctrinated in those things that I think are most important...I think this is the same for grade-school classrooms. Teachers that are passionate about reading, they're going to be more likely to pass along that passion to their students...their students will see it in them, the teachers will emphasize the reading...

In a later conversation about people becoming avid readers at any age, the following was said:

Brian: Some people carried it from their youth, those who didn't catch it in their youth maybe catch it somewhere else, some may never, you know? Maybe those who are kinesthetic learners, maybe won't. You know that there are people that sometimes it just never clicks.

Me: As educators, in your opinion, is that okay?

Brian: No, I don't think that's okay actually...I think in academic fields, I think you're short-changing yourself and your students if you don't have that love of reading.

Alice reiterated the importance of the teacher in elementary students' reading, stating:

They (elementary teachers) are the source of literacy. How the teachers teach reading and how much reading they have is the center of how literate the kids will be in other grades and when they're an adult. (I) can see in college students (those that) have a healthy literacy from elementary school on, and which ones don't.

Like Brian, Alice also used herself as an example, explaining:

As far as I go, I absolutely love reading and I am a freak about some of the books, I love them so much. So that is totally infectious. So I think the opposite is also true. If I was to be boring about it, if it's obviously like that, that would be infectious too. I think it goes both ways. You're influencing your students, no matter what you're doing, so I would assume that if that person is obviously that apathetic about reading in front of a classroom, then maybe their students won't be so into reading.

Alice illustrated her role in the process of ensuring that students of all ages develop a love of reading:

I mean, I think about every class of 30 students. So I'm infecting these 30 people with a love of reading. Also they get knowledge of how to read well, but whatever, that's good. Then from there, those 30 people are going to infect another 30 kids, multiple times over...so it's like a happy virus!

Alice reiterated this as she described what she believed should be the purpose of a children's literature class:

I think what it should be doing is teaching them how to make their libraries...how to select books and know what categories there are and what THEY like as well as what is just good. Which, in turn, means that they're going to build their libraries for their classrooms around stuff that not only they know is good, but that they know they LIKE themselves. So you have this sort of cascade of enthusiasm coming from me all the way down to their students.

Chris also emphasized the importance of elementary teachers' affective domain of reading both in his discussions about the course and in his direct statements to students.

He explained:

First and foremost is this viewing reading as this wonderful thing, however they've experienced it...so I need to teach them to come to terms with their reading experiences, so they can kind of embrace those and enjoy the opportunity that reading has, so they can pass it on to their kids...an example, I think if their view of reading is such, then they're going to pass that beautiful view onto their kids very easily, because kids want to please and they want a model. We're looking for models constantly.

In our conversations about the children's literature course, Chris described:

The underlying theme of the course is all of this (affective domain)...how do we enhance kids' joy of reading, view of reading, celebration of reading, use of reading, what does reading have to offer and as teachers, how can these guys go, 'Hey! Look at this!'

Chris often brought forth his experience as an elementary teacher who tried to turn kids on to reading. In one instance, he stated, "You know, teachers as a model of reading is critical and that's why when it's reading time, I try to model as much as possible too, and do all the same things that I would expect my kids (college students) to learn and do."

Chris infused his teaching of the children's literature course with this belief as well. I recorded one instance in which Chris instructed students, "Keep asking yourself, 'Why would we do this in the classroom. How can I help kids learn to read and LOVE to read?'" Later in the semester, Chris followed a small group sharing time in which students described their experiences reading aloud to elementary students. Teary eyed, he shared his joy, stating, "You achieved my goal; to inspire them, tickle them, turn them on to poetry reading!" At the conclusion of the course, Chris explained how he would like all teachers, regardless of their positive or negative experiences with reading, to use themselves to encourage their elementary students. He explained:

I would like to ask them (preservice teachers), ‘What are your beliefs and views towards reading? Towards selecting texts? Towards success and needs in reading? And how will those impact your students?...What will you do to make sure those don’t hinder your students? What will you do to make sure those, your beliefs and your understanding of your beliefs, support your students?’ So regardless of the fact that you (the preservice teacher) really struggle with seeing the beauty in reading, that’s probably a great selling point to (elementary) students to accentuate that and say, ‘You know, as a reader, this is what I think, and this is how I’m working to overcome it because I see the value in (reading)’.

*Belief #4: Instructors Hope or Expect That All
Students’ Affective Domains Will Improve
as a Result of Taking the Children’s
Literature Course*

The three instructors expressed their hope and/or expectation that preservice teachers’ affective domains would be changed by their experiences in the children’s literature course. Brian repeatedly expressed this hope. He explained:

I guess the hope would be, I hadn’t really thought of it this way, but the hope would be someone down the line, someone that maybe isn’t a huge reader will catch a book and go, ‘Wow, this is really cool!’ and maybe that will start a spark for that person.

Brian’s thoughts about the course and the preservice teachers in the course revealed:

The hope is that you provide the environment. I think that’s the most important thing about that class that I’ve enjoyed, is that we have this environment, this book loving environment, underpinning right now...and hopefully...it’s easier to jump into an environment that all your friends are in. It’s peer pressure.

Brian again expressed his hope, stating, “The hope is that that will rub off a bit, and others will see, ‘Wow, they’re really into that,’ you know, lead by example kind of thing. You hope as a teacher that your own passion for those kinds of things will rub off.” He summarized his beliefs with the aphorism, “A rising tide lifts all boats.”

Alice went beyond hope, to expectation. She voiced her expectation that students would have an improved affective domain of reading as a result of their experiences in

her class. Her confidence was evident as she discussed her students' potential scores on the survey rating scale prior to being shown the data. She stated:

If you handed this to them on the first day of class, before they'd read anything, before they even saw the array of books I brought on the first day, they'd be like, 'reading isn't too important, I don't read much, and I don't like reading hard stuff, etc.' for most of these...that's just a generality, I know that there's always exceptions...but as of now-ish, or a couple of weeks ago, I think maybe they might have changed. It seems like this class changes people's, the students', attitudes to reading a lot. It seems like they enjoy reading a lot more.

When asked how she knew this, she reported:

I see it by them walking up to me and going, 'Oh my gosh!' and they have to tell me. It's this big amazing discovery...they start with saying how much they enjoy something they read for class, then they describe how 'Before I never read and I really hated it...' and you know?

Alice shared several specific stories of students that have improved their affective domain of reading as a result of the course. In one instance, Alice recalled:

I had one student in this class last year, who said, 'Oh yeah, I never went to the (Public) library before with my daughter, but now I take my daughter there every single weekend, we go there on Saturday because of this class'.

At the completion of the course, Alice shared a few stories about other students that provided evidence of this change:

What (Dan) was saying was really cool, I think...He called himself a leader of this, and he gestured to the classroom. He's picturing himself being me and having to select all the stuff for his classroom for the future. I could see that that was what he was doing when he gestured to the classroom. And then (Courtney) asking me about more resources about fairy tales, in particular, I just think she found that that was important as the roots of story. So she was asking me how she could delve deeper into it...a few others...had general statements of, 'I really read a lot and learned a lot from reading it, so thanks for assigning all of it.' When Alice and I discussed students who might have a low affective domain of reading, she stated, "But if you come through my class, you're going to like to read...well, I do my best anyway!"

Chris, like Alice, also voiced the expectation that preservice teachers' affective domain would change over the course of the semester. He stated:

My reaction (to the survey rating scale data) is that it's going to change dramatically. The kids on that are on the lower end are going to develop a sense of self efficacy as readers, and they're going to see themselves as readers, the importance of reading and try to fit that into their definition of reading. I can almost guarantee it.

Chris emphasized this again in the second interview when asked for predicted scores if preservice teachers were to take the survey again. He stated:

I think their attitude towards reading in general and the potential for their attitude inspiring and sparking their students' interests... I think their view would either be dramatically increased or strengthened or flipped over to the point where they're supportive now...when we reviewed the low, we saw a lack of interest in reading and a lack of importance of reading, and I'm confident that it would (have) changed.

Chris had numerous stories to support his claims. He described how one student that had confessed a hate of reading had been changed by the course:

...he also in reflecting said how much he disliked me at the beginning of class as a result of me expressing my emotion and telling them how I felt about them as learners and the potential that I saw for their learners...and then he went on to say, 'as you consistently behaved in this way and showcased that that's actually who you are, that really helped me to see, oh, there's a lot more to this reading than just providing great and interesting texts to choose from. It's the teacher's inspiration and views and how you can pass those on to your students.'

Chris shared his experiences hearing other stories from students and summarized these with, "I think with the common responses from the class and then individuals, specifically like him, I'm confident that they've increased their interest and view of the potential of reading."

*Belief #5 Every Student Has the Potential to Develop
a High Affective Domain of Reading*

All instructors expressed that all preservice teachers had the potential to improve their affective domain of reading to become avid readers. Some were not certain as to how this improvement could be accomplished in higher education, yet all supported this

aim. Although Brian initially revealed, "...it's gotta start in the home", he went on to state repeatedly the potential that exists for anyone to gain an appreciation for reading. One of the stories he used repeatedly to illustrate this point throughout both interviews was about his former father-in-law, who, rather late in life, became an avid reader. Brian recalled:

He was like in his 50s, had never been a reader, thought it was a waste of time, 'you should be a man of action out there', and then he was layed up and read like a whole series of books over a couple of months, totally out of character for him. It just had to be something that was his thing.

Brian shared that this man continues to devote time to reading.

Brian saw this experience as evidence for his claim:

I really believe that everybody has the potential to love reading. It just has to hit them at the right time...it just takes whatever connects with you...know your audience and find something that fits them...and I think pretty much teachers at all levels, I think teachers even at my level can do that, which is part of the reason I like to teach children's literature.

Brian also recalled one of his student's experiences to provide support for his belief,

"...like the student that said, 'I just started when I was in 6th grade,' Well in 6th grade, she found that thing that clicked for her and said, 'there's got to be more like this, that was fun!'" Brian's belief in this potential development sparked an idea:

Maybe there should be courses in literature for fun, that elementary education teachers have to take, where they have to pick four books over the course of the semester that they're going to read, that they're going to discuss in class and they can be different from what everybody else picks...gives them that opportunity to find that thing that they haven't found.

He summed up his belief, saying "You know, there's always that chance..."

Alice also felt strongly that there's the potential for everyone to become a reader, quoting children's author, Philip Pullman, "...put the right book into the hands of the right child at the right time," to support her belief. Alice continued, "...and maybe they just...it's not the right time for them to fall in love with the right book, or it hasn't been it

yet. Maybe someday down the road, they'll discover it." This belief in the significance of the right book guided Alice in her objectives for the course. She described often her belief in the importance of opening doors for students:

...a teacher of this topic can influence all readers for the good...so, being a library starter,...that's big. To me, that's the biggest thing. That's the root of it, to infect teachers with this reading, with all these doors that are opening for reading. I think just to infect all of these people with a love of reading in some way, I think that's huge. And that can be really huge.

Alice recalled one of her favorite instances as evidence of this:

I'm fascinated to see how many people don't or haven't had exposure to Harry Potter. Everyone of them that hadn't seen the movie or read the book was like, 'I'm addicted now!' Every semester I teach it, there are a handful or so that haven't been exposed to Harry Potter, but this semester like half of them hadn't. It's like I knocked on the wall and opened it for them.

This image of opening doors was reiterated at the conclusion of the last interview with Alice when she stated, "I'm trying to infect them and if I infect them with this, then they're going to infect their own students with it, and all these doors are going to start opening because everyone will start reading...it's going to be huge!"

Chris appeared to believe so strongly in the potential of all his students to develop a high affective domain of reading that he rarely, if ever, acknowledged the possibility of any preservice teacher not doing so at some point in their lives if not during the children's literature course. To this end, Chris repeatedly described his emphatic faith in the influence of personal teaching and learning experiences. Chris felt that all preservice teachers would grow in their affective domain of reading as a result of a) reflecting on themselves as readers and their experiences with reading in the class, b) experiencing Chris sharing his relationship with reading, reading experiences, and modeling of reading habits and behaviors c) building connections to Chris as a teacher and a reader, d) building connections with one another through sharing of reading experiences and

themselves as readers. With these connections, Chris felt, all preservice teachers would, at the very least, attain a sincere value in reading, if not an appreciation for reading in their own lives.

Chris explained the context of his classroom that supported student reflection on themselves as readers and their experiences with reading:

So they're in such a safe environment in our class, which they've expressed, that they are very willing to go places that they know are going to be difficult, so they're willing to challenge themselves, so they're willing to say they'd like to go here...

Chris also described his attention to student reflection, stating:

...so I need to teach them to come to terms with their reading experiences, so they can kind of embrace those...I think that needs to happen more often, giving them a chance to talk about themselves as readers, their views of reading, their changing views, what's still nagging at them, what's beautiful...

Chris also discussed his frequent sharing of himself as a reader:

A lot of what this comes back to is what you share of yourself, that honest response, that emotion...you know, reading is, emotionally speaking, reading is everything to me and my kids, so sharing the reading experiences I have with my kids...I think the value that reading has had for me more as a teacher in the elementary classroom and a teacher (at the college level) are more what comes through (to students)...

Sharing of himself also included modeling, which I observed weekly when Chris sat on the floor and silently read while his students read. Chris explained, "Teachers as a model of reading is critical, and that's why when it's reading time, I try to model as much as possible too..."

Chris also explained the impact of personal connection with his students, relating a description of an interaction with a student who had just begun to build a relationship with reading:

He told me about his confusion as to how you can appropriately relate to students/learners with respect to reading, that's what I think opens the gateway to

loving and celebrating reading...because it's personal. And I think if you realize that teaching is personal and the impact that you have on students, then you can easily use that emotion, that exposure of yourself...it's always a personal emotional response and then they take it back into reading...

Chris also emphasized the importance of connections among students that inevitably lead to developing the affective domain of reading in preservice teachers:

My plan involves finding out how they feel about reading, and exposing them to one another...I'm thinking of one in particular that I think she thought that everyone loved to read...exposure to their peers that don't see reading the way they do and how in considering their peers and how they've grown or reacted to text...and then recommending texts to others spontaneously...

Research Question 4

Q4 How might instructors' perceptions of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers contribute to their instructional decisions?

Constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) analysis of interview transcriptions, observation notes, my researcher journal, and instructors' course artifacts was used to address this question. The analysis led me to see five aspects of the children's literature courses that were influenced by instructors' perceptions of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers: a) Interactions with students, b) Selection and use of required readings, c) Assignments and assessments, d) In-class activities, and e) Policies and procedures. In Table 7 Instructional Decisions Influenced by Affective Domain, I provide an overview of these instructional decisions. I then provide supportive narrative for each children's literature instructor's decisions.

Table 7

Instructional Decisions Influenced by Affective Domain

Aspect of Course	Instructional Decisions Influenced by Preservice Teachers' Affective Domains		
	Brian	Alice	Chris
Interactions with students	Facilitator of class, with students' voices being highest priority.	Leader of class, with entertaining and casual tone.	Facilitator of and participant in class, prioritizing individual and small group interactions.
Selection and use of required reading	Self-selected children's literature is most valuable. Textbook seen as resource to provide some background knowledge. Textbook selected by department.	Wide variety of texts (i.e. scholarly articles, checklists, commentaries, comics, poems, etc.) carefully selected for quality, interest, and to support in-class learning. Children's literature selected for ease of reading, connection to pop culture, quality, and adherence to department requirements.	Self-selected children's literature is most valuable. Textbook seen as resource to provide some background knowledge. Textbook selected for concise, accessible, and accurate knowledge.
Assignments and assessments	Self-selection of texts for weekly presentations and literary analysis.	Self-selection of texts for reading log. Self-reflection of experiences in course. Share favorite texts. Student choice of novel for group presentation and paper. Group creation of presentation format. Self-selection of final paper topic. Open notebook exam.	Prioritized students' experiences and affective domain as opposed to product and content. Self-selection of texts for read alouds, silent reading, and small group reading. Variety of forms of informal assessment including collaborative and performance based.

