

ΣΟΦΙΑ—SOPHIA

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18634/sophiaj.16v.1i.1005>

Teaching Perspectives and Expectations on the Reading Practices of First-Year Psychology Students

Perspectivas e expectativas de ensino sobre as práticas de leitura de estudantes do primeiro ano de Psicologia

MARÍA MICAELA VILLALONGA PENNA

Article Information

Received: June 03, 2019
Revised: August 23, 2019
Accepted: January 12, 2020

How to cite:

Villalonga, M.M (2020). Teaching Perspectives and Expectations on the Reading Practices of First-Year Psychology Students. *Sophia*, 16 (1), 33-47.

PhD. and Master in Cognitive and Learning Psychology, Professor at the Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, San Miguel de Tucumán, Argentina. micavillalonga@yahoo.com.ar



ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (printed): 1794-8932



UNIVERSIDAD
La Gran Colombia

Founded in 1951

Sophia-Education, volume 16 number 1. January / June 2020. English version

ABSTRACT

Reading at university in the area of social sciences involves working with multiple textual and discursive sources. Teachers can often expect students to behave as autonomous readers and to know in advance how to read in a specific area. In this sense, this work addresses the perspectives and expectations of teachers about the reading practices of Psychology students from a state-run university. For this, a qualitative study is carried out in which 30 teachers of the first year of the Psychology career are interviewed. The interviews are analyzed in the light of categories that emerge from the theoretical framework and emerging ones are also considered. The results reveal that the perspectives of the great majority of teachers about the reading of students focus on difficulties and that few teaching perspectives emphasize strengths and self-criticism with teaching practices. Furthermore, these perspectives are related to the reading practices expected by teachers. Those teachers who highlight difficulties declare that they promote monological reading practices and expect students to read in this way. Those who recognize potentialities and difficulties in their students when reading, declare that they enable dialogic practices and hope that students can read with them. Reading perspectives lead to the deployment of reading practices that may tend to remedy difficulties or become spaces for the construction of shared meanings about what is read.

Keywords: Reading, Higher Education Professor, University Student, Psychology, Education.

RESUMO

A leitura na universidade na área de ciências sociais envolve trabalhar com várias fontes textuais e discursivas. Muitas vezes, os professores podem esperar que os alunos se comportem como leitores autônomos e saibam antecipadamente como ler em uma área específica. Nesse sentido, este artigo aborda as perspectivas e expectativas dos professores sobre as práticas de leitura de estudantes de psicologia de uma universidade estatal. Para isso, é realizado um estudo qualitativo, no qual são entrevistados 30 professores do primeiro ano do curso de Psicologia. As entrevistas são analisadas à luz de categorias que emergem do referencial teórico e são consideradas emergentes. Os resultados mostram que as perspectivas da grande maioria dos professores sobre a leitura dos alunos se concentram em dificuldades e que, poucas perspectivas de ensino, acentuam forças e autocrítica nas práticas de ensino. Além disso, essas perspectivas estão relacionadas às práticas de leitura esperadas pelos professores. Os professores que enfatizam dificuldades declaram promover práticas de leitura monológica e esperam que os alunos leiam dessa maneira. Aqueles que reconhecem potencialidades e dificuldades de seus alunos ao ler, declaram possíveis práticas dialógicas e esperam que os alunos possam ler junto com eles. As perspectivas de leitura levam os professores a exibir práticas de leitura que tendem a remediar dificuldades ou tornar-se espaços para a construção de significados compartilhados do que é lido.

Palavras-chave: leitura, professor de ensino superior, estudante universitário, psicologia, educação.

Introduction

Teachers' perspectives on reading in disciplines and academic contexts are related to teachers' expectations of students as readers (Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000; Blommaert, Street, Turner & Scott, 2007; Lea, 1999; Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Street, 1999; Street, 2003). International developments (Lea and Street, 1997; Lillis, 1999; Scott, 1999) have revealed that teachers often expect university students to behave as autonomous and mature readers since reading constitutes a skill that, previously learned, can be transferred without major difficulties from the school to the university context (Ivanic, 1998; Lea, 1999; Lea and Street, 1997; Lillis, 1997; Stierer, 1997). In addition, national and international research describes how academic reading practices are constructed in a distinctive way according to the disciplines and that teachers expect students to understand this even if it is not made explicit (Carlino and Estienne, 2004; Fernandez and Carlino, 2010; Lea and Street, 1998; Lillis, 1999). In this sense, this study addresses as a research problem what are the perspectives and expectations of teachers about the reading practices of first-year students from a specific disciplinary community: the career of Psychology at a *public university*.

