

# **Training Method for Secondary School Teachers as Readers**

**Silvia Verónica Valdivia Yábar**  
**National University of the Altiplano in Peru**

**Luis Enrique Tineo Quispe**  
**Universidad Antonio Ruiz de Montoya**

*The teaching of literary reading remains organized around activities that hide the subjectivity of the reader. However, several researchers affirm that all reading is subjective and that the involvement of the reading subject would stimulate personal reactions and plural readings. In this framework, the objective of this study was to understand the effects of a teaching method of comprehensive work on the training of future teachers of Spanish in a program of studies at the Universidad Nacional del Altiplano in Peru. The qualitative research approach, the type of explanatory research, and the quasi-experimental design were adopted. A teacher trainer directed the didactic sequence, organized in seven sessions. The subjective investment of eight voluntary participants was observed and interpreted to understand how to better train them in literary reading and teaching. The results allowed us to identify the subjective resources mobilized by the teachers and to observe the modalities of the reflexivity of the students in the oral and written productions.*

*Keywords: didactics of Spanish, didactic sequence, teacher training, teacher reader subject, literary reading*

## **INTRODUCTION**

According to the works on initial teacher training in Peru (Vaillant, 2019) and the reports of pedagogical advisors and managers (Vecchione, 2020), it is inferred that the teaching of literary reading is organized around textual analysis activities and that the subjectivity of the reader is a source of falsehoods. On the other hand, according to research in Spanish didactics (Munita, 2016), all reading is an individual experience. Based on these analyses, this research has focused on the formation of the reading subject teachers in a curriculum of the Universidad Nacional del Altiplano in Peru to put students at the center of learning (Perla, 2020).

Indeed, formalist approaches to teaching reading have been criticized for hiding the effective participation of readers (Langlade, 2004). In the case of Spanish language teaching in Peru, it is precisely the case of explained reading, inherited from the historical approach, and methodical reading, inherited from formalist approaches. Although they come from different theoretical approaches, these two methods are essentially based on a masterly teaching of literary forms and processes. Methodical reading (advocated by Peruvian programs since 1995) goes through a formal explanation of narrative or stylistic processes, the

literary text is presented as a closed and self-sufficient linguistic object. The persistence of the teaching of methodical reading is an obstacle to taking into account the actual readers (Galindo et. al., 2022).

In the last twenty years, there has been a lot of research on the teaching of literary reading from kindergarten to university (Dufays et. al., 2005). Although the concept of literary reading is still debated, some practical consensus has emerged (Durão, 2022) on the importance of taking into consideration the reader's activity in the elaboration of the significations of the text. For Langlade (2004), it is necessary to show all the didactic interest in a renewal of school reading practices. As each reader completes the work according to his or her subjectivity, it is necessary to understand how student readers are involved in the reconfiguration of the literary text. Students' actual readings and, therefore, the singular and subjective dimensions of all reading have become the central objects of interest for certain literature teachers. The notion of the reading subject takes into account these concerns.

After a brief presentation of the key concepts of the research, this article will give an overview of the methodology through the experimental approach used with the trainee teachers. Then, the analysis of the main results will lead to identifying the limits of this approach.

## **THEORETICAL REFERENCE**

### **Literary Reading**

Literary reading has been the object of several definitions in the didactics of the Spanish language. Today, it is accepted that the reader plays an active role in the construction of textual meaning and that, therefore, every text can be considered the product of a reading (Ricoeur, 1985). Since 2004, after the publication of the proceedings of the colloquium on the reading subject, several literary researchers have been studying the actualization and reconfiguration of the read work. For Sauvaire (2013), literary reading allows the encounter between a plural and changing text and a plural and changing reader, whose multiplicities mutually alter each other. For Emery-Bruneau (2011), literary reading is seen as the dynamic activity of a reader engaged in a dialectic between a participatory reading, i.e. a subjective reading experienced in a rather affective way, and a distanced reading, in other words, a reading of effects experienced in a more intellectualized way. It is thus a dynamic process of meaning research, where the reader oscillates between values related to referents (unity of meaning, aesthetic conformity, truth) and values linked to the forms of the message (polysemy, subversion, fictionality). This ties in with the definition of Dufays et al. (2005), in presenting literary reading as a dialectical back and forth between the postures of participation and distancing.

### **Purposes of Teaching Literary Reading**

According to the official Spanish teaching programs in Peru, whose objectives have been kept since 1995, it is necessary to form balanced men, capable of reasoning, of using their brain which is not a sack to be filled, but a multifaceted value to be discovered, sustained and developed (Educación, 2016). In other words, the teaching of Spanish should not be reduced to the transmission of knowledge but should be a place of training in reflection and the elaboration of personal judgment. Moreover, if Spanish teachers are not to reduce their activity to making students acquire a repertoire of references, it is essential to specify the purposes to which the teaching of literary reading responds.