Table 7 continued

Aspect of Course	Instructional Decisions Influenced by Preservice Teachers' Affective Domains		
	Brian	Alice	Chris
In-Class activities	Child panel with discussions of likes, dislikes, etc. Discussion of genres as opposed to lectures. <i>Where the Wild Things Are</i> movie field trip.	Small group read aloud. Student choice of individual, partner, or small group to complete in-class activities. Incorporation of movie clips for demonstration and literary analysis.	Ample practice for read aloud in partner, small group, and finally whole class. Text sorting in small groups. Silent reading. Varied responses to reading.
Policies and procedures	Extensions provided with no penalties when student explained.	Present prior to and after class for students. Posted frequent updates to course webpage.	Extensions provided with no penalties when student explained. Present prior to and after class for students. Frequent use of e-mail for clarification and individual support.

Brian

Brian's children's literature course was offered through the English department at a two-year institution. Of the 16 students in the class, approximately half of the students in the class were English Language Learners or bilingual. In addition, approximately half of the students were part of a scholarship program for adult non-traditional students that earned their degrees in elementary education while working as aides in elementary classrooms.

Interactions with Students

Brian explained, "I'm part content expert, part facilitator, part cheerleader." In analyzing my observational notes, Brian's description of himself and his role in the

course is confirmed. He rarely lectured to students, instead posing critical thinking questions that interested the students and lead to whole class discussions in which he maintained the role of facilitator by connecting students' statements, providing clarification or information, encouraging students to participate, and posing more questions to keep discussion going. Students in the class were the primary voice, and as Brian admitted, some were more vocal than others:

I think what happens is the students in class maybe that are most vocal are probably the ones that are up here at the top (of the rating scale scores), and so they do the most reading, they care about it the most, they're more into it, and others that are maybe a little quieter, you know, they're filling in the blank spaces a little bit..

Brian's interactions with students represent an awareness of students' interests and motivations for learning the content of the class. Brian explained that once he had met the students and understood his audience, he realized he needed to adjust the course to meet their needs. He restructured the format to focus class activities and content on using children's literature in the elementary classroom. In addition, he focused most discussions on educational issues as opposed to literary topics. Brian frequently discussed his respect for the students' knowledge of education and elementary children. He stated, "These students are probably more knowledgeable about the students they'll be working with and what those students need than I am, so (I) have them support one another to grow their knowledge". During the frequent whole group discussions, Brian showed his ability to listen to students' interactions with one another and catch their heightened enthusiasm for a particular topic, which he would then help them to delve into more deeply.

*Selection and Use of
Required Reading*

Brian was required to use the seventh edition of *Literature and the Child* by Lee Galda, Bernice E. Cullinan, and Lawrence R. Sipe. Brian's statement, "I'm not very fond of textbooks in general," aligned with his usage of the text. Throughout the entire semester, Brian did not discuss the assigned course readings from the text, and his expectation was that "they at least scan or skim the chapter before class." When asked about this required reading for the course, Brian stated:

...this book is boring. I didn't want to read the book, and I love to read! And I'm a big proponent to not using textbooks. And this book had interesting information, but you noticed I never talked about it in class. We had chapters to read in preparation, but that was for the students to do, I wasn't going to...it was just boring stuff out of there, so I figured let's just focus on the (children's) books, let's focus on the genres (with those).

Brian's choice to focus on the students' self-selected children's literature showed his desire to spark and/or hold students' interests and motivation. He noted how many students reacted very positively to one another's chosen texts, often times recalling fondly when they'd read the text as children. Students appeared to take their cue from Brian; they gave little attention to the textbook reading and focused on the children's literature instead. My observational notes included multiple entries about students' frequent and spontaneous discussion of their chosen pieces of literature, often before the class had even started and during breaks as well. I found no recorded observations of students discussing textbook reading when analyzing data.

Assignments and Assessments

The assignment that contributed the most points to the course was a series of weekly presentations accompanied by 1-2 page written evaluations of each picture book or chapter book selected to represent the genre being studied. Students brought in a wide variety of texts, some from their childhood and many others recently published. Brian described his hope for the assignment in a metaphor:

...and if you're kind of a hold out of 'I never liked reading too much,' maybe you go, 'Eh, put my toe in the pool, see if the water's warm. It's alright...could be kind of fun.'...And I give them an opportunity every week to put their toe in, pick a new book, show off why you like it, why it matters...so you hope for the best (sparking student interest in reading) that way.

Another assignment required students to choose one text and write a 5-7 page literary analysis of the work. Students were given the option to complete the literary analysis on a book they'd already read or to choose a different text.

These assignments point to Brian's desire to maintain students' interest in the course content through choosing texts they felt comfortable reading and enjoyed. In addition, by providing the option for students to write the literary analysis on a text they'd already read, Brian assisted students in feeling more confident and assured in their success with what was a new type of writing for many students. For instance, one of my preservice teacher participants, Maria, welcomed the opportunity to reread a previously chosen text for the literary analysis. She stated that this was her favorite text she'd read all semester and understood well, therefore she predicted she'd perform better on the assignment.

In-Class Activities

The majority of in-class time was spent in student presentations of self-selected literature, discussion about the literature, and discussions about the genres and use of literature in the elementary classroom. In Brian's words, "Most of it (developing views of literature and reading) comes from interaction, interplay from talking to other students." He felt strongly that preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values might better be impacted by one another rather than himself:

That could be a positive by- product of this class too, with me not standing there lecturing about all this stuff, but the way that they get into all these discussions and have to choose (books)...It's not an osmosis thing, but the hope will be that they see that passion and that excitement that some of us have about some of these books that we've been talking about and they'll go, 'I gotta check this out'.

Brian felt that the environment conducive to impacting students' affective domain of reading was created through these frequent discussions and sharing of literature, including passing genre specific student chosen texts around the room every class session. He explained:

I think the most important thing about that class that I've enjoyed, is that we have this environment, this book loving environment underpinning right now...and hopefully...it's easier to jump into an environment that all your friends are in. It's peer pressure...It's like shooting at a target, and I practice accuracy by volume. I figure if I shoot enough, I'm going to hit the thing, right? Well, it's kind of the same thing in reading to a degree, and that's kind of how the class is working a little bit here. We're throwing every genre, every different thing at them, and I think that's a good way to handle it...

Another in-class activity that Brian felt influenced his students most significantly was a panel discussion. Approximately fifteen children ranging in age from 3-17 were brought in and split into three similar age groups (i.e. 3-7 years, 8-11 years, and 12-17 years). Preservice teachers were also split into three groups and prepared questions to ask each of the three groups of children. The evening of the panel activity, each group of

preservice teachers sat and discussed their questions with each group of children for about ten minutes and then rotated. The purpose of this activity was to give preservice teachers an opportunity to find out if the assumptions the class had been making about children's likes and dislikes, their reading habits, their attitudes, beliefs, and values about reading were actually what children thought and felt. Brian explained:

It was a teaching experience for me to say, I know all this stuff, but when it comes down to it, is that what is really going on with kids...in a really small way, it was a chance for us to see, 'are we getting it right?', a valuable thing to look at.

In the class session the following week, Brian asked the class to discuss what they had learned about children's attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading. Within this debriefing, the class discussed the unexpected event of the children turning the questions back upon the preservice teachers. During this discussion, I had noted, "Preservice teachers said they'd felt uncomfortable, embarrassed, not prepared...One said, 'My biology book is my favorite-that's all I've got time for!', and another, '(I) didn't really want to answer.'" After class that evening, Brian and I spoke informally about the preservice teachers' reactions to being interviewed by the children. We both concluded that the interaction was particularly interesting in that it forced the preservice teachers to consider their own affective domain of reading, something that had not occurred in previous class discussions.

Brian also felt that the class field trip to see the movie, *Where the Wild Things Are*, was another opportunity to positively impact students' attitudes about literature. The preservice teachers' viewing of the film, an adaptation of the children's text of the same title written by Maurice Sendak, sparked a great deal of discussion about the appropriate themes of film and literature for various ages of children. In my observation notes of this discussion, I recorded, "Hadn't heard (Shelly) speak out in any other class session.

Almost having hard time NOT sharing her opinions now.” Some students that had formerly not been involved in class discussions about the literature did become more interested and eager to participate. I had recorded, “Many not raising hands for this one (discussion).” Students described their experiences with the movie and their opinions on the topic. I’d noted, “(Kristy)-not sure if my kids would even get it. I don’t think they would. More for adults than kids, I think.”

Brian felt that incorporating pop culture through the use of film, commercial literature, and other media was an important aspect of making reading enticing to both preservice teachers and elementary students. He explained:

...I think sometimes we do a disservice to it (literature and reading) by focusing on the non-commercial stuff in our literature classes, because I can’t think of a single student who went through a world lit class or an American lit class who I’ve taught who came out going, ‘I have just GOT to read more of this stuff!’, you know?...because it’s hard. That’s only one type of literature and it’s for a particular type of reader. And for the most part, I’m not that type of reader even though I can read it. If I can read that or Tom Clancy, I don’t pick that. I pick Tom Clancy. It’s more fun...All literature should be fun like that, to a degree. Maybe that’s the best place to catch it. Yes, in this reading that is fantasy, where it’s still okay to be for fantasy, because it’s for kids.

He concluded, “...so, if you’re going to teach teachers, maybe the best we can do is give them every opportunity to find this (love of reading).”

Policies and Procedures

In my observation notes, I recorded multiple occasions in which students, such as the preservice teacher participant, Maria, requested deadline extensions. In these instances, as well as others, Brian accepted write-ups and other assignments within a given time frame beyond the deadlines stated in the syllabus. He explained to students that as long as they put in sufficient effort and show that they’d taken the time to know

their children's texts well during presentations, he was not concerned with particular deadlines. I observed many students' relief upon hearing this news. My observation notes stated, "Deadlines-no big deal. Students sighing, 'Phew! Not done with that yet.' Chatter, talking about deadlines for other courses, 'Not enough time!'" Maria, who (as discussed earlier) felt that she was able to show Brian her best work given this additional time. According to Brian, this flexibility did not pose a problem, and students did the work as requested.

Alice

Alice's children's literature course was offered through the English department at a four-year institution in an urban setting. The class was diverse in ethnicity and age, with approximately 20 traditional undergraduate elementary education preservice teachers and 10 post baccalaureate elementary education preservice teachers. All appeared to be native English speakers.

Interactions With Students

By combining her background in theatre and English, Alice desired to create a fun learning atmosphere through friendly interactions with her students. In her words:

I have this theory of education that I call edutainment and that it should be fun and just left brained, right brained thinking. You should be able to encompass learning with both your hemispheres and if you're just doing this left brained kind of wrote, fill in the bubbles kind of thing, it's not...you're not going to retain it nearly as well as if you're having a good time and laughing.

Her theory often showed itself. As documented in my observation notes over several class sessions:

Tons of smiles from instructor and students, spontaneous laughter, (Alice) seems encouraging and excited to read students' papers, she looks at the audience frequently – lots of emotion, smiles, changes in voice, lots of chuckles from the students as she reads aloud...reads aloud in such a way as to build suspense-holds back pictures.

Alice interacted with her students with a tone of humor, informality, and enthusiasm that students reacted to with laughter, and frequent comfortable communication with one another. Alice described, "It's almost like I'm showing them (Alice) the character, who's the lover of reading, and they can watch (Alice) and they can learn facts about literature from her and also see who she is as a reader character."

Alice also interacted with students with an understanding and acknowledgement of the media culture in which many of them have grown up and currently live. For instance, when discussing the lack of prolific reading of many of her students, she stated:

Well, I understand where they're coming from. I don't like it necessarily, but I can understand how it can happen and I mean, I dig it. I teach so much online for (another university) especially, and I'm just always on/in technology, play games and stuff, have a blog, etc....I think people who don't like reading are getting that same thing, only through media and I understand how much other media is everywhere and if you're someone who only watches *Survivor* and has never read a book, it will make me kind of sad, but I can understand.

As Alice stated, "It's impossible to extricate the literature from the pop culture," which was evident in her interaction with students. She repeatedly used students' background knowledge and experiences with many films past, present, and even future to connect students to content she was teaching about children's literature. For instance, the past *Alice in Wonderland*, *The Wizard of Oz*, the *Harry Potter* series of films and *Holes*, current *Cloudy with a Chance of Meatballs*, *Tale of Despereaux* and *Where the Wild Things Are*, as well as upcoming films, *Alice in Wonderland* and *Diary of a Wimpy Kid* were just some of those used to assist students in engaging with and understanding literary concepts she taught.

*Selection and Use of
Required Reading*

Alice readily admitted in both interviews, “It’s a lot of reading for a 2000 level course, I mean it’s A LOT,...and all of them usually get intimidated by it... but they’re really surprised by how much they like it too, which is nice.” Within the course, students are required to read and analyze twenty picture and/or chapter books, six novels, and a wide variety of literary articles, clippings, commentaries and other pieces chosen by Alice within a course packet that replaces a textbook. Alice said, “I am forcing them to read a lot,” and acknowledged, “I shove a lot of literature down their throats,” but she is confident that, “a lot of them end up liking it and they don’t think they will.”

In analyzing and later discussing the course required reading packet Alice created, I discovered that she put a great deal of time and consideration into each piece she included. Her priorities in selecting these pieces included conciseness, usability for students in the future, and creative pieces that aligned with the objectives of the course determined by the English department at her university. Her selection resulted in an eclectic mix of materials that she required students to read for background knowledge and as catalysts for analytical thought and class discussion about literature and how it is perceived by the preservice teachers. Alice stated:

The course packet came about because the textbooks that we’d been using just suck so badly...I want a textbook that isn’t just an anthology. It’s stupid to have a bunch of picture books in a big thick book. You might as well bring in the books and have the experience. And excerpts of novels make no sense to me either. I want to have the whole books.

Alice did explain that she was given guidelines from a committee of English professors that also taught children’s literature. This committee influenced textbook adoption and also decided on other parameters within the course. For instance, Alice

shared that she was required to assign between five and seven novels, with two being published before 1920, and that she was limited to teaching only juvenile literature. Alice explained:

(I) chose *Wizard of Oz* and *Alice in Wonderland* not only because they're favorites of mine, so I can enthusiastically talk about them, but also because some of the other old books are really just hard. And it's hard enough to read an older book, usually for most of them (students). These are the two that are either A, most famous, and so they kind of know about them already, or B, are easier to read...there are other things (books) too...stuff that's written even earlier than that, it's just hard to slog through...and it's fun for a nerd like me, but it's not fun for a class to have to learn about classic literature. These two are some of the funnest old books.

Alice felt it was necessary for students to have a lot of required reading for this course, given her personal objectives for the course. She explained:

I think what it (the course) should be doing is teaching them how to make their libraries...how to select books and know what categories there are and what THEY like as well as what is just good...which in turn means that they're going to build their libraries for the classrooms around stuff that they not only know is good, but that they know they like themselves...

This objective led Alice to encouraging students to self select at least a portion of the required reading. According to her syllabus, which I verified through observation notes, students were required to select all the picture books required for the course. Although there were parameters, such as genre, students were provided numerous opportunities to choose many of the texts they wanted to read to fulfill the required reading. Some students, such as Denise, chose to reread some favorite texts from their pasts. For some, the freedom to choose previously read texts might have provided comfort due to the familiarity of the texts, or possibly due to not having to search for texts that were unfamiliar.

Assignments and Assessments

Alice's desire for her students to develop their own interests in literature drove her design of multiple assignments and assessments in the course. First, she required students to self-select all texts for the reading log assignment. Students were invited to use any children's texts they desired, though Alice limited her students to only using two of the six assigned novels for the reading log. Some students chose to use the texts they'd brought in to share during the picture book unit, while others chose to locate others to use specifically for this assignment.

Alice's desire to give students choices to encourage their interest, motivation, and success also was evident in her decision to let students sign up for the novel they wanted to read, write a paper about, and then present with a group. Students appeared to enjoy this opportunity to decide which novel on which to focus their efforts, again with some choosing past favorites and others excitedly choosing novels that were new to them or ones they'd desired to read in their pasts but hadn't taken the opportunity to. My observation notes of the class session in which students signed up for their novel group stated:

During break, students are talking about novels they're supposed to be reading/signing up for...One student asks another-is it long?, other student explains that it's a pretty easy read, doesn't take long. Students signing up for novels and talking to peers, '(I) read this one, but I LOVED it!'