As anticipated, on the expectations of teachers around reading, international developments show how many times teachers expect students to behave as autonomous readers and capable of self-regulation (Lea and Street, 1997; Lillis, 1999; Scott, 1999). This, according to Lillis (1999), can make teachers consider it unnecessary to make explicit reading guidelines and can even enable them to demand things that have not been taught. The literature reviewed coincides in pointing out that teaching expectations can make it difficult for less familiarized students with the academic culture to stay in university

institutions (Collier and Morgan, 2008; Lea and Street, 1997; Lillis, 1999; Turner, 1999). For this reason, many authors considered that the reading conventions typical of academic cultures should be taught to new students to allow them to participate in the reference community (Lea, 1999; Lea and Street, 1998; Lillis, 1999, 2001; Scott, 1999; Street, 1999; Turner, 1999).

Furthermore, from certain theoretical aspects, reading constitutes a technical skill whose basic and generic elements can be transferred from one context to another (Ivanic, 1998; Lea, 1999; Lea and Street, 1997; Lillis, 1997; Stierer, 1997). According to Lea and Street (1998), reading is seen as an instrumental or technical practice that can be taught and learned once and for all. Then, when individuals present difficulties in reading or writing, the pedagogical actions that derive from this model are constituted as an attempt to alleviate or remedy the difficulties in reading and writing of students (Bazerman, 1988; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Lea and Street, 2006).

In the same direction as the aforementioned proposals, in our country, Carlino and Estienne (2004) characterized the reading modes expected by teachers in careers in the area of Humanities and Social Sciences. They found that teachers expected students to read the texts based on the topics and objectives of the subject program and according to the perspectives of the chairs, prioritizing certain issues developed in the texts.

They also expected students to know that polyphonic texts predominate in Human and Social Sciences, the understanding of which makes it necessary to take into account different perspectives, many of which can be controversial. They considered the students as subjects capable of self-regulation as readers and this led them not to specify guidelines on how to read the texts and to understand the requests for help from students as immaturity

and dependency. The authors considered that these questions were relevant because the students were evaluated according to a reading model that they had not yet incorporated (Carlino and Estienne, 2004).

In relation to perspectives on what it is to read at university, some international (Dysthe, 1996; Dysthe, 2011; Dysthe, Berndhardt and Esbjørn, 2012; Dysthe, Samara and Westrheim, 2006) and national research (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012) addressed the role of academic reading practices and basically describe two modalities of conceiving and organizing teaching and learning practices of reading: on the one hand, the monographic ones (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012; Dysthe, 1996; Dysthe, 2011; Dysthe, Berndhardt and Esbjørn, 2012; Dysthe, Samara and Westrheim, 2006) and peripheral ones (Carlino, Iglesia and Laxalt, 2013) and, on the other, the dialogical (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012; Dysthe, 1996; Dysthe, 2011; Dysthe, Berndhardt and Esbjørn, 2012; Dysthe, Samara and Westrheim, 2006), intertwined (Carlino, Iglesia and Laxalt, 2013) or joint.

The first -the monographic practices-, are characterized by a predominance of the magisterial oral presentations by the teacher in which they can contribute their interpretation of what has been read, avoiding discussion with the students. In addition, communications organized by shifts determined by the teacher prevail, which usually promotes insignificant contributions to the subject studied (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012; Dysthe, 1996). Similarly, there are interventions "at the ends" or "outer margins" of the reading activities, in which the teachers usually give a slogan to the students, do not intervene during the reading activities and only correct the productions or final results (Carlino, Iglesia and Laxalt, 2013).

The latter – the dialogic forms – on the other hand, are characterized by a predominance of interactions between teachers and students in which intertextual relationships are raised between the oral discourse

of the exchanges in the classroom and the written discourse present in the bibliography. Classroom interactions around disciplinary texts facilitate students' access to ways of reading and understanding in a specific area of knowledge (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012; Dysthe, 1996). Linked to this form of organization of reading practices are the "intertwined", in which teachers work mediating reading during classes and encouraging interactions with students to talk about what they have read. Reading is a means of working on the subject matter -that is, reading tasks are intertwined with the learning of conceptual contents- (Carlino, Iglesia and Laxalt, 2013).

Likewise, revised national research deepened the investigation of teacher perspectives on reading at different educational levels (Fernandez and Carlino, 2006; Fernández and Carlino, 2010). In one of them, Fernandez and Carlino (2010) investigated this in the first years of careers in the areas of Human and Veterinary Sciences of a public management university. They recognized difficulties in comprehension and estimated that reading in academic media is different from that of secondary school – since long and complex texts are read and it is necessary to establish relationships and not just remember central ideas.