Nowadays, literary reading, defined as a dialectical process that requires involvement (subjective reading) and distancing (objective reading) on the part of the reading subjects (Ahr, 2014), invites to create a space where the voice of the reading subject can be heard and fed by those companions in a dialectical to-and-fro. This dialectical conception of literary reading presents proven didactic challenges. According to Dufays (2013), the notion of literary reading was developed to inspire teachers' and students' actions for them to produce singular readings. According to us, the theoretical approach to literary reading can serve as a framework for the programming of literary teaching activities and the training of readers.

The fact is that if the school is the place of the shaping of the personality (Dufays et al., 2005; Educación, 2016), the approaches used in the Spanish class in Peru reduce the student to a simple performer. As the latest report on the teaching of Spanish in Peru and the works on initial training in Peru (Vecchione,

2020) show, the objectives of building the individual, aimed at by official instructions, are not achieved. That is why we ask ourselves how to form teacher-reader subjects.

### **Teaching Literary Reading**

Teaching literary reading means taking into account the subjectivity of readers, encouraging interactions between peers in front of the text, and forming reading subjects. Starting from the idea of going back and forth between the postures of participation and distancing according to Dufays et al. (2005), and of the activity of the reading subject according to Sauvaire (2013), the reading subjects teachers are going to be trained, that is, the Spanish teachers who will not limit themselves to be only the passionate reading animators or the interpretative guides, but will also be the reflexive professionals, sensitive, equipped, able to make students experience the inductive approaches that will push them to find the source of their sensitivity and reflexivity in literary reading to better understand themselves and develop as reading subjects (Émery-Bruneau, 2011)

Based on the method used during this research, it is expressed that the training of teacher-reader participants is a requirement for the teaching of Spanish.

### **Teacher-Reader Individuals, a Didactic Necessity**

Within the framework of this research, it was postulated that helping future Spanish teachers to assume their role and their condition of reading subjects can contribute to training them in the teaching of literary reading. For Ahr (2014), a reading subject is an autonomous, critical subject, aware of his tastes, and capable of expressing a feeling, an emotion, or a judgment based on his reading of the text, his experience, and his previous readings. He is also capable of comparing his reading experience not only with that of his peers but also with that of the many readers who preceded him.

In other words, it is a reader who reads a text with all the subjective and cultural resources at his or her disposal. It is considered that the formation of reading teachers is intrinsically linked to the teaching of literary reading.

As Deronne (2011) points out, it seems appropriate to train teacher-reader subjects to understand how the relationship between oneself and the text and between oneself and others develops to determine how literary reading contributes to the formation of oneself as a reader. These future teachers, considered as the reading subjects, could then take into account the participation of the students in their teaching practices.

### **Teachers Trained in Reflexivity**

The insights from the works of Émery-Bruneau (2011) and Sauvaire (2013) confirm that, subjective reading is a reflexive reading. According to Sauvaire (2013), reflexivity, understood as a distancing and self-reflection, is linked to the emergence of subjectivity. Thus, to teach subjective literary reading is to contribute to the development of readers' reflexivity.

Training teachers in reflexivity means teaching them to interpret a literary text and leading them to understand themselves as reading subjects. This distancing from their reading is favored by reflexive writing and orality (Sauvaire, 2015). Thus, to develop the reflexive abilities of the PEF trainee teachers, oral and written production activities around a collection of poems were alternated in the didactic sequence. It would seem that some activities occasion reflexive linguistic practices more than others. Therefore, the teacher should think of himself as a reading subject in the class to become aware of the role of subjectivity in the construction of signification. In this way, the training of teacher-reader subjects contributes to their training in the teaching of literary reading.

### **Difficulties in the Training of Teacher-Reader Subjects**

The training of reading teachers remains a challenge to be met in a school tradition oriented towards the construction of an expert reading posture. According to Langlade (2004), expert reading focuses interpretation of aesthetic characteristics and analytical tools. Therefore, it is thought that making room for the teacher-reader subject in training programs means accepting in class the subjective reading of future teachers, that is, making room for their imagination and the back and forth between personal investment in

reading and distancing from the text. Massol and Shawky-Milcent (2011), highlight the persistence of traditional exercises, supporting standardized writing of reading, taking into account that the subjective readings of readers are perceived by some as a form of non-respect for the rights of the text. Despite these resistances, it is thought that the training of reading subject teachers is a didactic necessity to better understand and teach literary reading.