Alice allowed the groups of students to design their presentations of their chosen novels with few, if any, parameters. Students seemed to greatly enjoy the space to exercise their creativity with this assignment. I recorded observations of students gathering together during breaks and after class, sharing ideas and exchanging materials, punctuated by comments, "This should work great! That's a good idea." As I observed

each group presentation, I noted the presenting group's enthusiasm, and the conscientious efforts they'd put forth to be prepared, as well as their excitement when fellow classmates participated and enjoyed their presentations. An analysis of my observation notes taken during the first two group presentations revealed, "Students are asking questions and offering comments, Students talking about loving BnB (*Bud, Not Buddy*), made them cry, student presenters had fun discussing Bud rules."

After the first two presentations, subsequent groups tended to model their presentations after the Jeopardy or quiz show format used by the first two groups. As I continued to analyze my observation notes, I discovered that students became disengaged, as did I, when each presentation focused heavily on a question-answer quiz show format, with questions focused on literal comprehension. I recorded the following:

11-13-09: Questions on the text lead them through the game board-almost all recall questions

11-20-09: Jeopardy game-literal questions in Jeopardy game...Entire class of students is fairly disengaged from the quiz game, talking over other groups, not listening to other questions, professor is also occasionally doing other things-not very engaged in game, group didn't want to play the final Jeopardy

12-4-09: Student presentation-Jeopardy game, again all questions are literal comp of text and very detailed (often insignificant)

Students were also given a great deal of freedom with assigned papers. Alice's syllabus stated:

There will be two papers assigned during the semester: one will be a 2-3 page paper due the day of your panel presentation, discussing a certain aspect of your chosen book that struck you...so you may choose to expand a topic you come up with in your presentation preparation, or it may be a topic of your choice. The second paper will be a complete, thoughtful, scholarly paper of 5-7 pages in length, discussing the book of your choice, either picture book or novel.

In my observation of the class, Alice opened up the topic for the second paper even further, allowing students to write about any aspect of children's literature that was of

interest to them. For example, Helen wrote her final paper about reading aloud children's literature.

Alice's interest in students' affective domain of reading was also evident in the self-evaluation assignment. This assignment was due during the final exam period, though students completed this assignment at home. During the last interview with Alice, she explained how she was eager to see if students latched on to some kind of connection with what reading could be for them, "That's part of the reason I assign that self-evaluation assignment. I get to read what their favorites and least favorites were and I also get to see what they felt about their journey."

There were seven assessments within Alice's children's literature course. Six of these were very brief, oral, short answer quizzes on each of the novels assigned. One of the assessments was an exam on the picture book unit, which covered the first half of the class. This open notebook exam included Alice's read aloud of two picture books by Tomie dePaola and a variety of interesting questions that elicited students' attitudes, beliefs, and values of picture books or their experiences with picture book reading. Some examples include, "Which story do you enjoy more? Why?", "What, in your opinion, is the best way to illustrate poetry for a picture book?", "Which book that you found or heard in class was the best read aloud picture book, in your opinion?", and, "What was your favorite picture book you found or heard in this class and why?"

Alice's questions on Folklore within this picture book exam were particularly interesting: "What should you do when you find a strange or ugly old person in the woods? How do you get into the enchanter/troll/witch's place? What should you do with any magical gifts you receive?" Alice explained these questions:

Instead of trying to remember that stupid list (folklore criteria), that's boring...they remember (because) I'm putting them in there literally. If you're a reader and you enjoy reading, you go to books like they're places...And so that's what I'm making them do...I'm literally putting them in that place, instead of talking about reading, they're in there.

Students appeared confident and relaxed while taking this exam. They smiled, laughed, and were very engaged with the two read alouds at the beginning the exam, and chuckled when they read the folklore questions. In my observation notes, I recorded:

She starts, 'As you listen, enjoy, obviously!' She (Alice) reads aloud two books and uses read aloud as part of quiz. All student eyes are on her and the text, even more so than during lecture. *Strega Nona*-students smiling. Students up looking at texts, take back to seat, then return to front...Student in next row over chuckles, see she's answering folklore questions.

Furthermore, Denise was very appreciative of the option to use her resources for the exam and proud of herself for earning full points on it, something she said she knew wouldn't have been possible if she hadn't been allowed to look back at the articles she'd read or notes she'd taken during class. Many other students were observed looking into their resources throughout the exam as well.

In-Class Activities

Most class sessions in Alice's course included whole group and small group activities and/or discussions. Students were always given the choice of which activity they wanted to complete from a list of options, as well as their grouping (i.e. individually, in partners, or in small groups). Activities included recreating fairytales, dramatizing texts, discussing opinions, sharing favorite texts they'd brought in, and reflecting on experiences. Alice encouraged students to have fun and enjoyed students' enthusiasm. During the second class session I observed small groups of students select and dramatize a portion of their favorite Dr. Seuss texts that they'd brought in to share. I recorded, "This

is the most alive this class has been since I've been observing..." In a discussion about preservice teachers' opportunities to practice reading aloud in these small groups, Alice explained:

I think they'd be absolutely terrified (to read aloud to the whole class) and they wouldn't want to do it on their own. In groups, they seemed like they had a great time...it tends to be kind of chaotic in the classroom, but it's fun. And it's nicer for them because they're not up in front of the classroom, but they're still practicing and they have a smaller group so they're able to get used to it, they seem to like that.

My observation of these small group activities revealed increased participation as compared to whole class discussion or activities, a comfortable atmosphere, and students enjoying their work.

Whole group in-class activities primarily consisted of lectures and discussions of concepts and texts interspersed with anecdotes (Alice's and various students'), Alice's reading aloud of various texts, video clips from movies, audio clips of famous actors reading children's literature, and video clips from theatre productions Alice had been involved in. In this way, Alice set out to capture and maintain students' interest, thus entertaining them while continuing to develop their understanding of literary concepts. In one instance, Alice asked the class to silently read a short selection in *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*. Then she played the movie clip matching the scene just read and pointed out the actor's use of oral interpretation clues found in the text (i.e. italics, caps, paragraph breaks, ellipses, etc.). Students were very engaged throughout this activity and responses afterward showed how students valued this new insight into both reading aloud and acting.

Policies and Procedures

Alice's conscious effort to be available for her students revealed yet another way she attended to their affective domain. Alice arrived at least 10-15 minutes prior to the beginning of class and spent at least as much time after class answering students' questions, enjoying conversation about literature with individual students, and providing resources to students that had asked. Alice also made herself available online, sharing her Facebook profile name, e-mail address, blog site address, and website. Alice encouraged students to contact her through various means and my observation of her interactions with students revealed that she was prompt in responding to their communication, often times in less than 24 hours. In addition, Alice updated the course webpage each week with what was covered in class, reminders of due dates, resources of interest, and other information related to the course. These efforts seemed to be appreciated by students and helped students to be confident in meeting course requirements, as well as inspiring them to pursue their developing interests in reading children's literature.

In one instance, Alice printed out the chat discussion she had with a small group of students about poetry. She then saved this chat session and posted it within a threaded discussion board on the class webpage. Alice shared the printed out threaded discussion board with me which had specific lines highlighted. When I asked about these lines, she explained that she highlighted those on the discussion board to call students' attention to those as she thought those would be most useful for them to learn about poetry. These lines stated, "I always say that the main purpose of poetry is twofold. 1) It should have rich, interesting sound, and 2) It should have a strong emotional quality shown through images" Later in this same threaded discussion, Alice stated:

...that's it. If you think poetry is lofty and you can never understand its meaning, you may have just been listening to too many English teachers, LOL!...If you get clear images, hear cool sounds, and get an emotional quality from a poem, that's it. Meanings are fun to find (or make up) but that's not the point of poetry...9 times out of 10 you don't need to 'understand.' Just enjoy...Poetry actually started out as song way way back in the day, like before print...

Some of the students' responses to Alice's various postings included, "Oh, that's nice to know. That is very interesting. I had no idea. Poems are everywhere!!! No kiddin'."

Although I didn't have access to the course webpage, this printed threaded discussion also included several students' questions about homework assignments, such as the reading log, poetry activity, and others. Alice responded with clarification, and students thanked her in the discussion board postings. In addition, I recorded several class sessions in which Alice checked in with students to see if they had received her e-mail in response to their questions. Students responded with appreciative statements and said that they were "all set" and understood what they needed to do.

Chris

Chris' children's literature course was offered through the Education department at a four-year institution in a suburban setting. The class was homogeneous in ethnicity and age, with 27 traditional undergraduate elementary education preservice teachers. All appeared to be native English speakers.

Interactions With Students

"If you can connect with a student, they can rule the world," Chris announced. These and other similar statements are evidence of Chris' priorities in his teaching:

classroom community, personal connection, and student centered learning. These priorities were evident in my observations as well. Chris explained:

One of my goals that I strive for every day is connecting with my students... to kind of meet Maslow's hierarchy of needs. If they have all their basic needs met, including love and comfort and safety, they're that much more open to learning...

Driven by this goal, Chris often spent snippets of time throughout each class in casual conversation with students. He sat with students in their groups, talked with students one-on-one prior to and after class, and frequently exchanged e-mails with his students. In his explanation of why class often started late, he stated:

I think it's an appropriate compromise of time because the value (is) for me to get to touch base with them and know them a little bit...If I had the time, I would spend more time just chatting and discussing and using the concepts or ideas that we're learning in class to launch discussion, definitely in small groups or individual conferences...where they could tell me, 'this is what I see myself doing in my classroom with the things that I've learned in here,' ...how learning is personal to them and what value what we've explored and modeled and practiced has in their classroom, for them as a teacher, because it's SO personal.

Chris saw his relationships with students as beneficial for their learning and that these relationships enabled him to provide students with what they needed and wanted in the course. He stated:

I listen to and observe the students to see what needs to be changed in the plan. And what really causes me, which is a celebratory term, to deviate from our plan is the understanding and the interest of the students...if we have to slow down, or speed up, which the students cue us to, then we will...the point is that I'm able to arrange powerful learning experiences for them, and increase their vigor and rigor in wanting to learn.

This was evident in my observation of and participation in Chris' class when the class became involved in a good discussion about the age appropriateness of a particular text they'd read. Because the discussion was extremely powerful, Chris supported students in continuing and altered his plans for the remainder of the class session. This was also evident when Chris would visit with students during a small group activity and then bring

the class together for clarification or discussion of the value in the activity, inviting students to demonstrate, explain, or assist one another in developing deeper understanding.

Chris saw himself as a learner with the students, sharing himself very openly and honestly with students. His open communication and display of emotion, he felt, enabled students to consider their own attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading. He explained:

I think it's everything, their attitude, their views are critical...their participation in class and their ownership of their learning that's resulted from this class have inspired their views, and I think will change not only how they teach, but how they learn...there's a degree of honesty, I think, and if I ask and give them time to answer...I think they become more honest from the beginning to the end of the class.

Chris believed that this open communication with students contributed to students understanding him as a reader. He felt that it was important to be someone who modeled what reading can be in one's life. Chris explained:

That (sharing of oneself) is what I think opens the gateway to loving and celebrating reading, because it's personal, and I think if you realize that teaching is personal and the impact that you have on students, then you can easily use that emotion, that exposure of yourself to really react to writing...so reading becomes an opportunity to experience emotion, to be angry, nauseas, to be elated and happy, to be confused and I think all that can come through reading of appropriate and powerful texts and it's offered through really open exposure of yourself.

Chris displayed this openness in every class session with his sharing of responses to texts he had read outside of class, texts he read aloud to the class, and texts students shared or read aloud to one another in the class. I observed him laughing, crying, sharing his adoration of, and sometimes discussing his confusion or dislike for various texts, authors, and illustrations. Although initially uneasy, students, such as Rachel and Catherine, and others mentioned by Chris, soon became comfortable with and appreciative of Chris' openness. As compared with other classes I observed, it appeared

that Chris' modeling led to a greater tendency for students to also express their attitudes, beliefs, and values more openly and honestly with one another.

*Selection and Use of
Required Reading*

Chris required students to read chapters or selections from three assigned texts, *Children's Literature Briefly*, *99 Ways to Get Kids to Love Reading*, and *For Reading Out Loud*, prior to each class session. Students were also required to read the novel, *Speak*. All other texts used within the course were selected by students. This included completely free choice of texts read during silent reading time, ten picture books to be read aloud, seven of which had to be aligned with genres studied in class, and one novel chosen from the International Reading Association's Teacher Choices of 2009 list. Chris explained, "Teaching reading should just be exciting. I don't see any reason for a mundane text, unless it's the only text available to share particular information. (We) need to use enticing texts."

In deciding the main textbook he used in the course, *Children's Literature Briefly*, Chris explained:

Objectives drive this...then...the variables that go into determining the text are readability, accessibility...I like them (texts) to be conversational...this book is a real informational text, but it doesn't read like an informational text...not a bulleted list of all these component parts students should know. It's really brief and well broken down into these are the reasons for celebrating children and adolescent literature, these are the types of genres kids enjoy and could enjoy, and if you learn more about them you can offer those to developing readers. That's the key, how well does the book offer resources to teachers and help them to become resourceful. I also choose my texts based on their cost.

Chris also explained that he's written things himself and has asked students to "go out on a scavenger hunt for articles about nonfiction read alouds" which they then share with

one another to build background knowledge and assist them in their own read aloud experiences.

Because Chris emphasized resourcefulness, he expressed that he does expect students to read the assigned portions of texts, but also does not penalize students when they have not read. He stated:

I want to challenge them, but they could memorize that book, and still not get it...I don't want them to focus their time so much on the reading that it takes away from their experience of the class...if they don't read it, the text is available for them to catch up.

Chris also shared his own ways of reading with the class when he discussed the required textbook reading. He explained to students that as a student himself, he could skim or scan some pieces and then really study other pieces depending on the instructors' purpose for the reading. Therefore, he called attention to specific pages, charts, or selections he wished students to study.

This explanation and clarification of his requirements appeared to make some students more comfortable with the amount of reading they were required to do and assisted students in preparing adequately for class, including spending more time in rehearsing read aloud texts and being sure they had read their chosen novel in preparation for literature discussion groups. Rachel explained:

I don't necessarily think that he's very focused on the book that we purchased, that we strictly read everything that's in there. I think he wants us to get the different genres, the differences between them, the different authors and a lot of different books, and working on our read alouds and just being more comfortable and just getting more familiar with reading in general, I guess.

Chris' belief, "I can't imagine teaching reading without adhering to interests," was very evident in the amount of self-selection of texts allowed in the course. Not only

did Chris encourage students to find texts that they really loved, but he also assisted them in doing so. He explained:

“That’s (finding texts students like) is a big part of the class. If I know how they feel about this (something they’d already read), then I can lead them here, and that takes them away from their old time favorite and gets them into new things...offering books to them, through brief book talks...detailing the character descriptions, etc....every class also started late because I was scrambling to find texts for a student. Sometimes that goes like wildfire (with lots of students asking for help) and other times just one student (is asking).

An analysis of my observation notes revealed Chris announcing right before silent reading time, “My goal is that you love reading at this time, so if you don’t love the book you’re reading, let me know and I’ll find another for you.”

Chris also encouraged students to share great books with one another, giving students time to briefly describe their current silent reading text to their small group, or the whole class if they thought others might be interested. I observed many students jotting down titles and notes during this time, and a few students exchanging books when they were finished reading them, sharing what they loved about a book they’d been reading, and sometimes what they were frustrated with. In one instance, Chris explained to the whole group that sometimes being a good reader was knowing when to abandon a book. He then held up a memoir he had been reading and shared his frustration with it. He explained that he had hoped it was going to be great, but he was going to set it aside because it wasn’t as gripping or personal as he had expected it would be. Rachel had recalled this instance when I spoke with her about her own feelings about abandoning books. She valued Chris’ sharing, and felt that it helped her to be more comfortable forming her own opinions about books and setting them aside if she wasn’t enjoying them. An analysis of my observation notes revealed another instance in which Chris stated, “What you’re learning about yourself as a reader is important...Is it okay to ditch a

book?” Catherine responded to his question, proclaiming, “Sure! Pick another one!”

Chris continued, “I’ll say, yes! If we read too many things that are painful, tragic things may happen.”

Assignments and Assessments

The types of assignments and lack of assessments in the course exemplify Chris’ priorities in teaching the course and the intent of the course. He explained:

The underlying theme of the course is...how do we enhance kids’ joy of reading, view of reading, celebration of reading, use of reading, what does reading have to offer and as teachers, how can these guys (preservice teachers) go...hey! look at this!...Content is really important, but it’s secondary, almost the gravy.