They considered that reading at the university in both Veterinary Sciences and Human Sciences, implied entering a specific disciplinary field and learning the specialized discourse of it. The characteristic thing in Human Sciences was that reading required learning to relate the texts and the authors to each other, and to read the texts several times and understand them from the perspective of a chair and a disciplinary community. The amount to read made another difference because it made it necessary for students to self-organize and learn to express the authors' proposals in their own words (Fernandez and Carlino, 2010).

Taking into account this theoretical journey, this paper seeks to describe the perspectives and expectations of teachers about the reading practices of Psychology students at a public university.

Methodology

In this study, a qualitative research approach with a grounded theory design was chosen since it sought to know and understand the meanings attributed by teachers about the reading practices of students entering a specific disciplinary community. In addition, the construction of the theory that accounts for the phenomenon occurred from the data collected and its relationship with the reviewed literature (Hernández Sampieri, Fernández Collado and Baptista Lucio, 2008).

The sampling was intentional, which allowed the selection of subjects that could contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon studied (Hernández Sampieri, Fernández Collado and Baptista Lucio, 2008). This study involved 30 teachers from seven different subjects of the first year of the Psychology career of a public university. They voluntarily agreed to participate in our research.

Data collection was done from in-depth interviews in order to know the teaching perspectives about the reading practices of the students. As already noted, teachers of the first year of the Psychology career of seven different subjects were interviewed during the first and second semester of the 2018 school year. The interviews lasted an average of 62 (sixty-two) minutes.

After reading the transcripts of the interviews, the initial coding was carried out based on the topics of the interview scripts, in categories that emerged from the theoretical framework and in the emerging categories. Subsequently, the categories were refined and for this, each fragment was compared with those previously categorized

in order to obtain internal consistency. In both processes, the constant comparison of the different segments and categories allowed to find similarities and differences between them. In addition, when no new categories were found and data became redundant, the categories were considered saturated and data collection and analysis was halted. Finally, the data were triangulated, that is, relationships between the categories were established. For analysis, the Software Atlas.ti (version 6) was used.

Process

Below are the topics and categories included, which emerge from the analysis of the interviews.

1) Perspectives on how students read

When teachers are asked to describe students' reading modes, they begin by referring to reading difficulties: they do not read, read and mark everything and cannot organize time according to the amount to be read. They also indicate what is read and what is learned in high school. Few teachers point out the reading potential of the students.

Many of the teachers (15 out of 30 teachers) describe that students do not read – which would be seen in the fact that the booklets are unmarked – or read and mark the texts excessively – as if they were all central ideas. The latter would account for the difficulty in identifying main ideas.

S: You talk to me about study strategies or techniques,
and as for the reading of the texts,
What do you notice in the students?

T: *They do not read... they don't read the bibliography... I do not know if it is that they do not understand or is it the comfort of not reading or of reading and not understanding at the outset and then waiting for the teacher to give them everything served. For example, the answers to the study guides or to be told*

in which paragraph of what text is what is asked of them in the guides, or to expect the practical class to be a second theoretical session... *So I don't know if they have problems in understanding or is it comfort* (teacher 9).

S: And have you observed, for example, what do students do with the study material, for example, the photocopies of parts of books or the booklets that are in the photocopier?

T: Look, *texts are not marked, when they come. And some of them, five out of a hundred, just five, bring all the booklet or photocopy marked.* And so they can't do anything in practice. They do not know how to summarize; they do not know how to get the main ideas (teacher 1).

S: And in relation to reading, have you identified any specific difficulties?

T: Yes (laughs), they don't read. Either they read and this thing happens to them that I tell you, *they underline everything, or they do not read and do not underline anything.* Not everyone comes from a good high school...*they read and mark everything, do not summarize...or they pretend to read in one day a very important amount of material, and they do not get it...and since most of them come with a weak basis, it is difficult for them to understand the bibliography...* (teacher 8).

T:... There is the constant: the *booklets unmarked, the difficulty in choosing main and secondary ideas, difficulty in identifying main concepts in the texts, the depth with which they study the concepts, the level of apprehension of knowledge, of concepts. There is a difficulty in this, and it has to do with high school education, they were not taught to read* (teacher 5).

A characteristic of student reading practices widely noted (20 out of 30 teachers) is the impossibility of organizing reading times according to the amount to be read for the different subjects. This would have a negative

impact on the possibilities of the students arriving at practical classes and partial exams with bibliographic material read and worked.