## METHODOLOGY

The methodology is framed within the qualitative approach. Particular attention was paid to the subjectivity of the readers. This is why the qualitative approach was chosen since it allowed the collection of verbal data that facilitated an interpretative approach. Starting from the general objective, which is to understand the effects of a method for teaching a comprehensive work on the training of secondary school teachers in Peru, research training was chosen as the type of research. This is a type of research conducted with the researcher, the trainer, and the teachers in initial or continuous training. During data collection, the research-training process made it possible to interact with the trainer and the future teachers during the implementation of the didactic device.

### Presentation of the Method

Several didactic methods (Burdet and Guillemin, 2013; Ouellet, 2012) were used to develop this didactic sequence. These mechanisms have the advantage of integrating reading, speaking, and writing activities to develop the linguistic and interpretative skills of students and trainee teachers. A progression has been followed that integrates the principle of going back and forth between individual readings of texts and their interpretations by readers in reading circles (CL) and reading journals. This sequence aims to lead each one to formulate a subjective interpretation and to develop the reflexivity of the subject reader-teachers (SLP).

### Target Population

Regarding the sample, a non-probabilistic sampling by reasoned choice was carried out guided by the following selection criteria: to be a PEF enrolled in the Education Studies Program at the Universidad Nacional del Altiplano; to be in the first year of training in the teaching of Spanish in secondary school.

The target population consisted of students trained in the methodologies of the texts and the didactics of the tests in high school exams. There was one teacher trainer and 17 students of at least 18 years of age, distributed as follows:

**TABLE 1**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROJECT PARTICIPANTS**

Participating students	Level	Number of women	Number of men
Undergraduate	1st semester	6	8
Undergraduate	2nd semester	1	2

The data come from the analysis of the didactic sequence carried out by the teacher trainer with the eight volunteer PEF trainee teachers and from the collective semi-directed interview conducted with the latter.

The particularity of these participants was that they had not been taught Spanish in high school. In addition, they had been trained in the practice of methodical reading for the teaching of literary texts. Starting from the general objective of understanding the effects of a teaching device of an integral work in the training of secondary school PEFs in Peru, the approach was undoubtedly inscribed in the hermeneutic and praxeological aspects of research in the didactics of literature (Dufays et. al., 2005). Therefore, the data collected were interpreted and analyzed according to the research objectives.

## **Development of the Didactic Sequence**

The didactic sequence is based on a collection of poems by César Vallejo, the Peruvian writer. This sequence is part of the competency-based approach prescribed by the Ministry of Education, which aims to offer an education centered on the development of the learner's competencies, competencies that are transferable from one discipline to another, and on his or her involvement in his or her learning. This sequence was organized around oral and written activities that encouraged PEFs to adopt creative and reflexive stances. These different activities were thought to contribute to the formation of SLPs.

The sequence included seven-course sessions and one preliminary session. In agreement with the students at the time of recruiting the participants and the teacher trainer, it was decided to conduct two sessions per day in the morning, from 9 to 10 and from 11 to 12:30. The sequence was conducted in a secondary education classroom in May 2022. Finally, this sequence initially planned in eight sessions was carried out in seven sessions (because sessions 7 and 8 mentioned in the research project were combined).

During the preliminary session, the teacher trainer gave theoretical updates on literary reading. From a fascicle of texts given to them in advance, the PEFs shared their understanding of the key notions of literary reading. This session finished with the distribution of the collection of poems by César Vallejo and the readers' journals. The following seven sessions led to the composition of the reading circles and the actual study of the collection of poems. During this didactic sequence, the role of the teacher trainer consisted in encouraging the students' involvement and supporting them in becoming aware of themselves as readers. The sequence ended with an individual analysis in the journals of a poem chosen by all participants.

## **Methodological Justification**

According to Ouellet (2012), a teaching method is a set of means and activities implemented by a teacher with the aim of training students. By considering literary reading as an interactional process between readers and works (Langlade, 2004), a teaching method has been designed to train teacher-reader subjects. We focused on activities that favored the confrontation between peers and the subjective investment of the readers. This method has made it possible to:

- Stimulate readers' fictionalizing activity, revealing and producing imagination (Langlade, 2004).
- Promote interactions between peers to enrich and develop the uniqueness of each reader, as they enrich and develop each other (Ouellet, 2012).
- Promote a reflective attitude (Dufays, 2013; Ouellet, 2012; Sauvaire, 2013) by a back and forth in the activities of reading and interpreting the initial text;
- Collect readers' singular texts (Petit, 1999; Munita, 2016).