The types of assignments most aligned with these priorities include: a) a series of field based read alouds in which students had to find and read aloud an appropriate text of a particular genre to a small group of elementary students, and then write-up a short review of the book and reflection on their experience, b) two observations and written reflections of read alouds conducted in the community and in a school setting, c) reading of two novels and participation in literature discussion groups, d) a brief write-up of a personal read aloud improvement plan and e) in-class silent reading with a brief reading log of responses. Chris shared, “listening to their conversations, and reactions, and reflections, I think those authentic teaching and learning experiences were invaluable.” Therefore, although he required students to hand in various assignments, their experiences that led them to completing the assignment was of greater interest to Chris in determining students’ learning and development in the course. In addition, Chris believed students’ ownership of assignments and personal fulfillment from experiences was important, therefore their self-selection of texts was required for most assignments.

Assessments in the course were varied in format. For example, the final exam was a performance based assessment in which students had to choose a multicultural children's literature selection, provide a brief book talk or description of the book, and perform a read aloud of either the whole book or a selected section of the book depending on its length. Students were to write up a brief review of the book and their goals for performing their read aloud to the class. Chris also included a few quizzes that varied in format, some of which included having a conversation with a partner about a specific question he posed about a genre, whereas others were completed with paper and pencil. The Informational Text Quiz was one example in which students had to complete ten analogies that highlighted informational text authors, terms, and awards for informational books. Quizzes were often collaborative in nature, which aligned with Chris' belief in positively impacting students' views of reading. He explained:

...an example is test taking...most people start to stress, fret, freak out, shut down. I try to dispel that view, that feeling, (and) replace it with an attitude that it's just an opportunity for me to see what you can do, so that they can pass that down to their kids. The same thing goes for reading.

In my observations of the class, Chris often joked with students about quizzes, asking students to view the informal assessments as opportunities rather than penalties. After experiencing several of his quizzes, Chris' students rarely appeared tense or concerned when he announced that it was time for a quiz.

In-Class Activities

"Sometimes it's fun and games with this little gem that they get to pull out, maybe several days later, and sometimes it's laughter and tears and just enjoying books...it's a lot of things," Chris stated as he described his class sessions. There were several routine

activities in Chris' class which were designed to positively impact students' affective domains of reading. Each class session began with silent reading time, which lasted between 10 and 20 minutes. This time was followed by read alouds performed by Chris and then later in the semester also performed by students in the class. During these read alouds, students often came up to the front of the room and were seated on the floor in the space on the carpet surrounding the reader. Students were provided opportunities to practice and gradually become more comfortable with reading aloud, as they were first required to read aloud for a partner, then their small group, and finally their whole class and groups of elementary students. Read aloud improvement was guided through a rubric and feedback from Chris and class peers.

For the first five-six weeks of the class, students also participated in literature discussion groups. One of these was of the required novel, *Speak*, and the other was focused on a novel chosen by groups of students. Another routine activity in the class was a group sorting of texts provided by Chris. He would place an armful of texts onto each table and tell students to look through and sort the texts according to which could be classified in the genre being studied that week and which could not.

Students also had frequent opportunities to respond to reading in personal and unique ways. Sometimes students responded to a read aloud, and other times Chris would require them to read something silently in class and respond to it. Responses including opportunities to draw, discuss with a partner or a group, reflect verbally or in writing, as well as other written responses such as recording questions and reactions. In one reading response I participated in, students were required to check off boxes indicating their opinion of statements they read, and then to provide a brief explanation of that opinion.

Students were often expected to share their responses to reading and encouraged to discuss personal connections to the reading as well as similarities and differences among their responses.

When asked to describe what he thought were the most influential experiences he provided for students, Chris stated:

As silly as it sounds, the silent reading was probably the most powerful when it comes down to nurturing a relationship with learning and reading for them. (And) literature discussions and the many ways of responding to reading because they finally get a say and it's not guided by me. When they have the opportunity to say what they think, what they feel, where it's not predetermined, their thinking...because I want it to be natural. I want it to be them...I believe the opportunity for them to immerse themselves in texts as they get poured out on the table, was extremely powerful because it allowed them to make connections and gather new titles...exposure...I can't even begin to express the value of the read alouds that they get to do with small groups of kids.

Although Chris' emphasis on positively impacting preservice teachers' affective domains of reading was evident in these activities, he had desired to do more with students to this end. Chris described his desire to have more opportunities for students to understand themselves as readers and to experience reading in ways that could potentially improve their attitudes or impact their beliefs and values of reading.

Chris described one class session in which about one third of the class was unable to make it to class due to inclement weather:

...they (the portion of students that made it) all sat around and drank coffee and cocoa and (ate) homemade cookies and talked about books they were reading and how they felt about the class...I think that needs to happen more often, giving them a chance to talk about themselves as readers, their views of reading, their changing views, what's still nagging at them, what's beautiful...I think it happens to a greater degree when the class is smaller.

Chris had also desired to include more experiences with think aloud and book talks, believing preservice teachers could benefit from the exposure to what readers think and become more familiar with children's literature. Modeling these activities, he felt, also

could then help them to do think alouds and book talks in their own classrooms in the future.

Policies and Procedures

Although a schedule of due dates and course events was provided in the syllabus, Chris often showed that flexibility was imperative for students to be comfortable in the course and to do their best work. I observed him meeting with students prior to class, during breaks, and after class to discuss assignments or make contact with students he had e-mailed about assignments. I also observed him announcing, “Whenever you can get that (read aloud observation assignment) to me is fine. Please take your time to reflect on your experience and share that with me.”

Chris also helped facilitate students’ completion of work by requiring students to provide copies of their read aloud summaries to students in their groups, which formed students’ children’s literature notebooks. In this way, students were being held accountable by one another, instead of him. I recorded one such instance, noting, “(Lisa) asked group, ‘Did you guys make your copies for us all?’ (Ann) - ‘I’ll bring it next week. That okay?’ Rest of students pass summary pages out.” Chris did not voice great concern when students asked for more time to complete assignments, nor did he state any type of penalty or point deduction when students handed work in beyond the given due date.

Summary of Findings

1. Preservice teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading were shaped by a variety of factors including: a) absence, presence, or relationship with readers, b) access to

- literature, c) opportunities to develop reading interests and habits and, d) reading skills and efficacy.
2. Preservice teachers recognize their roles as reading models for their students, valuing reading and texts; they desire to read more and increase their knowledge of children's literature in preparation for their roles.
 3. Based on their attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading and their views of reading and themselves as readers, preservice teacher readers can be described as Confident Established Readers, Apprehensive Prospective Readers, or Striving Isolated Readers.
 4. Preservice teachers' affective domains of reading are complex and unique.
 5. Preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers influence their: a) perceptions of assigned reading, b) their performance in assessments and assignments, c) their behaviors within and perceptions of class activities, d) their perceptions of and responses to their instructors, and e) their general engagement in the children's literature course.
 6. Preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers can be influenced by: a) their assigned reading, b) the forms of assessment used, c) the assignments required, d) the type of activities used in class, e) the enthusiasm of their instructors, and f) the personal connections with their instructors and peers in their courses.
 7. Instructors acknowledge the variability of affective domains in their preservice teacher student and hope and/or expect that all their students' affective domains will improve as a result of their involvement in the children's literature course.
 8. Instructors believe that their students view reading as a job or obligation as a result of their responsibilities as college students.

9. Instructors recognize the value in self-selected reading and believe this to be an important way in which their students can develop an interest in and appreciation of reading and literature.
10. Instructors consider peer interaction and collaboration to be beneficial toward the goal of improving student interest in reading and literature.
11. Instructors prioritize students' exposure to a variety of literature with the expectation that exposure will positively impact students' affective domains of reading.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

The impetus for this study originated with my experiences teaching elementary reluctant readers and intensified when I taught preservice teachers. My realization that some preservice teachers also harbored a disinclination to read was unexpected and quickly seized my attention. Recognizing the importance of elementary teachers in positively impacting elementary students' literacy (Bond, et al., 1997; IRA, 2000, 2003; Snow, et al., 1998), I designed a study to go beyond the thoroughly researched cognitive domain of reading (Askov, et al., 1980; Laine, 1984; Sullivan, 1976) by investigating the affective domain.

Despite researchers' and authors' desire to investigate and respond to the affective domain of reading with elementary and adolescent students (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Canter, 1995; Eckert, 2006; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; McKenna, 2001; Wigfield & Asher, 2002), the fundamental influence of their future teachers' affective domains of reading had received only modest attention (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Gerla, 1994; Stepp, 2008). Thus, the primary purpose of my sequential explanatory mixed methods (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007) study was to detect and describe the affective domain of reading within preservice teachers preparing to teach elementary aged students. The

secondary purpose of my study was to describe how experiences in children's literature courses might contribute to preservice teachers' affective domains of reading.

Research Questions

Four main questions guided this study. Two focused on preservice teachers' perspectives as readers and learners in children's literature courses. The other two focused on instructors' perspectives as facilitators of student learning in a children's literature course.

- Q1 How do preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values about reading characterize their views of reading and themselves as readers?
- Q2 Under what circumstances do preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers become evident, if at all, in a children's literature course?
- Q3 What perceptions, if any, do children's literature instructors have of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers?
- Q4 How might instructors' perceptions of their students' views of reading and themselves as readers contribute to their instructional decisions?

Overview of Procedures

Adopting a mixed methods mental model (Greene, 2007), I implemented a mixed methods research methodology and used a modified sequential explanatory design (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Quantitative results of the Adult Motivation for Reading Scale (Schutte & Malouff, 2007) were obtained from preservice elementary teachers ($n = 51$) in three children's literature courses. These results were combined with precursory observations of each course to select six preservice teacher participants. Through my analysis of qualitative data collected on the six preservice teachers, children's literature

instructors ($n = 3$), and myself, I sought to answer my four research questions from those three perspectives.

In keeping with Creswell's description of a mixed methods sequential explanatory design (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007), I used a variety of information sources, starting with a quantitative survey rating scale that continuously informed my qualitative data collection and analysis. Qualitative data sources included one-on-one interviews (three with preservice teachers and two with instructors), children's literature course observations (approximately 95 hours), artifact collection (i.e. syllabi, assignments, course readings, assessments, students' notes and reflections), weekly e-mail logs, and my researcher journal. Quantitative results informed my qualitative data collection in various ways, including when I sought instructors' reactions to the compiled rating scale scores during interviews, and when preservice teacher participants elaborated on their rating scale responses within interviews.

Guided by Dellinger and Leech's Validation Framework (2007), I used a variety of analyses in this study to arrive at quality meta-inferences (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Descriptive statistics of survey rating scale results, constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) across all quantitative and qualitative data, and thematic narrative analysis were used to answer research question one. Constant comparison (Merriam, 1998) across all qualitative data was also used in answering questions two, three, and four. Data importation (Caracelli & Greene, 2008; Greene, 2007), described as an interactive mixed methods data analysis (Greene, 2007), was used to answer all research questions. Using results of midstream analyses of both data sets to inform one another, I then employed Caracelli & Greene's process of typology development (2008) including bi-weekly

comparisons of qualitative and quantitative data throughout the thirteen weeks of data collection. This typology development resulted in my thorough analysis of both sets of data and led to my explanation of quantitative results and quality meta-inferences. Finally, I used M.L. Smith's warranted assertion method (1997) in a conclusive analysis of all findings to determine quality meta-inferences (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007) applied to the field of teacher preparation.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Eleven findings emerged from the data. Six pertain to questions one and two and five pertain to questions three and four. Thus, the findings are summarized and discussed in two major categories: a) Preservice Teachers' Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers, and b) Instructors' Perceptions of and Responses to Preservice Teachers' Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers.

Preservice Teachers' Views of Reading and Themselves as Readers

The first finding was that preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading were shaped by a variety of factors including: a) absence, presence, or relationship with readers, b) access to literature, c) opportunities to develop reading interests and habits, and d) reading skills and efficacy.

Preservice teacher participants discussed the influence of their parents, friends, siblings and teachers in their descriptions of their early and current experiences with reading. In some cases, participants recalled close personal relationships which had reading as a central component. For instance, Catherine described her close friendship,

“Oddly, I think one of the things that makes us such good friends is our love for reading...” In other cases, participants, such as Denise, disclosed the lack of readers in their lives, “My sister doesn’t read, my best friend doesn’t read, my boyfriend doesn’t read. Nobody just reads for leisure, except my mom...”

Many times relationships with readers accompanied access to texts, as was the case with Richard, whose parents were avid readers and whose wife and children all read. He described his childhood home and his current home as being overflowing with texts, with books filling shelves, magazines and journals stacked on the piano, and newspapers strewn on coffee tables. This easy access was in sharp contrast to Maria’s experiences in Mexico where she described her home void of literature and the absence of a school or public library.

The level of access and relationships with readers often led to opportunities for these participants to develop reading interests and habits. When participants had reading models who took interest in them as readers, guiding their exploration of literature and providing plentiful access to texts, they had frequent opportunities to mimic reading habits and behaviors, discover their personal interests in reading, and draw conclusions regarding the value of reading. These experiences, in turn, often led to increased time spent reading and improved reading skills and efficacy. Conversely, the lack of these experiences often led to little understanding of reading habits and behaviors, little time spent reading, continued struggles with acquiring and utilizing reading skills, and meager reading efficacy.

This finding is noteworthy because although previous researchers have focused their efforts on ensuring *elementary* readers have relationships, access to texts, and

reading models in their lives (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Cramer & Castle, 1994; Snow, et al., 1998), the presence and influence of each of these factors does not end in the elementary years; it extends into adulthood.

This finding suggests that instructors of preservice teachers need to attend to building relationships, accessing texts, and providing reading models when they design and teach children's literature courses if they want to nurture and enhance preservice teachers' affective domains of reading. For many, Apprehensive Prospective Readers (APRs) and Striving Isolated Readers (SIRs) in particular, such courses will invite preservice teachers into lifelong reading. As Denise explained in her recount of what she'd want instructors to gain from this study, "...many (preservice teachers) might not have ever been invited to it (reading)...never been introduced to it, how good it can be..." This finding builds on what others have suggested in their findings when looking at preservice teachers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Bean, 1994; Gerla, 1994; L. D. Miller, et al., 1994).

This first finding confirmed what I had predicted based on my teaching of children's literature. I had experienced some preservice teachers' improved attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading as a result of my own attention to building relationships within the course, providing easy access to texts and being a reading model for my students. Nonetheless, this finding helped me to see that the impact of my efforts was not something I fully understood. I had been unaware of the extent to which SIRs and APRs in particular had needed these factors in order to develop into avid readers and had taken for granted the influence of these factors in my own and other Confident Established Readers' (CERs) early development and *continued* identity as avid readers.

A second finding was that preservice teachers recognize their roles as reading models for their students, valuing reading and texts; they desire to read more and increase their knowledge of children's literature in preparation for their reading model roles.

Participants unanimously agreed that the children's literature course was essential for their teacher preparation. They indicated the value of knowledge about authors, genres, qualities to look for, and ways to choose literature, as well as the opportunity to be exposed to a wide variety of texts which led them to take interest in and enjoy literature. Regardless of their past or current readership, all participants felt that extending and expanding on the knowledge they'd gained in the course, and prioritizing their recreational reading was necessary for their success as elementary teachers. Rachel acknowledged:

...becoming an elementary teacher, I feel like I need to be familiar with a *lot* of different texts and authors and different things like that...if you're excited about reading and are a good reader, (you) set an example for your students... I hope to become a more active reader.

Richard Lavoie (2007) explained that humans are only motivated to do that which we are already capable of doing. This deceptively simple truth applies to preservice teachers and their motivation to become models of reading for their students. In many ways, preservice teachers may be more motivated to become readers than at any other time in their lives. Yet, improving their affective domain of reading and joining the culture of reading, may not be an activity preservice teachers know how to do; they need help. Denise explained:

If I walked into a library, I wouldn't even know where to begin...no idea...I wish I would have known that earlier in life... just how to find enjoyment in it (reading), because I was never showed that, because I always had to read the boring books...that's what kind of sucks about required reading.

This second finding highlights not only the necessity of children's literature courses in teacher preparation, but more importantly the purposes these children's literature courses need to embrace. While the exposure to the vast array of children's literature and guidance through the multitude of texts is important, exposure can not be the sole objective of children's literature courses. Preservice teachers already possess the motivation to become models of reading for their future elementary students and quickly recognize the value of reading and literature in elementary students' lives. What they often lack is knowledge and the means to be acculturated, which in many cases includes the presence of a champion for the cause and the context in which to do so.