S: What have you noticed in terms of difficulties of first-year students?

T: ... Well... *they have a hard time organizing their time to read the bibliography, like they do not calculate it.* If you tell them that they have to read a certain text for next class, *they read only half of it, and tell you the time was not enough ... and, also the fact that they find it very difficult to organize the time they have to devote to other subjects ...* (teacher 11).

S: When you tell me that they do not know how to study, what do you mean?

T: ... I think they are not taught how to study, the act of sitting down and *dosing the topics to study day by day.* For example I told them to read some pages, ten or fifteen, that was what they should read from a subject, in a book, it was a chapter of a book ... that was from one Monday to another Monday and almost any of them read,... I see them as if they were used to *two days before the exam try to study* (*he gestures quotes with his fingers*) everything, but they do not have a real study routine. That is, *they do not read the material for each practical class and then setting the most important thing as a secondary activity* (teacher 9).

A few teachers (3 out of 30 teachers) attribute students' difficulties in reading to the way they prepare reading material for new students indicating two issues: on the one hand, the presence of primary sources and scarcity of secondary sources and, on the other, the complexity of the texts to be read. –convoluted texts–.

S: We talked about the type of texts in the bibliography, but what challenges do you think students will have to read Psychology texts?

T: In this regard, what I was telling you, the *overwhelming amount of primary sources and the scarcity of secondary sources*. The *amount to read*. The topics that are treated in the area, the complexity and depth with which they must be addressed. Those things can be hard for the guys and also for me. *There are texts that explain things in a simple and direct way, there are others more convoluted, such as the Freudians...* (teacher 3).

Several teachers (12 out of 30 teachers), when asked to describe their students' reading practices, refer to reading difficulties related to what they learned in high school. Among the difficulties, they mention, as indicated above, the problems to identify main ideas in a text or summarize -mark everything-, the lack of reading for practical classes and the impossibility to organize the times according to the amount to be read.

S: You tell me about working with texts, and then I think: How would you describe the students' reading practices?

T: This is what I said, right? There are students who *have their ways of reading learned in high school that work for them a lot here...many find it difficult to identify main ideas of a text or they can not identify them. They leave everything to read at the last minute and obviously, they don't get there...in high school they are not taught to read...they read a few pages and that's it and they are not taught to identify ideas or authors' perspectives...then they arrive at university and everything is very difficult for them*(teacher 10).

Few teachers (5 out of 30 teachers) indicate that there are students who read and note a practice that consists of organizing the material with slips of paper, marking some isolated concepts with highlighters, writing things on the sides and reading by relating multiple textual sources.

T: ... and not all the students bring the material they read, no... but let's see... what they bring are the booklets with colored paper and material that is all marked, underlined and with legends on the sides and the highlighter issue, this marking with highlighters. What do they highlight? What they understand to be the most important thing, concepts... or things that in theoretical classes are marked as important (teacher 2).

S: How do students read?

T: Well, there are some students, not many, who *read and mark main ideas...* it is like you see them reading their *notes about theoretical classes* and compare them with what the *authors of the texts say* and put together schemes of the texts and *compare* these schemes with each other to see... to contrast what the authors say... it's like there are few students who can *work with multiple textual sources... the notes of the theoretical classes, the chapters of books and the documents or study guides* (teacher 7).

With regard to perspectives on students' reading practices, and as in national (Carlino and Estienne, 2004; Fernandez and Carlino, 2010) and international studies (Lea and Street, 1998; Turner, 1999), these teachers describe them by referring to the difficulties in identifying main ideas in texts and self-organizing according to the amount to be read. In addition, they describe practices that have not been pointed out in the literature reviewed, for example, writing things on the sides of the text and using colored pieces of paper as indicators. These could be ways of organizing and appropriating the reading material.

Teachers also indicate reading practices in which students relate or intertwine different textual sources – the notes of theoretical classes, book chapters and teaching documents. These seem to be similar to those

that are stated as dialogic or intertwined practices (Carlino, Iglesia and Laxalt, 2013; Cartolari and Carlino, 2012; Dysthe, 1996).

II) Teaching expectations about student reading practices

II. 1) Reading practices that are based on a discursive source

Although teachers state that students have difficulties in organizing the time and amount to read, many of them (25 out of 30 teachers) expect learners to be able to organize time to read – devote at least a couple of hours a day or a week to reading about the subject. They indicate that, as a result of not organizing the times for reading, students resort to summaries made by third parties.

S: What do you expect students to do when reading?