This method was based on a collection of poems chosen based on the emotional charge and interpretative freedom offered by poetry. Research in Spanish didactics highlights the need to vary students' activities in the teaching of literary reading (Colomer, 2005). By creating a teaching method that can stimulate the subjective activity of readers, we wish to propose an alternative solution to traditional approaches. The confrontation of individual readings of trainee teachers could be a source of enrichment for the construction of each reader's interpretations. This is why, in this didactic sequence, different activities (reading circles, reading diary, individual and collective reading) have been combined to allow the PEFs to acquire interpretative skills for the production of a singular text.

## **Data Collection Tools**

### *The Reading Journals*

According to Giasson (2014), a reading journal is a tool for reacting to texts. It is for this reason that, since the preliminary session, each participant was given a reading journal that was used during the 7 sessions of the course. The students have used it in different ways. Some of them have transcribed all the activities carried out during the sessions. For others, the journal was used solely for individual interpretations of the collection. The reading journal emerged as a means of keeping track of individual readers' readings and, above all, as a means of taking into account what readers do.

In this research, the reading journal was considered as a data collection instrument. Presented as a space that allows one to account for their reading activity (Ahr, 2014; Giasson, 2014), the reading journal is a means of access to the reader's singular text. The data collected through this instrument allow us to take cognizance of the effects of this sequence on the PEFs' interpretations. It is not only a memory support, but also an aid to text interpretation. To date, several works confirm its importance in the formation of readers (Vibert, 2013). These authors argue that the reading journal leads its users to adopt a reflective attitude that favors a back-and-forth between their writings and readings. The reading journal is also a tool for reflection. According to Giasson (2014), the reading journal enables the development of readers' reflexivity, as they refer to it to explain, analyze and evaluate practice. In addition, the readers' texts that were transcribed and analyzed in this research come from the reading journals. One of the PEFs, "it is a medium or tool that allows us to preserve the diverse reactions of the readers of a literary text" (Diary, p.1).

In short, there were no instructions for the use of the journals. Each PEF was free to make personal use of them. It was noted that some are dated and organized chronologically according to the sessions, while others appear as simple scattered notes. Nevertheless, this instrument made it possible to learn about the effects of the device on the PEFs' interpretations of the poems (their reading abilities) and to analyze the effects of the device on the PEFs' conception of literary reading (the appropriation of a didactic notion).

### *Reading Circles*

Beginning in session 1, the teacher trainer asked the PEFs to establish reading circles (hereafter CL). The PEFs established three CLs according to the layout of the classroom. A leader was designated in each circle. The role of the latter was to summarize the activities carried out in the circle. Then, the PEFs discovered that they could alternate roles in the circle.

In this research, the CLs constituted the central activity of the didactic sequence. Indeed, the discussions in the CLs were aimed at promoting the subjective investment of the readers. These circles were effective during sessions 1, 2, 4, and 5. According to Burdet and Guillemin (2013), a CL is a didactic device within which participants, gathered in small heterogeneous groups, learn to interpret and construct knowledge from literary texts or ideas. In other words, reading circles would promote interactions between readers and allow for a better understanding of texts.

As part of this sequence, the CLs created had the following objectives:

- to stimulate the activity of the reading subjects;
- take into account the subjective experience of the readers and their mastery of the text;
- allow dialogue between peers and learn to discuss to build together new ideas about the text.

For all PEFs, CLs are a device to experiment with in class, because by encouraging peer interactions, they give everyone the occasion "to go beyond their solitary fears and to enrich themselves from the point of view of others" (Diary, p.2). It is, therefore, a didactic tool that seems to be adapted to the training of teacher readers.

## **RESULTS**

### **Presentation and Analysis of Data**

In this section, the discourse analysis of eight PEFs for teaching Spanish at the secondary level is presented. These participants who met the selection criteria provided varied data to better understand how to form teacher-reader subjects from the didactic method produced. The results of the different subjects come from the reading journals, the reading circles, and the semi-directed interview transcribed in full verbatim. All the subjects appropriated the device in such a way that their data appeared complementary (Table 2) and made it possible to see the main dimensions of SLE formation.