This finding was unexpected and encouraging. Like many well-meaning instructors, I had assumed that lack of engagement and participation in my class was due at least in part to students not being motivated to learn the content. Instead, this finding revealed that my students and I had similar goals (preparation for their careers in teaching reading), yet, we were not aligned in what was needed to reach that goal. In other words, I mistook their lack of engagement for a lack of motivation, instead of possessing few tools. Still, with this improved understanding of students' perspectives and needs, I feel confident and encouraged to supply the necessary tools to harness students' motivation and prepare them to become reading models for their future students.

Any assumption that preservice teachers are not motivated to become avid readers is faulty at best and can be replaced by information gleaned from students. Discovering preservice teachers' personal histories with reading would help instructors to understand their students' disenchantment or disengagement from reading and position themselves to

develop a context in which their students can establish a reader identity (Hall, 2006) that they will carry with them into their elementary teaching career.

A third finding was that preservice teacher readers embody characteristics that enable them to be described as one of three typologies: Confident Established Readers, Apprehensive Prospective Readers, or Striving Isolated Readers. These three typologies originated from constant comparison analysis (Merriam, 1998) of quantitative and qualitative data encompassing five features: a) affective domain, b) reading status in identity, c) reading skill efficacy, d) purpose for reading, and e) reading presence in daily life. To strengthen my description of each typology, I used thematic narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008) to craft six narratives of the preservice teacher participants (see Chapter 4). These stories take the reader into the daily life and thoughts of these participants, illustrating the complexity within each typology.

Creation of these typologies is significant because it confirms that preservice teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading vary. They also provide a practical way for college instructors to develop deeper understandings of their students' strengths and needs, and to structure their courses accordingly. Students from all three typologies read different types of texts, such as magazines, newspapers, and books. Therefore, using the typologies to purposefully structure flexible grouping arrangements would enable students to support one another in children's literature courses, capitalizing on the social influence known to impact reading attitudes (McKenna, 2001; F. Smith, 1987). It would also increase the likelihood that preservice teachers and instructors alike would gain exposure to the types of texts that interest elementary students. This exposure is critical because there is increasingly more awareness of the need for teachers to incorporate

alternative texts to teach and reach as many children as possible (Alvermann, 2004a, 2004b; Burnett, Dickinson, Myers, & Merchant, 2006; Carter, 2007; Clark, 2005; Frey & Fisher, 2008; Mahar, 2003; Schwartz & Rubinstein-Avila, 2006). Those that teach children's literature courses have little choice but to include these alternative texts if they truly want to prepare highly qualified teachers, those who are prepared to teach in the new millennium.

A fourth finding was that preservice teachers' affective domains of reading are complex and unique, demanding our attention to ward off inaccurate assumptions about these students. My analysis of the interactions among quantitative and qualitative data drove home the complexity of preservice teachers' individual differences. For instance, using Table 8 Participant Survey Rating Scale Proportional Results, I compared preservice teacher participants' proportional scores, calculated by dividing the number of points earned by the number of points possible for the total survey rating scale and then each dimension. (Please see Chapter 4 for these data.)

Table 8

Participant Survey Rating Scale Proportional Results

Participant	TRM	RE	RPS	DW	RR
Richard	90%	77%	100%	95%	87%
Helen	80%	70%	78%	100%	80%
Maria	70%	50%	78%	80%	80%
Catherine	67%	76%	86%	45%	26%
Rachel	65%	67%	70%	70%	40%
Denise	41%	37%	40%	50%	40%

Note. TRM = Total Reading Motivation; RE = Reading Efficacy Versus Reading Avoidance; RPS = Reading as Part of Self; DW = Reading to Do Well in Other Realms; RR = Reading for Recognition

When I analyzed the breakdown of each participant's affective domain with these proportional scores and repeatedly compared this to the qualitative data I collected and analyzed throughout the study, the individuality and complexity of the affective domain became evident. First, although Richard and Helen can both be identified as CERs, their proportional rating scale scores combined with my analysis of qualitative data indicated differences in their affective domain of reading. For example, Richard was interested in reading for his own purposes and prioritized reading which stimulated transformation in his own life, whereas Helen considered reading as "essential for life", and prioritized reading for purposes of achievement and success in school and her future career.

My analysis of Catherine, Rachel, and Maria's data provided another example of the individuality and complexity of the affective domain of reading. Catherine, Rachel, and Maria's TRM proportional scores are quite similar, while their DW and RR scores

vary dramatically. This variation indicated that Catherine was motivated to read and read in very different ways than Rachel and Maria, which was confirmed with the qualitative data reported previously, showing that Catherine prioritized reading self-selected texts for enjoyment, while Rachel and Maria prioritized reading required texts to ensure their success in classes.

Of all proportional dimension scores, Denise's DW proportional score indicated that she valued reading for the purpose of doing well in school or for work, if at all. My analysis of qualitative data confirmed not only the validity of each of her scores as compared with other participants', but also the validity of the DW score being her highest proportionally. Denise explained that the reading she does is done for school purposes and that putting forth effort for this purpose is important to her, despite her struggles with reading and distaste for it.

Furthermore, the inconsistency and malleability of some readers' affective domains of reading exemplified their individuality and establishes the need for mixed methods. Although the survey rating scale data indicated that Catherine and Helen had positive attitudes about reading, and were identified as having a strong relationship with reading, an analysis of interview transcriptions revealed that there were times when Catherine and Helen's attitudes were not positive. Catherine shared her distaste for reading during fifth grade due to a lack of choice in her reading, while Helen described her fear and discomfort with reading during her primary years due to struggles with decoding and pronunciation amplified by her teachers' use of Round Robin Reading. Therefore, the widely accepted assumption that establishing a love of reading as a one-time event from the onset of schooling and providing early intervention to ensure it

happens (L. Calkins, 1997; Cramer & Castle, 1994), is, in fact, questionable. Instead, the pursuit of lifelong readership with attention to the affective domain needs ongoing attention (McKenna, 2001; Mullis, et al., 2007; Parsons, 2007; Schutte & Malouff, 2007).

Clearly, this fourth finding was dependent upon the ongoing mixed data collection and analyses. The data importation (Greene, 2007) and mixed analyses strengthened my inferences and was compulsory to developing the three typologies of preservice teacher readers. However, this conclusion can not be limited to *research* in this field; *instruction* of preservice teachers must also apply this comprehensive approach. Instructors seeking to understand and respond to their students' affective domains of reading must glean insight into what is necessary to access their students' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading as well as how these students feel about themselves as readers. Thus, simply administering a survey, for example, would be deplorable, leading to flawed assumptions about students' affective domains of reading and thwarting their development as avid readers and reading models.

The complex individual differences amongst my participants brought to light my past instructional oversights. Although I had attempted to resist making false assumptions of my children's literature students by openly acknowledging and respecting their personal histories with reading, I had failed to understand the pervasiveness of their personal histories on their readership as adults. Teaching to students' unique characteristics, formerly quintessential in my work as an elementary special educator, has now regained its prominent position in my teaching of preservice teachers.

The fifth and sixth findings showed that the affective domain was evident within four common elements in all three children's literature courses: a) assigned reading, b)

assessment and assignments, c) participation/engagement, and d) instructors. These elements influenced and/or were influenced *by* preservice teachers' affective domains of reading. Through my analysis of observation protocols, interview transcripts, e-mail logs, and artifacts, preservice teachers revealed multiple instances in which their attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading impacted their experiences and success in the children's literature courses. In fact, there was little, if anything, unaffected by students' affective domains of reading.

The influence of preservice teachers' views of reading and themselves as readers points to instructor's duty to attend to the affective domain of reading. Minimally, a failure to address students' affective domains of reading would result in their learning falling short of course objectives. Unfortunately, the damage does not stop there. As McKenna explained, "Each incidence of reading is predicted to have a small but real effect on attitudes. This effect may be to reinforce existing attitudes or to alter them by providing something other than what the reader would have expected," (2001, p. 127). When students are assigned reading they do not enjoy, can not connect with, and/or see no other purpose for completing other than to please the instructor, poor attitudes about reading are inevitable. In this way, well meaning instructors may be doing exactly the opposite of what they aspire to; they may be turning preservice teachers off of reading.

All instructors in my study agreed that a priority for elementary teachers is to help young children develop an interest in and affinity for reading, a priority aligning with research in the field of elementary teaching (Chandler-Olcott, 2002; Wedwick, Wutz, & Fisher, 2006). Yet, if instructors continually assign all reading in their teacher preparation courses, and allow little, if any, student choice, are they not setting the example that

teachers' reading agendas supersede student interest? In addition, when self-selection of reading is assigned without assistance, the assumption is that all preservice teachers are capable of independently searching for and selecting desirable literature. Although CERs have done this regularly, APRs and SIRs rarely have, leaving these readers to their own devices, of which they had few. The resultant frustration simply reinforces the belief that the reading culture is out of reach for APRs and SIRs, fortifying an already unenthusiastic and at times, dismal attitude about reading.

Preservice teachers' various perceptions of and performances on assessments and assignments lends further support to the necessity of addressing the affective domain of reading in teacher preparation. When students have a disinterest in the literature being assessed, or are disengaged from the content or format of assignments, they will often perform poorly (Fink, 2006; Hidi, 2001; Hidi, Renninger, & Krapp, 2004; Kempler, 2007). Poor performance then will contribute to the lack of confidence and sense of efficacy SIRs, in particular, struggle with repeatedly. In addition, students may either reinforce or establish the view that reading or the use of literature is simply a job, disconnected from their development or identity as readers who choose to do so for their own purposes. Given our current problems with curriculum that has stripped away any desire to read, let alone for one's own purposes (Gallagher, 2009; Meier & Wood, 2004), the only hope for school-agers is to have a teacher who will campaign for lifelong reading, with an appreciation for setting one's own purpose to guide their instructional decisions.

The influence of the affective domain evidenced by APR and SIR silence throughout all whole class discussions was unsettling. CERs dominated discussions,

leading instructors to assume the interest and engagement of all in the class. In analyzing interview transcriptions, I found that instructors were quick to generalize the remarks and affective display of a few students to the entire class. For instance, after examining the survey rating scale data, Brian admitted:

I would have expected them to be a bit higher. I think what happens is the students in class maybe that are most vocal are probably the ones that are up here at the top (of the distribution), and so they do the most reading, they care about it the most, they're more into it. And the others that are maybe a little quieter, you know they're filling in the blank spaces a little bit, and I'm assuming that they're riding along the same train, when maybe they're not quite as into it.

My analysis of observation protocols, interviews, and my researcher journal reinforced the predominance of this faulty assumption and caused me to reflect on the accuracy of my perceptions of student understanding and engagement in my courses. No longer can I wittingly forge ahead in my lessons when my questions are answered by one or two eager learners, overshadowing the silence of many. The learning potentially lost when APRs and SIRs avoid whole group discussion is intolerable. However, their involvement in *every* small group discussion holds promise, leading me to insist that small group interactions be prioritized if instructors desire that all students be active in their learning.

Moreover, instructors' investigation into *why* their APR and SIR preservice teachers are not participating in whole group discussions would provide further evidence in support of guided self-selection of texts. For instance, Denise's inattentiveness in class was strongly correlated with the literature selection being focused on in class. When she was not interested or did not enjoy the required text, she did not engage fully in the class, and did not participate readily even in small group interactions. The elevated level of understanding and confidence resulting from her interest in the material amplified her

desire to contribute to discussion. Clearly, preservice teachers' attitudes about what they're reading greatly impact their participation, which aligns with conclusions drawn from research conducted with elementary and adolescent learners (Alexander & Engin, 1986).

That CERs connected more readily with instructors than APRs and SIRs was interesting to observe, yet not surprising. In reflecting on my own instruction of preservice teachers, I found that I was drawn to CERs like myself; sharing texts, discussing opinions on books, and enthusiastically retelling favorite plots to entice one another to read texts. Brian's declaration, "I have a hard time understanding somebody who doesn't like to read!" echoed thoughts I'd had in my interactions with APRs and SIRs in my classes.

The desire for connection to their instructors was universal among my participants, and therefore requires teacher educators to commit to building relationships with *all* students if they wish to engage and inspire them. Without these personal connections, APRs and SIRs will continue to perceive instructors and the reading culture as worlds apart from themselves and therefore avid readership unattainable. In addition, personal connections with students will improve student engagement with the class (Taylor, 1999), as evidenced by Denise's comment, "...when you get to college, you really feel like just a number...just a name on a sheet. I think I would be more motivated too, and more interactive with class discussions if I had a connection with the teacher."

Participants' connections with instructors as well as their enjoyment and learning of the course content corresponded closely with the intensity of instructors' enthusiasm communicated through their instruction. When instructors infused themselves (i.e., their

personal experiences, and their own attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading) within their instruction, their enthusiasm was contagious and students flourished. Preservice teachers relished their instructors' passion for literature and teaching. In the words of SIR, Denise:

It's all about how things are taught...her (Alice) just being enthusiastic about it makes me want to read it, because she does things that are different, more than just telling me it's good. It's all about how she makes me feel about the book.

Rachel was impacted similarly by her experience with her instructor, Chris. She stated:

I haven't ever had a teacher like him, because he was so passionate about teaching and everything...You can really tell that he wants to be there, wants to teach...he just really cares if we do well or if we're actually learning, and if we succeed...

Although the significance of instructors' enthusiasm was not alarming, my understanding of the source of the enthusiasm had been superficial. It appears as if the passion for children's literature is best understood through the instructors' sharing of its personal meaning in their lives. Though my students had acknowledged my enthusiasm for children's literature, I had not previously investigated the ways this enthusiasm was made evident to them. I now understand that my frequent anecdotes of my reading experiences, friendships with readers, and my students' responses to literature were all contributing to the enthusiasm detected and appreciated by my students.

If teacher educators aim to lead their students beyond cognitive objectives listed upon their syllabi, investment of themselves in their teaching is critical. Through instructors' authentic sharing of reading experiences, interests, and emotions, preservice teachers will reflect on their own. This reflection and understanding of oneself as a reader is important to becoming an effective reading teacher (Bean & Readence, 1995; Brooks, 2007; Commeyras, Bisplinghoff, & Olson, 2003; Gerla, 1994). Additionally, class activities must reflect instructors' passions for literature and literacy. In my study, when instructors designed activities that originated from their passion for literacy in their lives

and their beliefs about its importance in the lives of others, students responded with eagerness and inquisitiveness, often exceeding the expectations of the instructors.

For instance, Chris' vehement dedication to readers' relationships with texts, resultant from time spent in self-selected reading, spawned Rachel's renewed interest in reading for oneself, students' spontaneous book recommendations to one another, and the transformation of a students' self-proclaimed hatred of reading. Alice's use of her background in theatre to fervently demonstrate storytelling skills took hold of her student audience and ignited their own passions for dramatic read alouds. And, Brian's intense commitment to children's recreational reading was the inspiration for a panel discussion in which preservice teachers interviewed small groups of children to determine their interests in reading. These instructional decisions epitomize what is needed in the teaching of children's literature: teaching built upon personal strengths, talent, and knowledge, born from a passion for the field.

*Instructors' Perceptions of and Responses to
Preservice Teachers' Views of Reading
and Themselves as Readers*

A seventh finding was that instructors acknowledge the variability of affective domains in their preservice teacher students. They also hope and/or expect that all their students' affective domains will improve as a result of their involvement in the children's literature course.

Cognizant of the falsity of past assumptions, all instructors in my study admitted that not all students in their courses were passionate readers. They wondered how and why students who were not interested in reading would choose a profession in which reading was so prevalent, yet readily agreed that various attitudes, beliefs, and values of

reading were represented in their classes, and were likely due to varying childhood experiences with reading.

The acknowledgement of this reality is important, but not enough. Instructors' awareness of their students' affective domain of reading must permeate their intentions for the children's literature course. In my study, all instructors were hopeful, even expectant of a change in their students' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading, yet with strikingly dissimilar levels of attention to how these student characteristics might be addressed in their courses. In some courses, for instance, instructors made a point of checking in with students about their feelings about reading, eliciting their opinions, emotions, and reactions with frequent informal verbal and/or written reflections. While, in others, students' attitudes, beliefs, and values were overlooked with the hope that the enthusiasm of a few would "rub off" on the less interested students in the course.