T: Look, I hope *they comply* with what I was telling you, that we make certain *agreements with them, that they dedicate half an hour or an hour to the subject, every day, and if not, that they gather everything in one day*, and that is what we offer them as an alternative (teacher 22).

S: What do you expect from students as readers?

T: I tell them to try to *come with things they've read from home or to read the text in class* to see what we can find to complete the answer, but you turn around and they don't do it. And you realize that since there is already a *little note, a summary made by I don't know who, that's the most important thing and they do that because they don't organize themselves to read...they don't dose their reading, they don't dedicate a little bit of time to the subject every day*, they don't do that, so *the easiest way out is that summary* (teacher 12).

S: What do you expect from students as readers?

T: *That they organize their times to read*, that is essential. Because of course, I give up, so what do they do? *They begin to study one or two days before the term exam. They do not know that they have to prepare...*And this implies sitting for at least four hours a day, and they believe that with half an hour it is enough (teacher 9).

In addition, almost all (23 out of 30 teachers) expect students to be able to read based on what teachers ask for, identify key ideas from texts, or look for specific ideas in texts – the ideas they mark as main ideas they should identify in texts. They note that when students do not perform these operations, they appeal to summaries made by third parties, a practice they consider inadvisable.

S: What do you expect your students to do as readers?

T: I think what I hope to find is that they read and look for those things that have been presented as important and not that they mark the whole text as important, and well, *those concepts that we tell them are important because we know the subject* (teacher 25).

S: What do you expect your students to do when they read?

T: Well, that they can *find and identify the main ideas that we mark in the texts...* we teachers expect students to see those ideas that we think are important... What I like that they can do and I hope they do is *that they use as a mental scissor to cut specific information* and that they do not think that everything is important (teacher 17).

S: And you, specifically, how do you think a student has to read in college or what do you expect your students to do with the texts?

T: I hope that *they read and manage to mark something, main ideas. I hope to see highlighter traces, but not all the text marked, just specific things*, those things that we are presenting as important things and not that they come with those summaries that circulate ... those folders with summaries of the texts whose authors they do not even know (teacher 23).

S: What do you expect the students to do as readers?

T: That they arrive with *things read to practical sessions* and that they can see *well what is important about the texts...* because otherwise they end up studying those *folders with summaries of the texts whose authors they do not even know*. They study from there because it is the easiest... Also that they get to read everything for the partial... that there is really a *commitment of each one to read the texts and highlight main ideas, appropriating the texts ...and not that they read of poorly made summaries* (teacher 11).

The expectations of these teachers are focused on students being able to perform a strategic search for information in the texts. Therefore, they hope that students can focus on the ideas that teachers consider to be the most important in the texts and that they can "cut" those ideas or specific information. This is more similar to what is described as monological practices in international (Dysthe, 2011; Dysthe, 2012; Dysthe, Samara and Westheim, 2006) and national studies (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012), since what would be privileged is that which, from the teaching discourse, is marked as the main ideas.

In addition, teachers also state what they do not expect: that students read what is called in this study "summaries made by third parties". It should be noted that this results in an emerging category that is defined as

folders with summaries of the texts of the bibliography of the subjects whose authorship is unknown to the students. However, these texts seem to be regarded as authoritative bibliography by learners.

These teachers do not seem to accept the inclusion of these texts that are not those that have been selected by them as bibliographic material. In the present study, the inquiry into these texts has not been deepened. But if we take into account that these teachers expect students to identify in the texts those ideas that they consider central, it could be that they do not accept these texts because they do not "authorize" the presence of voices whose authorship is unknown.

Likewise, the fact that these teachers expect monologue reading practices from their students may be due to the fact that they notice difficulties in them to identify main ideas in the texts and organize their time according to the amount to be read. Perhaps this type of practice would be seen as a remedial or palliative aid that could make reading easier for students.

II. 2) Reading practices linking multiple discursive sources

In contrast to what was developed in the previous section, few teachers (5 of 30 teachers) indicate as a practice to read with the students taking into account the program of the subject and relating the bibliography with the theoretical class and the authors among themselves.

As anticipated, these teachers hope that students can consider the programs of the subjects and that they learn to read taking into account this as a guide. They value the logical organization of a program and how it relates to the possibility of understanding what is read.

S: What do you expect your students to do as readers?

T: Look, I hope they can read taking into account the program of the subject, in fact, the program is one more text of our subject. *All programs must have a logical order, one unit has to be related to another.* For example, if they have not understood thought in classical sociological, this dichotomy between objectivism and subjectivism, I have no tools to think Bourdieu, Guiddens, in a unit number four ...*But of course, if that logical order is not understood it will be very difficult to contextualize and understand what I read* (teacher 2).