**TABLE 2**  
**ANALYSIS OF RESULTS BY SUBJECT**

	<b>Subjects per day</b>	<b>Reading circles</b>	<b>Interview</b>	<b>Categories</b>
Subject 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and description of the knowledge and practices taught.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formulation of interpretative hypotheses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and explanation of the knowledge and practices taught</li> </ul>	Mastery of knowledge and teaching practices Subjective summary reading Development of the SLP's reflexivity (subject-reader-teacher)
Subject 2	Comprehensive recovery of the knowledge taught Development of the reader's subjectivity Formulation of interpretative hypotheses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking into account the contribution of peers in the development of reflexivity</li> </ul>	Analysis of their training process Verbalization	Mobilization of subjective resources Questioning of the reader Personality of the author involved Distancing from the knowledge and practices taught in the training course Commentary on oneself as SLP
Subject 3	Comprehensive retrieval of the knowledge taught Transcription of the answers to the interview guide Formulation of one's interpretations of the collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity propitious to the interpretation of texts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflexivity of the SLP</li> </ul>	Mobilization of subjective resources and distancing from their interpretations. Distancing from the knowledge to be taught and from the practices experienced in training. Commentary on oneself as a reader and as a teacher
Subject 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of the text regarding epistemic resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding oneself as a reading subject and interpreting texts</li> </ul>	Weak reflective activity as a reader Negative impact of traditional analysis	Mobilization of subjective resources Personality of the author involved Questioning of the reader Reader's reflexivity
Subject 5	Development of reflexivity as a reader	Identification and explanation of their interpretations Assumed subjectivity (self)	Reversal of the reader Projection as a teacher	Mobilization of subjective resources Understanding of oneself as a reader

	Comprehensive retrieval of the taught knowledge			Distancing from the knowledge and practices taught during the training process
Subject 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification, explanation, and evaluation of interpretations</li> </ul>	<p>Strong reflective activity as a reading subject</p> <p>Leading position and management of interactions</p>	<p>Strong reflective activity as SLE</p> <p>Posture as a leader</p> <p>Evaluation of knowledge and practices taught</p>	<p>Distancing from their interpretations</p> <p>Personality of the author involved</p> <p>Distancing from the knowledge and practices experienced in training</p>
Subject 7	<p>Strong reflective activity as a reading subject</p> <p>Formulation of interpretative hypotheses</p> <p>Analysis of their interpretative process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of the poems about epistemic resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take into account the contribution of peers in the development of the reader's reflexivity.</li> </ul>	<p>Distancing from teaching</p> <p>Questioning the reader</p> <p>Understanding of oneself as a reader</p> <p>Distancing from the knowledge and practices experienced in training</p>
Subject 8	<p>Linguistic, encyclopedic, and rhetorical knowledge.</p> <p>Illustration of each poem in the collection</p>	<p>Reflective activity from the identification of hypotheses in the validation of interpretations.</p> <p>Leader's position</p>		<p>Mobilization of subjective resources</p> <p>Questioning of the reader</p> <p>Becoming aware of the role of peers in the development of their reflexivity as readers.</p> <p>Understanding of oneself as a reader</p> <p>Singular interpretation of the collection</p>

Despite her declared shyness, subject 1 was involved in the different activities carried out. She thinks that it is necessary to master didactic knowledge to be a good reader and a good teacher. This is what was observed in her discourses, through the distancing of knowledge and practices, which testifies here to the development of reflexivity as an SLP. Moreover, it can be argued that peers have strongly contributed to the development of reflexivity as a reader and to her understanding as a reading subject.

Regarding subject 2, his reflexivity as an SLP was real because he distanced his knowledge and practices and analyzed the transformations of his training process over time. However, it is the reflexivity of the reader that predominates in his data, because he distanced his interpretations and commented on himself as a reader. Finally, it seems that the collaborative activities (reading circle and semi-directed interview) allowed him to open up a bit more and produce coherent interpretations. These activities



certainly seem less formalistic than the use of the reader's journal, which for this subject should encourage verbalization by which the reader appropriates the text.

Subject 3, is declared to represent himself as a reading subject thanks to the device and recommends that the reader must be taken beyond first impressions, which leads him to mobilize various resources. In addition, taking into account the knowledge and practices taught and the role of peers in the reflexive appropriation of knowledge and practices led him to develop reflexivity as an SLP.

Subject 4 revealed that it was during the interview that he found satisfaction in training to teach Spanish. His evolution as a reader subject will lead him to produce singular interpretations. Because of his religious beliefs, he says that he was struck by the first poem in the collection under study. But, on the pages, he felt appeased, which revealed his sensitivity as a reader. Moreover, his interpretations of the different poems in the collection reflect a strong mobilization of diverse subjective resources (epistemic, psycho-affective, axiological, and cognitive). In short, the reflexivity of subject 4 as a reader and as an SLP found significant echoes in the device produced since he trusted that in addition to mastering his object, the teacher must be a reading subject.

For subject 5, the reflexivity of the reader is the dominant category. Not only does he mobilize various resources during his interpretations, but he also distances himself from his interpretations, leading to the construction of himself as a reader. On the other hand, his reflexivity as SLP remains shallow, for even if he formulates comprehensive summaries of the knowledge taught, it seems that his appropriation is not effective when he still implies that the reader is as free during methodical reading as during literary reading.