With a lack of concerted effort and established purpose of children's literature courses to positively impact the affective domain of reading, instructors run the risk of forsaking literacy. Making the assumption that preservice teachers will inherently improve their attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading simply through knowledge of genres, the history of children's literature, and uses of it in the classroom (among other common themes evident in syllabi) is imprudent. Although seemingly optimistic, the assumption that all students' affective domains will improve through the course without deliberate preparations indicates a severe lack of understanding of the affective domain of reading and the necessity for instructors to become more knowledgeable in it. To continue to plan courses without prioritizing investigation into and improvement of students' affective domains is to surrender preservice teachers and their future students to

a distressing fate: that of continued aliteracy, contributing to the already appalling statistics on recreational reading (Bradshaw & Nichols, 2004; Mullis, et al., 2007) and its disturbing effects (Gallagher, 2009; Krashen, 2004, 2005, 2006).

An eighth finding was that instructors believe that their students view reading as little more than a job or obligation as a result of their responsibilities as college students. That this assumed student view of reading has some truth to it, as evidenced by Rachel and Denise's statements, is not astounding. What *is* noteworthy is the preponderance of accepting this narrow view of reading. Not only did instructors note that students had this view, but they reinforced the legitimacy of it through their own experiences as undergraduates in college. For future elementary teachers to maintain this limited view of reading is unacceptable and for children's literature instructors to disregard the ramifications of it is disturbing. Researchers have shown that teachers' knowledge and definitions of reading influence how they teach reading (Snow, Griffin, & Burns, 2005), therefore preservice teachers' continued narrow use of and view of reading would restrict elementary students' views as well. Given the wide variety of opportunities to apply reading in our lives (i.e. for enjoyment, improved personal health and wellness, increased awareness of the world, etc.), teaching with a minimized view of reading is inexplicable.

Instructors of literacy teacher preparation, and children's literature in particular, have the privilege and responsibility of providing preservice teachers with a context in which limited views could and should be broadened. If not in literacy teacher preparation courses, when might future teachers remove the constraint of reading for a grade, and replace it with reading for oneself? Certainly expanding teachers' views of reading can not be left up to their future experiences in the classroom given the narrowing of

curriculum (Richard L. Allington, 2002; Richard L Allington & Walmsley, 2007; Garan, 2004; K. S. Goodman, 1992) and the evidence of teachers' susceptibility to embracing the views espoused in curriculum (Shannon, 1983, 1989; Shannon & Crawford, 1997). Teacher preparation, therefore, must answer this call so that elementary students will value and use reading for various purposes, including their own.

A ninth finding was that instructors recognize the value in self-selected reading and believe this to be an important way in which their students can develop an interest in and appreciation of reading and literature. In addition, instructors prioritize students' exposure to a variety of literature with the expectation that exposure will positively impact students' affective domains of reading.

These findings reiterate what researchers and educators at all levels have purported; students need choice and exposure to a wide variety of texts in order to be motivated to read and build an appreciation for reading (Atwell, 1998; Maybin, 2007; Millard & Marsh, 2001; D. Miller, 2009; Mohr, 2006; Moss & McDonald, 2004; Yoon, 2002). All instructors I worked with in this study believe in the idea that the right book at the right time can instill a love of reading in anyone at any age. This also is reminiscent of ideas applicable to teaching reading at the elementary and adolescent levels (Chandler-Olcott, 2002; Collins, 2004; Wedwick, et al., 2006; Wedwick & Wutz, 2008), yet freedom to self-select and exposure to many texts in children's literature courses may be insufficient for this divine match to occur with preservice teachers. When students, such as APRs and SIR, Rachel, Maria, and Denise, have had little freedom of choice in their past reading lives, and therefore little opportunity to discover what they're interested in, the freedom intended to be liberating becomes terrifying, and gads of texts intended to be

eye-opening, become overpowering. This fear and sense of drowning is then multiplied by anxiety brought on by not knowing how to independently find a text of interest amongst the thousands of books and other texts published every year.

Even a CER, Catherine, could imagine how overwhelming a trip into Barnes & Noble might be for an inexperienced reader:

...it really probably is really overwhelming to not know where to start...I think when people walk in there, they see the huge stacks of the popular novels and then there are aisles and aisles of cookbooks, and biographies, and autobiographies, and just weird things, and novels...shelf after shelf after shelf of just random things...the person can get discouraged when the first thing they grab off the shelf doesn't fit...

Catherine's description matched the feelings Denise and Maria both shared. Without guidance, these APRs and SIRs become distressed and resort to old favorites and required texts from their childhood as respite, knowing they'll at least be guaranteed freedom from disappointment. Knowing these readers are often not risk-takers, and taking into account their lack of knowledge of the reading culture, APRs and SIRs deserve mentors, such as instructors and CERs, in order to experience the joys of selecting and reading a text for oneself. Without this mentorship, they might never learn or be able to teach their students the invaluable process of searching for and selecting a text that truly inspires them.

A final finding of my study was that instructors consider peer interaction and collaboration to be beneficial toward the goal of improving student interest in reading and literature. I was reassured of instructors' interest in their students' affective domain when observing the students in small and whole group activities. These activities engendered student interaction for various purposes, including: reading aloud to one another, sharing opinions of books, sorting books, discussing literature, and completing informal literary analyses designed by their instructor. All instructors emphasized that students were more

comfortable with one another in small self-selected groups than in whole groups, yet did not state that they'd incorporated small group activities with the intention of improving students' attitudes, beliefs, or values of reading.

In accordance with my observations, teaching experience, and other researchers' findings, social factors play a considerable role in forming positive attitudes about reading (Layne, 2009; McKenna, 2001; McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995; F. Smith, 1987). Therefore, when instructors design literature activities in which students regularly interact with one another, students are likely to form positive attitudes about the literature and reading. However, to *ensure* this positive outcome, instructors must be purposeful in their grouping procedures, devising interaction among students in all three typologies, and designing activities that prioritize improvements in students' affective domains. Assuming students will achieve affective gains inadvertently in small self-selected groups is risky, to say the least, calling for teacher educators to reevaluate their instructional decisions and the knowledge and purpose steering them.

Conclusion

Preservice teachers within children's literature courses are not all created equal. They come with their own personal histories with reading and unique affective domains of reading. All must establish a passion for reading if teacher educators are to expect them to positively impact the reading motivation and engagement of their future students. A children's literature course provides one opportunity a preservice teacher will have to develop a high affective domain of reading, especially if instructors: a) act as reading models, b) expose students to a wide variety of literature, c) use small group activities,

and d) provide ample opportunities for self-selected reading (See Figure 5: Children's Literature Course Construction).




Figure 5. Children's Literature Course Construction

Adopting these four aspects of instruction (See outer ring of Figure 5) is the minimum level of support literacy teacher preparation instructors should provide for preservice teachers' affective domains of reading. Yet, if literacy teacher preparation, and children's literature courses in particular, are to answer the call to *ensure* all elementary

teachers become the reading models needed to inspire elementary students to become lifelong readers, then they must go a step further (See inner black ring of Figure 5); they must commit to:

- a) Knowing their students' unique affective domains of reading.
- b) Building relationships among all readers and serving as a strong reading model within the resultant community.
- c) Providing guidance in students' self-selection of texts through explicit instruction in the habits and behaviors of avid readers (i.e. how to ascertain books of interest, the organization of libraries and bookstores, how to use a variety of online book browsing tools, etc.).
- d) Exercising purposeful flexible grouping practices to stimulate meaningful and influential interactions among various types of readers.
- e) Arranging targeted text exposure in which all readers provide recommendations for one another, such that every reader has multiple opportunities to experience personally fulfilling reading.

All individuals, including elementary students have the right to lifelong readership and the rewards of recreational reading (R. C. Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988; Ivey & Broadus, 2001; Krashen, 2004, 2006; Langford & Allen, 1983). The barriers to receiving this right are plentiful, including a narrow curriculum focused on test preparation, budget cuts that prevent adequate access to texts, and alarming rates of aliteracy resulting in home environments void of a reading culture. One way to grant elementary students this right is to provide them with teachers who are ambassadors to the reading culture, teacher readers who are passionate about lifelong readership. Without

question, the findings of this study confirm that attending to preservice teachers' affective domains of reading is anything but a choice; it is an essential.

Implications

Findings of this research have the potential to influence four main parties within the field of education: a) administrators of teacher preparation programs, b) instructors of children's literature courses and/or other literacy courses, c) elementary classroom teachers, and d) researchers of the affective domain.

Administrators of Teacher Preparation Programs

1. Apply the findings of this research toward justifying the requirement of a children's literature course in preservice teacher preparation.
2. Carefully consider purposes for existing children's literature courses and reevaluate course goals and objectives such that desirable outcomes of the course align with the need to improve students' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading.
3. Investigate the placement of a children's literature course in the sequence of required courses for preservice teachers. If preservice teachers were to develop positive attitudes, beliefs, and values early on in their teaching preparation, they would likely apply this to succeeding courses in literacy theory and methods, thus being more active in their learning and enthusiastic about applying new concepts in their practicum and student teaching placements.

*Instructors Of Children's Literature Courses And Other
Literacy Preparatory Courses*

4. Investigate preservice teachers' affective domains of reading using a combination of one-on-one, small group, and whole group discussion, written reflection, surveys, and other self-evaluative tools.
5. Be aware of the influence students' unique affective domains have upon their learning and design instruction to address the affective domain. Minimally, this includes acting as a reading model, using small groups, exposing students to a wide variety of texts, and incorporating self-selected reading.

Classroom Teachers

6. Utilize the effective instructional elements suggested in the model (See *Figure 5: Children's Literature Course Construction*). Although these suggestions derived from studying children's literature courses at the college level, many of these practices echo those designed to entice elementary students to read (L. M. Calkins, 2000; Keene & Zimmerman, 2007; D. Miller, 2009).
7. Prioritize and support self-selected reading in elementary and secondary classrooms. Student choice was integral in participants' development as readers, including substantial negative effects when self-selection of reading was prohibited. Additionally, lack of opportunity to self-select reading materials at school negatively impacted these adults' abilities to do so beyond their school-age years.

*Researchers of the Affective Domain in
Teaching and Learning*

8. Extend beyond using popular quantitative methods (Coddington & Guthrie, 2009; Estes, 1971; Fawson, Reutzel, Read, Smith, & Moore, 2009; Galipault, 2009; McKenna, 2001; Schutte & Malouff, 2007) to research the affective domain. Use a variety of information sources to access the complex phenomena of the affective domain.
9. When possible, employ mixed methods of data collection *and* analyses continually throughout investigations to ensure quality inferences.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research in the affective domain of reading should extend and expand on the findings of this study in order to ensure elementary students' high affective domains of reading. First, the field of reading research has neglected to provide evidence of a positive relationship between teachers' affective domains of reading and their students'. Therefore, research is needed to confirm or disprove this assumption, and clarify the ways in which teachers do influence their students' attitudes, beliefs, and values of reading. Second, a comparison study of preservice teachers' affective domains of reading within courses that use the model and typologies presented in this study, and those that don't would confirm the practicality of these findings. Finally, a follow-up or longitudinal study to ascertain the persistence of improved affective domains of reading beyond a children's literature course in which improvement was observed is also necessary to confirm the benefits of children's literature courses that prioritize the affective domain of reading.

References

- Aldridge, A., & Levine, K. (2001). *Surveying the social world: Principles and practice in survey research*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Alexander, D. G., & Engin, A. W. (1986). Dimensions of reading attitude of primary students *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 46(4), 887-901.
- Allington, R. L. (2002). *Big brother and the national reading curriculum : how ideology trumped evidence*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Allington, R. L., & Walmsley, S. A. (Eds.). (2007). *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools, the RTI edition*. Newark: International Reading Association
- Alvermann, D. E. (2004a). Media, Information Communication Technologies, and Youth Literacies. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(1), 78-83.
- Alvermann, D. E. (2004b). Seeing and then seeing again. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(3), 289-302.
- Anders, P. L., Hoffman, J. V., & Duffy, G. G. (2000). Teaching Teachers to Teach Reading: Paradigm Shifts, Persistent Problems, and Challenges. In M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3, pp. 719-742). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, N. A. (2009). *Elementary children's literature: Infancy through age 13* (3 ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Anderson, R. C., Wilson, P. T., & Fielding, L. G. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 285-303.

- Applegate, A. J., & Applegate, M. D. (2004). The Peter Effect: Reading habits and attitudes of preservice teachers. *Reading Teacher*, 57(6), 554-563.
- Arici, A. F. (2008). Pre-Service teachers' reading tendencies: Implications of promoting reading. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(6), 645-652.
- Askov, E. N., Kamm, K., Klumb, R., & Barnette, J. J. (1980). Study skills mastery: Comparisons between teachers and students on selected skills. In M. L. Kamil & A. J. Moe (Eds.), *Perspectives on reading research and instruction: Twenty-ninth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 207-212). Washington DC: National Reading Conference.
- Athey, I. (1982). The Affective Domain Reconceptualized. In B. A. Hutson (Ed.), *Advances In Reading/Language Research* (Vol. 1, pp. 203-217). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- Athey, I. (1985). Reading research in the affective domain. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3 ed., pp. 527-557). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning* Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers
- 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.
- Bean, T. W. (1994). A constructivist view of preservice teachers' attitudes toward reading through case study analysis of autobiographies. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu

- (Eds.), *Multidimensional Aspects of Literacy Research, Theory, and Practice* (pp. 370-379). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Bean, T. W., & Readence, J. E. (1995). A comparative study of content area literacy students' attitudes toward reading through autobiography analysis. In K. Atinchman, D. J. Leu & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on Literacy Research and Practice* (pp. 325-333). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference
- Bhaskar, R. (1975). *A realist theory of science*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Biberstine, R. D. (1977). Affective dimensions of reading instruction *Contemporary Education* 48(3), 165-167.
- Bingham, C., & Sidorkin, A. M. (Eds.). (2004). *No Education Without Relation*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Bond, G. L., Dykstra, R., Clymer, T., & Summers, E. G. (1997). The Cooperative Research Program in First-Grade Reading Instruction [Reprint]. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32(4), 345-427.
- Bradshaw, T., & Nichols, B. (2004). *Reading at risk: A survey of literary reading in America*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Brooks, G. W. (2007). Teachers as Readers and Writers and as Teachers of Reading and Writing. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(3), 177-191.
- Brown, J., & McDowell, E. E. (1979). The role of self-image on reading rate and comprehension achievement. *Reading Improvement*, 16, 22-27.
- Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Burnett, C., Dickinson, P., Myers, J., & Merchant, G. (Writer) (2006). Digital connections: transforming literacy in the primary school [Article], *Cambridge Journal of Education*: Routledge.
- Calkins, L. (1997). *Raising Lifelong Learners: A parent's guide*. Jackson, TN: Perseus Books.
- Calkins, L. M. (2000). *The Art of Teaching Reading* Boston, MA Allyn & Bacon
- Canter, L. (1995). *What to do when your child hates to read: Motivating the reluctant reader*. Santa Monica, CA: Canter & Associates.
- Caracelli, V. J., & Greene, J. (2008). Data analysis strategies for mixed-method evaluation designs. In V. L. Plano-Clark & J. W. Creswell (Eds.), *The Mixed Methods Reader* (pp. 231-250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. .
- Carter, J. B. (Ed.). (2007). *Building Literacy Connections with Graphic Novels: page by page, panel by panel*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cassidy, J., & Cassidy, D. (2009). What's hot for 2009. *Reading Today*, 26(4), 1-9.
- Chandler-Olcott, K. (2002). Scaffolding love: A framework for choosing books for, with, and by adolescents. *Illinois Reading Council Journal*, 30, 10-23.
- Chen, S.-Y. (2007). Extracurricular reading habits of college students in Taiwan: Findings from two national surveys. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(8), 642-653.
- Clark, C. (2005). Why Children Read. *Literacy Today*(45), 26-27.
- Cline, R. K. J., & Fixer, R. (1985). Survey of attitudes toward language arts for prospective elementary teachers. *English Education*, 17, 69-78.