S: What do you expect your students to do as readers?

T: *I like that they read with the program of the subject at the same time... I teach them that the program is the compass, the guide to read, to know in which thematic unit we are, what to read and that these authors allow to know certain contents. I ask them to tell me from the program what texts they had to read. I make a brief introduction, where I tell them who are the authors who are about to read, why, if what they have in front of them is a book chapter, or whatever...* (teacher 3).

In addition, their expectations are focused on students reading taking into account what has been developed in the theoretical classes since they allow them to focus on the most significant in the texts.

S: What do you expect from students as readers?

T: Look, that they read following our guidelines and not... erratically. They have *theoretical orientations*, theoretical presentations by a teacher, so, there is a first guide to focus on what is important (teacher 4).

T: What I tell them and I emphasize is that they come to *the theorist* because it provides them with the scheme of where

they have to point out, because if they had that outline, there are things that they would realize are not part of the summary of the text that they can do. Then, *from the theoretical class they can take out the most important*, and fill it in or add things that they see are useful for them. Actually, the theory can make them realize that it is not the entire text (teacher 5).

These teachers choose to guide students by reading along with them. To do this, they help them identify positions in the texts, tell them who the authors are, when they wrote and why, and show them the primary sources. They also work with study guides that include questions that are answered by relating texts or parts of texts. They help them to relate what has been developed in the theoretical classes, what is proposed in the texts and the explanations of the teachers. They underline the importance of reflecting on teaching practices as a way to help students.

S: What do you expect your students to do when they read?

T: I hope they read but...*I tell them who are the authors who are about to read, why, if what they have in front of them is a book chapter, or whatever ... I go to the practical with the book, I show you the book, and with the booklet too. As there are many, I prefer to work with guides, questions that are sometimes answered from an author, from the section of a text and other times from more than one author, or from sections of different texts ... so that they see that the texts can be related.* I also suggest them to see *how the author approaches the subject... it would be what is the skeleton of the text*, in general, that they see how the author is introducing the topics... because there are questions that have to do with it. I suggest that they have at hand *the notes of the theoretical class...And with those clues they answer the questions... in addition to*

the notes of the theoretical class... I do what I can from my teaching space... *read with my students, tell them who they read, why they wrote, at what time they wrote, that what they read are photocopies but that those photocopies are in books, show them the books ...* I think we have to be able to think about what we do, how we teach the students, that seems important to me, *to be able to reflect on what we do* (teacher 3).

S: What do you expect from students as readers?

T: I told you, *this is a challenge...* I can expect them to read but I have chosen to help them and that is why this year *particularly it has been positive to work with the texts in the committees...* yesterday for example, I worked with a text by Weber, *moving paragraph by paragraph*, and trying to understand well the criticism of such a topic. *Here the author is in favor of such a position, here the author presents his proposal*, and help the students to follow it ... That this year I have modified the way of working, the strategy of the practical classes, this of grabbing the text and working it in class all together...*has to do with my reflections on this, that a more explicit guide was needed for the guys...* The practices become this, let's say, in trying to relocate them, and *look at the texts in the light of what they have seen in the theoretical class* and, then, take it to the student, give him/her a hand... out there we are not one of those teachers who leave the student alone, because we know the difficulties posed by understanding the texts of the bibliography (teacher 6).

In this case, there are few teachers (5 out of 30 teachers) who raise the need to relate the explanations given in the theoretical class with what is done in practice. Also, these teachers raise the importance of contextualizing what is read. Only a teacher indicates that

he reads with his students and guides them in this process - and to read together with the students as a way to guide them - helping them to focus on the central ideas, clearing up doubts that arise. The latter coincides with what was found by Carlino and Estienne (2004) and Natale et al. (Braidot, Moyano, Natale and Roiter, 2012; Natale, 2013; Natale, and Stagnaro, 2013).

These teachers seem to work more from what Carlino, Iglesia and Laxalt (2013) call "intertwined" reading since they propose to mediate the reading processes during classes and encourage interactions to talk about what is read between teacher and students and between peers. In addition, although they do not disclose whether reading is one of the purposes of the subject, according to what is indicated in international (Dysthe, 2011; Dysthe, 2011 Dysthe, Samara and Westrheim, 2006; Wake, Dysthe and Mjelstad, 2007) and national studies (Cartolari and Carlino, 2012), seem to work in a dialogic way. This is pointed out since they indicate to promote spaces in which they talk about what is read, linking what is understood by the students with the explanations of the teacher.