At the end of the experimental method, subject 6 does not seem to perceive the difference between methodical reading and literary reading. In this sense, his interpretations of the collection demonstrate a strong mobilization of epistemic resources, as he first seeks to apply his knowledge in textual analysis. He appears as a resistant case. His disciplinary knowledge does not admit subjectification, unlike others. Despite his involvement in the reading circle, his reflexivity as a reader remains at level 1 (identification of an interpretative hypothesis and explanation), since, according to him, meaning is only found in the text.

As for subject 7, reflexivity as a reader is significantly observed. As a reader subject, she declares to rely particularly on her subjectivity, epistemic resources, and peers. At the level of mobilized resources, these are the epistemic resources that dominate, followed by psycho-affective resources and cognitive resources. In her content, she does not limit herself to distancing herself from her interpretations. She not only formulates personal interpretations but also incorporates the discourses of her peers in the production of her interpretations. Subject 7 has achieved a high level of reflexivity as a reader and as an SLP through the conceptualization of the interpretive process.

Finally, subject 8 made a very clear representation of the knowledge and practices taught in training. According to him, an important place must be given to the person who reads the text and who will give it meaning. He confesses that the device allowed him to realize that he is a reader's subject because meaning is constructed about the reader's subjectivity. He becomes aware of his subjectivity as a reader, which leads him to go back and forth to the text to produce a singular interpretation. On the one hand, his data translate the development of reflexivity as a reader (mobilization of resources, questioning of the reader, intersubjective dimension of learning). On the other hand, the distancing of knowledge and practices, and the construction of the self as a PEF, reveal its reflexivity as an SLP.

### **Synthesis of Data Analysis**

After the data collection, a large amount of data was accumulated with the notes taken in the observation guide during the sessions in the circles, through the readers' diaries, and with the collective semi-directed interview conducted at the end of the didactic sequence. At the end of the device, the CL allowed, on the one hand, to highlight the autonomy of the readers and to observe the determinant impact of the interactions in the production of a singular text. On the other hand, through the CLs, it was possible to observe how the PEFs were constructing their interpretation of the text. The analysis of the collective semi-directed interview revealed that the practices and activities experimented in this method received a favorable opinion from the PEFs in the Education Program. According to the participants, this training was enriching because it allowed them to develop new strategies to better teach literary texts to students. Thus, for one of the PEFs,

through this teaching method, the student expresses himself freely, contrary to a methodical or analytical reading. He goes further by specifying that the student learns to relativize his point of view thanks to the point of view of other readers, a form of interactivity. In short, for him, it is not necessary to hide the reader's subjectivity, because that is part of literary reading.

For another, the subjective investment of the readers allows free rein to the reader's relationship with the text and allows another approach to the text and above all to the intellectual development of the reader. This student concludes his opinion by emphasizing that as a future teacher, it is dangerous to refuse development. Consequently, it is necessary to be trained in literary reading. It is understood that the PEFs consider that the method experimented with has contributed to training them in the teaching of literary reading. Similarly, the knowledge taught has been assimilated, to the extent that most of the participants realize the difference between methodical reading and literary reading. In general, literary reading should be taught because it is the reader who constructs the meaning of the text. One of the PEFs stated that literary reading gives primacy to the reader, so it is different from methodical reading. There is great freedom in the reading subject due to his particular relationship with the text. Whereas, during methodical reading, whatever the relationship one has with the text, it must be kept in a particular method.

### **Comments**

It has been observed that this method is in contradiction with the scholastic and academic training of the PEFs, which is oriented towards the analysis of textual clues. From the data collected, it appears that it is difficult for the PEFs to abstract the poet's personality, more precisely it seems that the reader's subjectivity is expressed according to the traditional enunciative modalities "the poet says that". Thus, interpretations are formulated in the form of the intentions attributed to the poet. For example, in analyzing the collection, one PEF stated that, through all these unfortunate experiences of life, the poet finally realized that he should not blame God and, instead, realize that he was the one who was in a form of illusion (or ignorance) of the reality of existence; hence his return to the father.

In essence, the interpretative activity of the reading subject is not expressed in the first person, while in the interviews the PEFs are mostly considered as reading subjects. This contradiction will merit a more detailed analysis of the data collected. The question of textual genre should also be explored, since, for some participants, the lyric genre constituted an obstacle to the expression of their reader subjectivity, since, according to them, lyricism is the expression of the poet's personal feelings.