- Coddington, C. S., & Guthrie, J. T. (2009). Teacher and student perceptions of boys' and girls' reading motivation *Reading Psychology*, 30(3), 225-249.
- Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of Research on New Literacies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Collins, K. (2004). *Growing Readers: Units of study in the primary classroom*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers
- Commeyras, M., Bisplinghoff, B. S., & Olson, J. (2003). *Teachers as readers: Perspectives on the importance of reading in teachers' classrooms and lives*. Newark, DE International Reading Association
- Condon, M. W. F. (1978). Consideration of affect in comprehension: The person belongs in reading. *Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning*, 54(3), 107-116.
- Cramer, E. H., & Castle, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Fostering the Love of Reading: The Affective Domain in Reading Education*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano-Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2008). Advanced Mixed Methods Research Designs. In V. L. Plano-Clark & J. W. Creswell (Eds.), *The Mixed Methods Reader* (pp. 161-196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Dellinger, A. B., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Toward a unified validation framework in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(4), 309-332.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and Curriculum* (Vol. V). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Eckert, L. S. (2006). *How does it mean?: Engaging reluctant readers through literary theory* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Elliott, J. B. (1983). Development of a scale assessing the attitudes of college students toward reading. In G. H. McNinch (Ed.), *Reading Research to Reading Practice: Third Yearbook of the American Reading Forum* (pp. 49-50). Athens, GA: American Reading Forum.
- Estes, T. H. (1971). A scale to measure attitudes toward reading *Journal of Reading*, 15, 135-138.
- Fahrenbruck, M., Schall, J., Short, K. G., Smiles, T., & Storie, M. (2006). Journeying through life and literature *Journal of Children's Literature*, 32(1), 27-36.
- Farstrup, A. E., & Samuels, S. J. (Eds.). (2002). *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction* (3 ed.). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Fawson, P. C., Reutzel, R. D., Read, S., Smith, J. A., & Moore, S. A. (2009). The influence of differing the paths to an incentive on third graders' reading achievement and attitudes. *Reading Psychology*, 30(6), 564-583.

- Fink, R. (2006). *Why Jane and John couldn't read and how they learned: a new look at striving readers*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fowler, F. J., Jr. (2002). *Survey Research Methods* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Fowler Jr, F. J. (2002). *Survey Research Methods* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Fox, D. (1994). What is literature? Two preservice teachers' conceptions of literature and the teaching of literature. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional Aspects of Literacy Research, Theory, and Practice* (pp. 394-406). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference
- Frager, A. (1987). Conquering aliteracy in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38, 16-19.
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching Visual Literacy: Using Comic Books, Graphic Novels, Anime, Cartoons, and more to Develop Comprehension and Thinking Skills*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Galda, L., & Cullinan, B. E. (2002). *Cullinan and Galda's literature and the child* (5 ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Galipault, L. D. (2009). *How do children's attitudes toward reading relate to reading practice and reading achievement*. Unpublished Dissertation Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton, FL.
- Gall, M. D. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (Eds.). (2006). *Educational Research: An Introduction* (8 ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

- Gallagher, K. (2009). *Readicide: how schools are killing reading and what you can do about it*. Portland, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Gamse, B. C., Jacob, R. T., Horst, M., Boulay, B., & Unlu, F. (2008). Reading First Impact Study Final Report Executive Summary (NCEE 2009-4039).
- Garan, E. M. (2004). *In defense of our children: When politics, profit, and education collide*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Gebhard, S. M. (2006). The lost boys (and girls): Readers in Neverland. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57, 454-463.
- Gebhard, S. M. (2007). *The crazy ideas you had: The impact of a literacy course design, delivery, and teacher on preservice teachers' reading attitudes*. Unpublished Dissertation, Duquesne University, United States-Pennsylvania.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books
- Gerla, J. K. (1994). *A descriptive analysis of preservice teachers' perceptions of themselves as readers and writers*. Unpublished Dissertation, Texas A&M, United States-Texas.
- Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. (Eds.). (1970). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gomez, K. (2005). Teachers of literacy, love of reading, and the literate self: A response to Ann Powell-Brown. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 92-96.
- Goodman, K. S. (1992). I didn't found whole language *Reading Teacher*, 46(3).

- Goodman, Y. M. (1985). Kidwatching: Observing children in the classroom. In A. Jaggar (Ed.), *Observing the Language Learner* (pp. 9-18). Newark International Reading Association
- Greene, J. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry* (1 ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and Motivation in Reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research Vol. III* (pp. 403-422). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Haase, A. B., O'Malley, P., Robinson, R., & Luiten, J. (1981). Adult readers' perceptions of self in reading. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 52, 762.
- Hall, L. A. (2006). Anything But Lazy: New Understandings About Struggling Readers, Teaching, and Text. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(4), 424-426.
- Hamston, J. (2006). Pathways to multi-literacies: Student teachers' critical reflections on a multimodal text. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 29(1), 38-51.
- Hidi, S. (2001). Interest, reading, and learning: Theoretical and practical considerations *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(3), 191-209.
- Hidi, S., Renninger, K. A., & Krapp, A. (2004). Interest, a motivational variable that combines affective and cognitive functioning In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: Integrative perspectives on*

intellectual functioning and development (pp. 89-115). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hoewisch, A. K. (2000). Children's literature in teacher-preparation programs. *Reading Online*. Retrieved from

http://www.readingonline.org/past/past_index.asp?HREF=/critical/hoewisch/index.html

Howe, K. R. (1988). Against the Quantitative-Qualitative Incompatibility Theses or Dogmas Die Hard. *Educational Researcher*, 17(8), 10-16.

Humphrey, N. (1993). *A History of the Mind*. London: Vintage.

IRA (2000). Excellent Reading Teachers: A Position Statement of the International Reading Association. In I. R. Association. (Ed.). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

IRA (2003). Investment in Teacher Preparation in the United States: A Position Statement of the International Reading Association In I. R. Association. (Ed.). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Irwin, J. W. (1979). College readers' mental imagery, reading ability and attitude toward reading *Reading Improvement*, 16, 124-129.

Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). "Just Plain Reading": A survey of what makes students what to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(4), 350-377.

Jaggar, A., & Smith-Burke, M. T. (Eds.). (1985). *Observing the Language Learner*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association

- Keene, E. O., & Zimmerman, S. (2007). *Mosaic of Thought: The power of comprehension strategy instruction* (2 ed.). Portsmouth, NH Heinemann.
- Kempler, T. M. (2007). *Optimizing students' motivation in inquiry-based learning environments: The role of instructional practices* Unpublished Dissertation University of Michigan Ann Arbor.
- Kiefer, B. Z. (2010). *Charlotte Huck's children's literature* (10 ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kingston, A. J., Brosier, G. F., & Hsu, Y. (1975). The inventory of teacher knowledge of reading - A validation. *The Reading Teacher*, 29, 133-136.
- Koehler, V. (1985). Research on preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 3, 23-30.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research*. Edgewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (2004). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research* (2 ed.). Edgewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (2005). Is In-School Free Reading Good for Children? Why the National Reading Panel Report Is (Still) Wrong. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(6), 444-447.
- Krashen, S. (2006). Free Reading. (Cover story). *School Library Journal*, 52(9), 42-45.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (1993). *Methods of Educational and Social Science Research*. White Plains: Longman.
- Kucer, S. B. (2005). *Dimensions of Literacy: A Conceptual Base for Teaching Reading and Writing in School Settings* (2 ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Laine, C. (1984). Reading and writing skills of prospective teachers. In G. H. McNinch (Ed.), *Reading teacher education, Fourth yearbook of the American Reading Forum* (pp. 53-55). Athens, GA: American Reading Forum.
- Lancy, D. F. (1993). *Qualitative Research in Education: An Introduction to the Major Traditions*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group
- Landau, E. D. (Ed.). (1968). *Teaching Children's Literature in Colleges and Universities*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English
- Langford, J., & Allen, E. (1983). The effects of U.S.S.R. on Students' Attitudes and Achievements. *Reading Horizons*, 23, 194-200.
- Lavoie, R. (2007). *The Motivation Breakthrough: 6 secrets to turning on the tuned-out child*. New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Layne, S. L. (2009). *Igniting a passion for reading: Successful strategies for building lifetime readers* Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Ley, T., Schaer, B. B., Wright, J. P., & Neal, K. S. (1988). Relations among dimensions of reading attitudes and stages of internalization of reading attitudes held by prospective teachers. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 67, 407-414.
- Lickteig, J., Johnson, B., & Johnson, D. (1994). Future teachers' reflections, perceptions, and anticipations about reading and writing. *Journal of Reading Education* 19(Spring), 22-43.
- Lundin, A. H., & Cubberley, C. W. (1995). *Teaching Children's Literature*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.
- Lynch-Brown, C., & Tomlinson, C. M. (2005). *Essentials of Children's Literature* (5 ed.). Boston: Pearson.

- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Press
- Mahar, D. (2003). Bringing the Outside In: One Teacher's Ride on the Anime Highway. *Language Arts*, 81(2), 110-117.
- Mathewson, G. C. (1994). Model of Attitude Influence Upon Reading and Learning to Read. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (4 ed., pp. 1131-1161). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Maybin, J. (Writer) (2007). Literacy Under and Over the Desk: Oppositions and Heterogeneity [Article], *Language & Education: An International Journal*.
- McKenna, M. C. (2001). Development of reading attitudes. In L. Verhoeven & C. Snow (Eds.), *Literacy and Motivation: Reading Engagement in Individuals and Groups* (pp. 135-158). Mahwah, NJ: International Reading Association
- McKenna, M. C., & Kear, D. J. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers *The Reading Teacher*, 43(9), 626-639.
- McKenna, M. C., Kear, D. J., & Ellsworth, R. A. (1995). Children's Attitudes toward Reading: A National Survey. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(4), 934-956.
- Meier, D., & Wood, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Many children left behind: how the No Child Left Behind Act is damaging our children and our schools*. Boston: Beacon Press
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741-749.
- Midcalf, L. F. (2008). *Attitudes of elementary preservice teachers regarding content area reading instruction*. Unpublished Dissertation, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.
- Millard, E., & Marsh, J. (Writer) (2001). Sending Minnie the Minx Home: comics and reading choices [Article], *Cambridge Journal of Education*: Routledge.
- Miller, D. (2009). *The Book Whisperer: Awakening the inner reader in every child*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, L. D., Fine, J. C., & Walker, J. J. (1994). Preservice teachers' literacy dispositions In B. L. Hayes & K. Camperel (Eds.), *Reading: Putting the Pieces Together* (pp. 37-52). Athens, GA: American Reading Forum.
- Mohr, K. A. J. (2006). Children's Choices for Recreational Reading: A Three-Part Investigation of Selection Preferences, Rationales, and Processes. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(1), 81 - 104.
- Moss, G., & McDonald, J. W. (2004). The borrowers: library records as unobtrusive measures of children's reading preferences. [Article]. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 27, 401-412.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Kennedy, A. M., Martin, M. O., & Foy, P. (2007). *PIRLS 2006 International Report*. Boston, MA: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

- Nash, R. (2005). Explanation and quantification in educational research: the arguments of critical and scientific realism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(2), 185-204.
- Nathanson, S., Pruslow, J., & Levitt, R. (2008). The reading habits and literacy attitudes of inservice and prospective teachers: Results of a questionnaire survey. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 313-321.
- Norton, D. E. (2007). *Through the eyes of a child: an introduction to children's literature* (7 ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2004). Mixed method and mixed model research. In B. Johnson & L. Christensen (Eds.), *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (pp. 408-431). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2006). The Validity Issue in Mixed Research. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 48-63.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2008). The Validity Issue in Mixed Research. In V. L. Plano-Clark & J. W. Creswell (Eds.), *The Mixed Methods Reader* (pp. 273-298). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. .
- Pagnucci, G. S. (2004). *Living the Narrative Life: Stories as a tool for meaning making*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Parsons, S. C. (2007). This new/old process: Teacher candidates rediscovering literacy through authentic engagement. *Affective Reading Educational Journal*(Fall), 12-23.

- Pavlik, R. A. (1975). An assessment of undergraduate preparation available at the University of Northern Colorado for the teaching of reading in the elementary school. *Colorado Journal of Educational Research* 14, 22-28.
- Plano-Clark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (Eds.). (2008). *The mixed methods reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. .
- Powell-Brown, A. (2003-2004). Can you be a teacher of literacy if you don't love to read? . *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 47(4), 284-288.
- Pratschke, J. (2003). Realistic models? Critical realism and statistical models in the social sciences. *Philosophica*, 71, 13-38.
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A comprehensive guide* (3 ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reed, K. X. (1989). Expectation vs. ability: Junior college reading skills. *Journal of Reading* 32, 537-541.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ringness, T. A. (1975). *The Affective Domain in Education* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sandelowski, M. (2008). Powerful rhetorical devices used in writing mixed methods research. In V. L. Plano-Clark & J. W. Creswell (Eds.), *The mixed methods reader* (pp. 299-336). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Schofield, H. L. (1980). Reading attitude and achievement: Teacher-pupil relationships. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74, 111-119.
- Schutte, N. S., & Malouff, J. M. (2007). Dimensions of Reading Motivation: Development of an adult reading motivation scale. *Reading Psychology*, 28, 469-489.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The Sage Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry* (3 ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Schwartz, A., & Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2006). Understanding the manga hype: Uncovering the multimodality of comic-book literacies *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(1), 40-49.
- Scott, D. (2000). *Realism and educational research: new perspectives and possibilities*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer
- Scott, D. (2005). Critical realism and empirical research methods in education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39(4), 633-646.
- Scott, D. (2007). Resolving the quantitative-qualitative dilemma: a critical realist approach. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 30(1), 3-17.
- Shank, G. D. (2002). *Qualitative Research: A Personal Skills Approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall
- Shannon, P. (1983). The Use of Commercial Reading Materials in American Elementary Schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(October/November/December), 68-85.
- Shannon, P. (1989). *Broken Promises: Reading Instruction in Twentieth-Century America*. Granby: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

- Shannon, P., & Crawford, P. (1997). Manufacturing descent: Basal readers and the creation of reading failures. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*, 13(3), 227-245.
- Shapiro, J., & Whitney, P. (1997). FACTORS INVOLVED IN THE LEISURE READING OF UPPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS. *Reading Psychology*, 18(4), 343 - 370.
- Shell, D. F., Murphy, C. C., & Bruning, R. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 91-100.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for analysing talk, text, and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Smith, C. M. (1990). A longitudinal investigation of reading attitude development from childhood to adulthood. *Journal of Educational Research*, 83(4), 215-219.
- Smith, F. (1987). *Joining the Literacy Club: Further Essays into Education* Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Smith, M. L. (1997). Mixing and matching: Methods and models. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 1997(74), 73-58.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, S. M., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. Washington DC: National Academy Press
- Snow, C. E., Griffin, P., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Knowledge to support the teaching of reading: Preparing teachers for a changing world* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

- Stepp, J. (2008). *Reading ability and academic achievement of college education major: Reading attitudes, motivations, and behaviors*. Unpublished Dissertation, Tennessee Technological University United States-Tennessee.
- Stone, N. (1994). Self evaluation and self motivation for college developmental readers. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 10*, 53-62.
- Stoodt-Hill, B. D., & Amspaugh-Corson, L. B. (2009). *Children's literature: discovery for a lifetime* (4 ed.). Boston: Pearson
- Su-Yen, C. (2007). Extracurricular reading habits of college students in Taiwan: Findings from two national surveys. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(8), 642-653.
- Sue, V. M., & Ritter, L. A. (2007). *Conducting Online Surveys*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Sullivan, E. P. (1976). Functional literacy of teacher trainees. In W. D. Miller & G. H. McNinch (Eds.), *Reflections and investigations on reading: Twenty-fifth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 147-151). Clemson, SC: National Reading Conference.
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Editorial: The new era of mixed methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods, 1*(1), 3-7.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). Introduction to mixed method and mixed model studies in the social and behavioral sciences. In V. L. Plano-Clark & J. W. Creswell (Eds.), *The Mixed Methods Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. .

- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2002). *The handbook of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences* (1 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Taylor, L. (1999). Personalizing classroom instruction to account for motivational and developmental differences *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 15(4), 255.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2003). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 3-50). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2008). Mixed methods sampling: A Typology with examples In V. L. Plano-Clark & J. W. Creswell (Eds.), *The Mixed Methods Reader* (pp. 199-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tolsma, C. (1981). Evaluating college reading programs: An affective approach. In G. Enright (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Western Collge Reading Association* (pp. 77-80). Whittier, CA: Western College Reading Association
- Tracey, D. H., & Morrow, L. M. (2006). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Tunnell, M. O., & Jacobs, J. S. (2008). *Children's literature, briefly* (4 ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Vogt, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of statistics and methodology* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Warmack, W. L. (2007). *Elementary education pre-service teachers' attitudes toward reading*. Unpublished Dissertation, Auburn University, United States-Alabama.
- Weber, M. (1949). *The Methodology of the Social Sciences* Glencoe: Free Press
- Wedwick, L., Wutz, J., & Fisher, D. (2006). Thinking outside the book box: Using BOOKMATCH to develop independent book selection *Voices from the middle*, 14(1), 20-29.
- Wedwick, L., & Wutz, J. A. (2008). *Bookmatch: How to scaffold student book selection for independent reading* Newark, DE International Reading Association
- Weidler, S. D., & Askov, E. N. (1984). An investigation of preservice teachers' attitudes toward reading. In G. H. McNinch (Ed.), *Reading Teacher Education: Fourth Yearbook of the American Reading Forum* (pp. 10-13). Athens, GA: American Reading Forum.
- Wigfield, A., & Asher, S. R. (2002). Social and Motivational Influences on Reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of Reading Research Vol 1* (pp. 423-452). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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.
- Yoon, J. C. (2002). Three decades of sustained silent reading: A meta-analytic review of the effects of SSR on attitude toward reading *Reading Improvement*, 39(4), 186-195.

Zhao, Y. (2006). Are We Fixing the Wrong Things? *Educational Leadership*, 63(8), 28-31.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY RATING SCALE

Adult Motivation for Reading Scale - EDRD 314

2. Thank you for your participation!

Following are statements about reading. For each statement, please decide what is most true for you and select the appropriate response from the buttons below each statement. There are 25 items total followed by five identification items on the next page.

1. If a text (i.e., book, article, webpage, etc.) is interesting, I don't care how hard it is to read.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

2. Without reading, my life would not be the same.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

3. My friends sometimes are surprised at how much I read.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

4. My friends and I like to exchange books or articles we particularly enjoy.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

5. It is very important to me to spend time reading.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

6. In comparison to other activities, reading is important to me.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

7. If I am going to need information from material I read, I finish the reading well in advance of when I must know the material.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

8. Work performance or university grades are an indicator of the effectiveness of my reading.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

Adult Motivation for Reading Scale - EDRD 314

9. I set a good model for others through reading.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

10. I read rapidly.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

11. Reading helps make my life meaningful.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

12. It is important to me to get compliments for the knowledge I gather from reading.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

13. I like others to question me on what I read so that I can show my knowledge.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

14. I don't like reading technical material.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

15. It is important to me to have others remark on how much I read.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

16. I like hard, challenging texts (i.e., books, articles, webpages, etc.).

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

17. I don't like reading material with difficult vocabulary.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

Adult Motivation for Reading Scale - EDRD 314

18. I do all the expected reading for work or university courses.

- ☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

19. I am confident I can understand difficult texts (i.e., books, articles, webpages, etc.).

- ☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

20. I am a good reader.

- ☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

21. I read to improve my work or university performance.

- ☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

22. Please indicate your enjoyment of reading

- ☐ not at all ☐ a little ☐ indifferent ☐ mostly ☐ very much

23. Please indicate how often you read:

- ☐ never ☐ rarely ☐ sometimes ☐ often ☐ very often

24. Please estimate how many hours per week you typically spend on required reading.

25. Please estimate how many hours per week you typically spend on recreational reading.

Adult Motivation for Reading Scale - EDRD 314

3. Conclusion

Please complete these last identification items, and then click on the button below to submit your survey responses and please remember to close your internet browser to ensure the security of your responses!

Thank you again for your participation in this important study.

1. I am taking this children's literature course_____.

- ☐ to fulfill a requirement of my major or program of study
- ☐ as an option in fulfilling a requirement of my major or program of study
- ☐ due to personal interest in the subject and not to fulfill any requirement of my major or program of study
- ☐ other (please explain below)

Other (please specify)

2. I am seeking teaching licensure for:

- ☐ elementary
- ☐ early childhood
- ☐ I am NOT seeking teaching licensure
- ☐ other (please indicate in comment box below)

Other (please specify)

3. I intend to graduate in _____ semester(s).

- ☐ 1 or less ☐ 2-2.5 ☐ 3-3.5 ☐ 4-4.5 ☐ 5+

4. My age falls between:

- ☐ 18-20 ☐ 21-23 ☐ 23-25 ☐ 25-30 ☐ 30-35 ☐ 35-40 ☐ 40+

5. Please type your first and last name in the space below. Remember, all responses will be kept confidential.

Figure 6. Adult Motivation for Reading Scale

APPENDIX B
LETTERS OF CONSENT

(Instructor Informed Consent)

Dear _____:

The purpose of this mixed methods study is to determine the presence of and influencing factors upon undergraduate preservice teachers' reading attitudes, beliefs, and values within children's literature courses. The results of this study will be used to better understand how teacher educators may design their instruction of literacy courses in higher education to meet the needs of preservice teachers.

The study consists of two stages. The first, a quantitative stage necessary to identify potential participants for the second stage of the study, requires students to complete a 32 item rating scale and should take students approximately 10 minutes to complete. Item responses range from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This online rating scale, provided through SurveyMonkey, uses state-of-the art technology to protect the confidentiality of student responses; therefore it is highly unlikely that students' responses would be intercepted. In order to increase the security of their responses, I will advise them to close the internet browser upon completing the rating scale. Your students' personal responses will not be revealed to you, though descriptive statistics of your students' responses as a class can be shared if you are interested.

The second stage of this research study consists of a variety of qualitative procedures requiring your participation and the participation of one or several of your students.

Your involvement in the study would include the following:

- a) If I am unable to do so, due to scheduling, I would ask you to read a brief description of the study to your class and then take your entire class of students to the most conveniently located computer lab during your class session. Then, e-mail your students the link to the rating scale, and finally provide approximately ten minutes for students to complete the online.
- b) Providing me with either digital or printed copies of lesson plans and/or other preparatory materials used for this course (i.e. the syllabus given to students, handouts, assignments, rubrics, course readings, quizzes, exams, etc.)
- c) Participating in two informal interviews of approximately one hour in length to discuss your experiences teaching students in this course.

Based on data from Stage One, one to three of your students would then be petitioned to participate in the remainder of the study. Their voluntary participation would include the following:

- a) Participating in approximately three informal interviews of approximately one hour in length to discuss their experiences as a reader and their experiences in this course.
- b) Being observed by me throughout approximately 15 hours of class time in this children's literature course.
- c) Writing weekly e-mailed logs with questions provided by me and prompted by observation and interview data I collect and analyze.
- d) Providing access to and possibly copies of their graded assignments completed for the class.

At no time should you or your students feel obligated to participate in any stage of this study nor should student participation or lack thereof impact their academic success in your course. Students will be informed of the voluntary nature of their participation and will be assured that their involvement in the study does not in any way threaten or positively influence their grade in the course.

It is my obligation to protect the confidentiality of your and your students' responses to rating scale items, interview questions/prompts, written documents, and observational data recorded. I will uphold this obligation through the use of pseudonyms for the institution which offers this course, your students and yourself throughout all reports produced from this study. This commitment to confidentiality will also be communicated to your students and will be important to ensuring honesty and openness of student responses.

There are no foreseeable risks to you or your students as the participants in this study beyond those which you encounter within regular classroom and online activity. In addition, participation is voluntary and you may decide not to participate in this study. In appreciation of your voluntary gift of time and attention required by this study, I will be providing a \$10.00 gift certificate to Barnes & Noble bookstore at the completion of the study. If you begin participation you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask me, the researcher, any questions, please sign and date this document if you agree with these terms. You will retain a copy of this document signed by both you, as a participant, and I, as the

researcher. I will also retain a copy of this signed document for purposes of ensuring the standards set forth by the University of Northern Colorado for ethical research. Should you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Sponsored Programs and Academic Research Center, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1907. In addition my contact information is listed below and I encourage you to contact me at any time with questions, concerns, and comments regarding your participation in the study.

(Instructor)

Date

Jennifer A. Davis

Date

Thank you for your participation in this study and I look forward to working with you this semester!

(Stage One: Preservice Teacher Participant Informed Consent)

The following letter to student participants was copied and pasted into the initial page of the rating scale on SurveyMonkey:

Dear *_(Name of institution inserted here)_* Student:

The purpose of this brief online rating scale study is to determine undergraduate preservice teachers' reading attitudes, beliefs, and values. The results of this rating scale will be used to identify possible participants for further stages of this study and to better understand how teacher educators may design their instruction of literacy courses in higher education to meet the needs of preservice teachers.

The rating scale consists of 23 multiple choice items, two open ended items, and five identification items. This should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Item responses range from strongly disagree to strongly agree. SurveyMonkey uses state-of-the-art technology to protect the confidentiality of your responses, therefore it is highly unlikely that your responses would be intercepted. In order to increase the security of your responses, I advise you to close the internet browser upon completing the rating scale.

Due to the nature of this study, the researcher requests that you provide your name and some additional descriptive information in one of the rating scale items. This information will be used by the researcher only to identify students that may participate in the second stage of this study. Although your course instructor may see the collection of scores resulting from this rating scale, no names will be associated with these collected scores. Therefore, your personal responses will not be revealed to your instructor for this course or anyone aside from the researcher.

If you are selected and agree to participate in the next stage of this study, your name will remain connected with this rating scale and all documentation will be secured within the password protected SurveyMonkey account, a password protected laptop, and/or locked file cabinets. If you are not selected as a possible participant in the next stage of this study, your name will be deleted from your rating scale immediately following participant selection for the second stage. Finally, pseudonyms will be used for the institution, your instructor and yourself throughout all reports produced from this study to ensure confidentiality of your responses.

There are no foreseeable risks to you as the participant in this study beyond those which you encounter within regular online activity. In addition, participation is voluntary and does not in any way affect your grade for the course in which you are enrolled. You may decide not to participate in this study and if you begin participation you may still

decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask myself or your instructor any questions, please proceed with the rating scale if you agree with these terms. Also, please help yourself to a snack once you have completed this rating scale!

[If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Sponsored Programs and Academic Research Center, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1907]

(Stage 2: Student Participant Informed Consent)
Consent Form For Human Participants In Research
University Of Northern Colorado

Project Title: *Qualitative and Quantitative Inquiry into the Affective Domain of Preservice Teachers Enrolled in Children's Literature Courses*

Researcher: Jennifer Davis, doctoral candidate, School of Teacher Education

Phone: 970-351-1605 E-mail: Jennifer.Davis@unco.edu

Research Advisor: Dr. Michael F. Opitz, School of Teacher Education

Phone: 970-351-1345 E-mail: Michael.Opitz@unco.edu

Dear _____,

As explained in the first stage of this research study, results from the online rating scale you and your classmates completed have been used to select possible participants for this second stage of the study. Your responses indicate that you could provide additional valuable information in this study aimed at improving the instruction and preparation of preservice teachers.

Select student participation in this second stage of the study includes:

- Three one-on-one interviews with me, the researcher
 - approximately one hour in length
 - scheduled at times spaced throughout the semester that are convenient for you and I
 - scheduled in places that are conducive to audio recording and are convenient for you and I
- Approximately five class session observations of you and selected others in your children's literature course
- My in-class review and/or collection of copies of documents completed for the course, including class assignments, reflections, quizzes, and exams. (All documents will be returned to you promptly.)
- Weekly e-mailed reflection logs in response to one e-mailed question each week

Please be assured that data collected from/with you is safely secured, confidential, and will not be shared with your instructor. Participation in this study shall not jeopardize or ensure your academic success in this course.

There are no foreseeable risks to you as the participant in this study beyond those which you encounter within regular college course participation. Participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate in this study and if you begin participation you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected

and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you would like to participate in this research. A copy of this form will be given to you to retain for future reference. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Sponsored Programs and Academic Research Center, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1907.

Student Participant Date

Researcher: Jennifer Davis-Duerr

APPENDIX C

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF SURVEY RATING SCALE RESULTING FROM PILOT STUDY

Overall Review

In terms of reliability, the measure seemed to be consistent according to Chronbach's alpha, particularly considering the small n sizes due to the pilot nature of this administration of the measure. While there was some indication that higher Chronbach's alpha ratings could be achieved by the deletion of items 17 and 19, the increase in alpha would not be large enough to warrant the deletion.

Validity evidence was found for both administrations of the measure, using the same test for validity that was employed by Schutte and Malouff (2007). The summed test score for the 21-item measure was correlated with the scores for two additional questions (one a question regarding a self-reported joy of reading and the other question regarding a self-report for the frequency of reading). The resulting correlation coefficients provide some evidence of validity.

The pilot unveiled several administration issues that were addressed for the final study, but psychometrically, the measure was deemed to be adequate for the purposes of identifying participants for the qualitative portion of the study.

Pilot 1d summary

The Chronbach's alpha for the test for group 1d was .88 ($n = 14$), with a standardized Chronbach's alpha of .86 ($n = 14$). While some of the items indicate a higher Chronbach's alpha if deleted, the alpha levels achieved considering the pilot oriented nature of the administration of the test are such that deletion of any items are unwarranted. The validity test for this administration of the measure indicated moderate to high correlations between the measure and the self reports of enjoyment of reading ($r = .72$, $n = 14$) and frequency of reading ($r = .77$, $n = 14$).

Pilot 1e summary

The Chronbach's alpha for the test for group 1e was .79 ($n = 17$), with a standardized Chronbach's alpha of .81 ($n = 17$). Again, some of the items indicate a higher Chronbach's alpha if deleted, but the achieved alpha levels are such that deletion is unwarranted. The validity test for this administration of the measure indicated moderate to high correlations between the measure and the self reports of enjoyment of reading ($r = .70$, $n = 17$) and frequency of reading ($r = .62$, $n = 17$).

Table 9

Pilot 1d Reliability Statistics of Adult Motivation for Reading Scale

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.876	.861	23

Table 10

Pilot 1d Case Processing Summary

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	14	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	14	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 11

Pilot 1d Adult Motivation for Reading Scale Item Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
V1	76.71	109.912	.580	.867
V2	75.79	112.335	.645	.867
V3	77.00	107.077	.593	.866
V4	76.79	109.720	.717	.864
V5	76.21	108.181	.748	.862
V6	76.36	101.016	.859	.856
V7	77.36	110.247	.634	.866
V8	77.07	120.071	.106	.882
V9	76.64	107.786	.847	.860
V10	76.86	109.055	.533	.869
V11	76.29	114.066	.452	.871
V12	77.50	121.192	.083	.880
V13	77.29	120.066	.186	.877
V14	76.50	129.808	-.439	.890
V15	77.71	116.066	.409	.872
V16	77.86	119.978	.166	.878
V17	77.14	124.747	-.114	.886
V18	77.29	112.835	.426	.872
V19	76.57	123.802	-.065	.884
V20	76.21	110.951	.596	.867
V21	76.57	110.418	.627	.866
V22	76.07	104.841	.749	.861
V23	76.50	105.038	.796	.859

Table 12

Pilot 1e Reliability Statistics of Adult Motivation for Reading Scale

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.793	.811	23

Table 13

Pilot 1e Case Processing Summary

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Cases Valid	17	100.0
Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	17	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 14

Pilote 1e Adult Motivation for Reading Scale Item Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
V1	74.94	72.684	-.226	.811
V2	74.24	65.816	.409	.784
V3	75.65	62.493	.418	.781
V4	75.12	63.610	.306	.789
V5	74.71	60.471	.752	.765
V6	75.00	59.250	.794	.760
V7	76.00	65.500	.340	.786
V8	75.53	66.140	.192	.795
V9	75.24	65.441	.447	.782
V10	75.82	57.904	.591	.768
V11	74.94	61.809	.674	.770
V12	75.71	65.346	.304	.788
V13	75.47	62.890	.513	.777
V14	75.24	69.941	-.025	.805
V15	76.41	64.507	.487	.780
V16	75.76	65.816	.327	.787
V17	75.82	81.029	-.622	.843
V18	76.00	67.500	.152	.796
V19	74.94	67.184	.309	.788
V20	74.71	62.846	.548	.775
V21	74.88	65.360	.331	.786
V22	74.65	58.243	.703	.762
V23	74.76	62.441	.622	.772