While these teachers also propose that students do not read and that they have difficulty organizing time according to the amount of material to be read, they are able to recognize that students' reading difficulties may have to do, in part, with what is read. In this sense, the teachers point out that in the reading material there are many primary sources and few secondary sources and, that convoluted texts or texts that include multiple voices of authors prevail over texts that explain. Although the inquiry into this last aspect has not been deepened, it is considered that the fact that teachers can reflect on the characteristics of the reading material they provide to learners is fundamental to be able to teach them to read it and build disciplinary knowledge based on reading.

It is also these teachers who notice that some students are able to organize reading material,

identifying relevant information in it and reading and linking multiple textual sources. The latter is consonant with the type of reading practices that teachers indicate to promote in their subjects: dialogic reading practices. So, although these teachers notice difficulties when reading in their students, within the framework of their subjects they seem to try to help them by generating reading spaces tending to build shared meanings about what is read.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study has been to describe the perspectives and expectations of teachers about the reading practices of students of the Psychology career of a public university. As for the teaching perspectives on reading, teachers point out, basically, two issues. On the one hand, that students do not read, that they read and mark the text excessively as if they could not identify main ideas and that they cannot organize time according to the amount of material to be read. On the other, that learners read, organize reading material and read multiple textual sources. In addition, few teachers notice that their difficulties have to do with the reading material they offer and many teachers attribute these difficulties to what was not taught at the previous educational level.

We also found that most teachers expect students to read monologically and, least, in a dialogical way. In relation to the first practice, teachers expect learners to make a strategic search for specific information in the texts. On the second, teachers wait and teach them to contextualize what they read and to relate what was raised in the theoretical classes, with the bibliography proposed for a topic and with the explanations of the teacher.

In short, it can be seen that some teaching conceptions focus on the difficulties of

students to read and that the expected reading practices – monological practices – are related to them. At the same time, these practices could constitute the way that these teachers generate to help their students with difficulties. It is also observed that there are teachers who notice both the difficulties and the possibilities of their students as readers and, consequently, the expected and taught reading practices would make it possible to link multiple discursive sources including what the texts propose, what is understood by the students and the explanations of the teachers. In this sense, a contribution of this work is to visualize how teacher perspectives about reading are intertwined with what teachers expect from learners like readers.

Both in the case of the monological reading practices and in the case of the dialogic ones expected by the teachers, as indicated by Lillis (1999) and Lea and Street (1998), are reading conventions typical of the academic culture of this particular community. Both seem to be taught and made explicit by teachers in their eagerness to allow students to participate in the community of reference.

In addition, it is necessary to point out that despite the differences observed in the perspectives and expectations of teachers around reading, there are no elements to indicate that dialogic reading practices are better than the monological reading practices expected by the vast majority of teachers. However, Cartolari and Carlino (2012) propose that dialogic reading practices have greater epistemic potential. If we take this approach into account, future inquiries could address this question in order to reflect on which kind of reading teaching practices possess the greatest epistemic potential in this particular disciplinary community.

Since this study has been carried out from a qualitative approach and given the limited size

of the sample, it is considered that it is not feasible to make generalizations beyond similar cases and in related circumstances. But, the present research offers a series of questions that could be investigated in future research: how do teacher perspectives and expectations around reading relate to teaching practices of reading teaching? Will teachers promote monological or dialogical instances of teaching and learning of reading in the classroom? What perspectives do students have about reading and what do they expect from teachers?

Likewise, this contribution can allow us to think in other academic contexts how the teaching perspectives on reading relate to what they expect from students as academic readers. In this sense, as Carlino (2005) indicated, if usually in educational institutions it is heard that "students do not read" or that "students do not understand what they read", studies such as the one that has been faced can constitute the starting point to begin to investigate these issues in academic communities and begin to make visible the possible reasons for this situation.