### **Limits of the Teaching Method**

#### *Reorganization of the Sessions*

Initially, the sequence comprising eight class sessions, including the preliminary session, was conducted by the teacher trainer in seven sessions. Indeed, during the preliminary session, the teacher trainer noted that the participants were taking notes on the personal supports, while there were tools provided for this. Also, the reading journal was given to them during the preliminary session. This led the teacher-trainer to combine sessions 1 (the reading diary) and 2 (the constitution of the CLs). According to the observation guide, session 1 took place in one hour as follows:

- reading of the text booklet given to the volunteer participants;
- theoretical clarifications by the teacher-trainer;
- presentation of the reading diary by the teacher-trainer;
- exchanges between the participants and the trainer on the usefulness of the reading diary;
- constitution of the CLs;
- rules of interaction and functioning of the CLs.

Given the interest and diversity of the activities carried out during this session, the entry into the work constituted session 2. It was observed during this session, which aimed at the subjective investment of the PEFs, that the circle leaders were in charge of distributing the floor to each member. However, in some circles, the position of the circle leader was compared to that of a teacher in charge. Thus, one of the PEFs stated:

I believe that as states go, some organization is needed. To be understood in these reading activities, we need someone who can, from time to time, frame the discussions or restore order so that we reach the reading objectives. (ENT. 12)

If those in charge of the circles come to be considered the “heads of state”, it is feared that this will prevent the emergence of the reading subjects. Moreover, the teacher must remain a facilitator, i.e., he has an organizational and supportive task (Giasson, 2014). It is not a matter of reproducing the schemes of magisterial teaching.

Then, the method proposed in session 4 (questioning of texts) to work on five poems chosen by the teacher-trainer. Considering the difficulty of the PEFs working on five texts in the CLs in less than two hours, the teacher-trainer chose three poems to use in the CLs. The PEFs found that the time allotted for the interpretation of the texts was too short and that it was better to work on a single text for a collective work that would allow each one to produce a unique interpretation. Finally, although sessions 6 (interpretation of the collection) and 7 (reconfiguration of the text) were led by the trainer, it is thought that they could have been combined into one. Since the interpretation of the collection had begun in session 6, the reconfiguration of the text was organized around the discussion of the activities carried out during the didactic sequence. It is thought that session 6 could have been aimed at the collective interpretation of the collection by the PEFs in the CLs, while session 7 would have been oriented towards a singular interpretation of the collection. The didactic sequence thus reorganized would have ended with a peer evaluation of the PEFs’ interpretations.

#### *Methodological Limitations*

The implementation of knowledge resulting from research encounters obstacles. How to disseminate current devices and renew approaches to teaching and learning literary reading? In the last ten years, many researchers have noted the difficulties encountered in teaching the analysis of literary texts (Massol and Shawky-Milcent, 2011). Thus, the recurrence of traditional exercises based on the acquisition and transmission of knowledge is at the origin of the difficulty of students and even teachers to represent themselves as reading subjects. Given the results, it is understood that making room for subjective reading to form reading subjects is a challenge.

In addition, by choosing the semi-directed group interview as a data collection tool, we wanted, among other things, to identify the resources mobilized by the PEFs. Finally, the fact of conducting a group interview did not leave enough time to go back over the questions asked and the answers given by the participants.

## **CONCLUSION**

Literary reading has been seen as a prodigious means to stimulate students’ creativity and boost interpretive approaches (Munita, 2016) leading to the formation of an active and autonomous reader, capable of understanding and interpreting literary texts. For most PEFs, it is necessary to teach literary reading because this approach allows the teacher to step aside [...] to lead the student to stop being passive and be a constructor of his formation (ENT. 29). This teaching method has shown the determinant impact of interactions in the process of producing a singular text. At the final of this research, it seems that many PEFs have become aware of the transformations of their training trajectories over time. This self-awareness as a reading subject translates into a singular interpretation of texts. The experimentation of a didactic sequence centered on the teaching of literary reading seems to contribute to the formation of teachers as reading individuals, but this theoretical and didactic approach conflicts with the practices and representations resulting from the traditional approaches to school reading.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Translated & edited by American Publishing Services (<https://americanpublishingservices.com/>).