REFERENCES

- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanič, R. (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. Psychology Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science* (Vol. 356). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communities*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blommaert, J., Street, B., Turner, J., & Scott, M. (2007). Academic literacies: what have we achieved and where to from here. *Journal of applied linguistics*, 4(1), 137-49.
- Braidot, N., Moyano, E., Natale, L., & Roitter, S. (2012). Enseñanza de la lectura y la escritura como política institucional a lo largo de las carreras de ingeniería del IDEI-UNGS. In *Trabajos Completos, VI Congreso Argentino de Enseñanza de la Ingeniería (CAEDI)*, Salta, september, 1997.
- Carlino, P. (2005). *Escribir, leer y aprender en la Universidad. Una introducción a la alfabetización académica*. Bs. As: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Carlino, P., & Estienne, V. (2004). ¿Pueden los universitarios leer solos? Un estudio exploratorio. *Memorias de las XI Jornadas de Investigación en Psicología. Faculty of Psychology of the University of Buenos Aires*, 29, 174-177.
- Carlino, P., Iglesia, P., Laxalt, I. (2013). Qué dicen los docentes que hacen cuando los alumnos no comprenden lo que leen. In *XII Congreso Latinoamericano para el Desarrollo de la Lectura y la Escritura. IV Foro Iberoamericano de Literacidad y Aprendizaje*. Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México, July 2013.
- Cartolari, M., & Carlino, P. (2012). Leer y tomar apuntes para aprender en la formación docente: un estudio exploratorio. *Magis. Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 4(7), 67-86.
- Collier, P. J., & Morgan, D. L. (2008). Is that paper really due today?: differences in first-generation and traditional college students' understandings of faculty expectations. *Higher Education*, 55(4), 425-446.

- Dysthe, O. (1996). The Multivoiced Classroom Interactions of Writing and Classroom Discourse. *Written communication*, 13(3), 385-425.
- Dysthe, O. (2011). Opportunity spaces for dialogic pedagogy in test-oriented schools: A case study of teaching and learning in high school. *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe*, 90, 69.
- Dysthe, O., Bernhardt, N., Esbjørn, L. (2012) *Dialogue-based teaching. The art museum as a learning space*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Skoletjenesten.
- Dysthe, O., Samara, A., & Westrheim, K. (2006). Multivoiced supervision of Master's students: a case study of alternative supervision practices in higher education. *Studies in Higher education*, 31(03), 299-318.
- Fernández, G. M. E., & Carlino, P. (2006). Leer y escribir en la escuela media y en la universidad. Diferencias percibidas por ingresantes a la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas de la UNCPBA. In *XIII Jornadas de Investigación y Segundo Encuentro de Investigadores en Psicología del Mercosur*. Faculty of Psychology, University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, November 28-30, 2006.
- Fernández, G., & Carlino, P. (2010). ¿En qué se diferencian las prácticas de lectura y escritura de la universidad y las de la escuela secundaria?. *Lectura y Vida*, 31(3), 6-19.
- Hernández Sampieri, R., Fernández- Collado C. & Baptista Lucio, P. (2008). *Metodología de la Investigación*. Mexico: McGraw Hill.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lea, M. R. (1999). Academic literacies and learning in higher education: Constructing knowledge through texts and experience. *Students writing in the university: Cultural and epistemological issues*, 103-124.
- Lea, M. & Street, B. (1997). *Perspectives on Academic Literacies: an institutional approach*. Swindon: Economic and Social Research Council.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in higher education*, 23(2), 157-172.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and Applications. *Theory into practice*, 45(4), 368-377.
- Lillis, T. (1997). New voices in academia? The regulative nature of academic writing conventions. *Language and Education*, 11(3), 182-199.
- Lillis, T. (1999). Whose common sense. *Essayist literacy and the institutional practice of mystery*. 127-140.
- Lillis, T. (2001). *Student writing: access, regulation, desire*. Literacies. UK: Routledge.
- Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of applied linguistics*, 4(1), 5-32.
- Natale, L. (2013). Integración de enfoques en un programa institucional para el desarrollo de la escritura académica y profesional. *Revista mexicana de investigación educativa*, 18(58), 685-707.

- Natale, L. & Stagnaro, D. (2013). Alfabetización profesional durante la carrera universitaria: entre la universidad y la empresa. *Itinerarios educativos*, 7, 11-28.
- Scott, M. (1999) Agency and subjectivity in student writing. In C. Jones, J. Turner and B. Street (eds) *Students Writing in the University: cultural and epistemological issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stierer, B. (1997). Mastering Education: a preliminary analysis of academic literacy practices within masters-level courses in Education. In *Higher Education Close Up*, at University of Central Lancashire, Preston, 6-8 july.
- Street, B. (1999). Academic Literacies. In J Turner & B. Street *Students writing in the university: cultural and epistemological issues* (pp. 193-228). Philadelphia: JB publishing company.
- Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current issues in comparative education*, 5(2), 77-91.
- Turner, J. (1999). Academic literacy and the discourse of transparency. In: C. Jones, J. Turner & B. Street (eds.) *Students writing in the university: cultural and epistemological issues* (149-169). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.