## REFERENCES

- Ahr, S. (2014). *L'enseignement de la littérature aux cycles 3 et 4: Quelles orientations pour quels enjeux?* Retrieved from [https://www.education.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/imported\\_files/document/AHR\\_Sylviane\\_-\\_MCF\\_-\\_CSP\\_Contribution\\_362982.pdf](https://www.education.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/imported_files/document/AHR_Sylviane_-_MCF_-_CSP_Contribution_362982.pdf)
- Burdet, C., & Guillemin, S. (2013). Les cercles de lecture: Un dispositif favorisant la gestion de la compréhension et l'autonomie du lecteur. *Forumlecture. Ch*, (1), 1–22. Retrieved from [https://www.forumlecture.ch/sysModules/obxLeseforum/Artikel/483/2013\\_1\\_Burdet-Guillemin.pdf](https://www.forumlecture.ch/sysModules/obxLeseforum/Artikel/483/2013_1_Burdet-Guillemin.pdf)
- Colomer, T. (2005). *Andar entre libros: La lectura literaria en la escuela*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Deronne, C. (2011). Former des enseignants à exprimer leur expérience singulière d'une œuvre littéraire ou plastique. *Repères*, (43), 103–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/reperes.222>
- Dufays, J.-L. (2013). Sujet lecteur et lecture littéraire: Quelles modélisations pour quels enjeux? *Recherches et Travaux*, (83), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.4000/recherchestravaux.666>
- Dufays, J.-L., Gemenne, L., & Ledur, D. (2005). *Pour une lecture littéraire: Histoire, théories, pistes pour la classe* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). De Boeck.
- Durão, F. (2022). Reconstruyendo un debate. Teoría (literaria) americana. Una introducción crítica. *Literatura: Teoría, Historia, Crítica*, 24(1), 381–408. <https://doi.org/10.15446/lthc.v24n1.98443>
- Educación, P.M.d. (2016). *Currículo nacional de la educación básica*. MINEDU.
- Émery-Bruneau, J. (2011). Former des « sujets-lecteurs-enseignants » : Une responsabilité collective pour des actions didactiques réfléchies. *Québec Français*, (163), 79–81. Retrieved from <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/qf/2011-n163-qf1823256/65428ac/>
- Galindo Ruíz de Chávez, M.D.L.N., & Castro Magaña, J.R. (2022). Eventos y prácticas de literacidad en torno a la formación literaria en educación básica en México. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 22(1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.15517/aie.v22i1.47444>
- Giasson, J. (2014). *Les testes littéraires à l'école*. De Boeck.
- Langlade, G. (2004). Sortir du formalisme, accueillir les lecteurs réels. *Le français aujourd'hui*, (145), 85–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/lfa.145.0085>
- Massol, J.-F., & Shawky-Milcent, B. (2011). Texte du lecteur et commentaire de texte: Relations, évolutions, modalités d'apprentissage. In C. Mazauric, M.-J. Fourtanier, & G. Langlade (Dir.), *Textes de lecteurs en formation* (pp. 231–244). Peter Lang.
- Munita, F. (2016). Prácticas didácticas, creencias y hábitos lectores del profesor en una escuela exitosa en la promoción lectora. *Ocnos*, 15(2), 77–97. doi: 10.18239/ocnos\_2016.15.2.1140
- Oulet, S. (2012). *Le sujet lecteur et scripteur: Développement d'un dispositif didactique en classe de littérature* [Thèse de doctorat, Université Toulouse II - le Mirail]. Retrieved from <https://archipel.uqam.ca/4675/1/D2324.pdf>
- Perla, M. (2020). Formar ciudadanos lectores competentes: Concepciones de lectura en las políticas curriculares de la región. *El toledo de Astier*, 20, 398–414. Retrieved from <http://sedici.unlp.edu.ar/handle/10915/117199>
- Petit, M. (1999). *Nuevos acercamientos de los jóvenes a la lectura*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Ricœur, P. (1985). *Temps et récit. 3. Le temps raconté*. Éditions du Seuil.
- Sauvaire, M. (2013). *Diversité des lectures littéraires: Comment former des sujets lecteurs divers?* [Doctoral dissertation, Université Toulouse le Mirail-Toulouse II].
- Sauvaire, M. (2015). La diversité des sujets lecteurs dans l'enseignement de la lecture littéraire. *Éducation & Didactique*, 9(2), 107–117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/educationdidactique.2310>

- Vaillant, D.E. (2019). Formación Inicial del Profesorado de Educación Secundaria en América Latina- Dilemas y Desafíos. *Profesorado, Revista De Currículum Y Formación Del Profesorado*, 23(3), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.30827/profesorado.v23i3.9516>
- Vecchione, C.D.M. (2020). Políticas públicas de formación inicial docente en el Perú. *Formação Docente–Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa sobre Formação de Professores*, 12(23), 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.31639/rbpf.v12i23.282>
- Vibert, A. (2013). Faire place au sujet lecteur en classe: Quelles voies pour renouveler les approches de la lecture analytique au collège et au lycée. *Ministère de l'éducation nationale (DGESCO-IGEN)*. Retrieved from [http://eduscol.education.fr/lettres/im\\_pdflettres/intervention-anne-vibert-lecture-vf-20-11-13.pdf](http://eduscol.education.fr/lettres/im_pdflettres/intervention-anne-vibert-lecture-vf-20-11-13.pdf)