



From Integrating to Learning: Insights from Spanish L2 Multiple Documents Selection in Reading Tasks*

De la integración al aprendizaje: perspectiva acerca de la selección de fuentes en español como L2

Da integração à aprendizagem: perspectiva da seleção da fonte de documentos em espanhol como L2

Maha Soliman

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5751-8810>

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

maha.soliman@pucv.cl

* This paper is derived from unpublished doctoral dissertation "Multidimensional exploration of interactivity in oral instances of communicating what is read in Spanish L2 classrooms: A case study," submitted to Pontifical Catholic University of Valparaíso.

Received: 14/04/2021

Sent to peer review: 16/04/2021

Accepted by peers: 19/06/2021

Approved: 03/09/2021

DOI: 10.5294/lacil.2021.14.1.6

To reference this article (APA) / Para citar este artículo (APA) / Para citar este artigo (APA)
Soliman, M. (2021). From integrating to learning: Insights from Spanish L2 multiple documents selection in reading tasks. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 14(1), 151–177. <https://doi.org/10.5294/lacil.2021.14.1.6>

ABSTRACT. Previous literature has focused on investigating the use of sources in the classroom and how much they contribute to building a coherent mental representation of the texts. These studies explain how integration from multiple document sources occurs; however, their results are limited to the first language and do not inform about the types of these sources or how they are used. In this sense, the objective of this case study is to identify the types of sources used in four courses of a student exchange program in a Chilean University. The data was collected through focus groups with sixty students and in-depth interviews with four professors to determine in what sense the type of document selected could contribute to the learning process. A content analysis was carried out using Nvivo 12 to report on the pedagogical implications of using these sources in a Spanish L2 teaching setting.

Keywords (Source: Unesco Thesaurus): Comprehension; second language instruction; document selection; integrated education; Spanish.

RESUMEN. La literatura previa se ha enfocado en investigar el uso de las fuentes en la sala de clases y cuánto contribuyen en construir una representación mental coherente de los textos leídos. Estos estudios explican cómo se integra a partir de múltiples fuentes de documentos, sin embargo, sus resultados se limitan a la primera lengua y no informan sobre los tipos de estas fuentes o el por qué de su uso. En este sentido, el objetivo de este estudio de caso es identificar los tipos de fuentes de documentos utilizados en cuatro cursos de un programa de intercambio estudiantil en Chile. Los datos se recopilaron a través de grupos focales con 60 estudiantes y entrevistas en profundidad con 4 docentes realizados durante el primer semestre del 2019 para determinar en qué sentido el tipo de documento seleccionado podría contribuir al proceso de aprendizaje. Se realizó un análisis de contenido mediante Nvivo 12 que permitió informar sobre las implicancias pedagógicas del uso de estas fuentes en el aula de español como L2.

Palabras clave (Fuente: tesauro de la Unesco): Comprensión; enseñanza de una segunda lengua; selección de documentos; integración educativa; español.

RESUMO. A literatura anterior centrou-se na investigação da utilização de fontes na sala de aula e no quanto contribuem para a construção de uma representação mental coerente dos textos lidos. Estes estudos explicam como é integrado a partir de múltiplas fontes de documentos, no entanto, os seus resultados limitam-se à primeira língua e não relatam os tipos destas fontes ou porque são utilizadas. Neste sentido, o objetivo deste estudo de caso é identificar os tipos de fontes de documentos utilizados em quatro cursos de um programa de intercâmbio de estudantes no Chile. Os dados foram recolhidos através de grupos focais com 60 estudantes e entrevistas aprofundadas com 4 professores realizadas durante o primeiro semestre de 2019 para determinar em que sentido o tipo de documento selecionado poderia contribuir para o processo de aprendizagem. Foi realizada uma análise de conteúdo utilizando o Nvivo 12 para informar as implicações pedagógicas da utilização destas fontes na sala de aula de espanhol como L2.

Palavras-chave (Fonte: tesauro da Unesco): Compreensão; ensino de segunda língua; seleção de documentos; integração educacional; espanhol.

Language teaching does not only involve linguistic skills and grammar, but also implies a deep comprehension and knowledge of disciplinary content (Guerrini, 2009; Milne et al., 2010; Nikula et al., 2016). In this sense, learning from text has become a main milestone in disciplinary literacies where comprehension is not limited to one text source, but it could also be based on multiple document sources (Goldman et al., 2016). The document, in this case, refers to any text, regardless of its length or genre (Britt & Rouet, 2020). A document belongs to a certain period of time and can be classified according to the source from which it is extracted. According to Strømsø et al. (2010), Strømsø (2017), and Brante and Strømsø (2018), a document can be attributed to a primary or secondary source based on the author of the text, their profession, where it was written, the date on which the document was written, and the suitability of the content for the audience.

Moreover, those documents could be verbal or multimodal, or they could even be extracted from digital or printed media (Goldman et al., 2012; Rouet & Britt, 2014; Salmerón et al., 2018c). However, it all depends on the readers' capacity to select the most useful source for the task assigned (Rouet et al., 1996; Stearns et al., 2000; Anmarkrud et al., 2014; Stenseth & Strømsø, 2019).

Those studies have been implemented in the first language and most of them agree that trustworthiness of the document's source and the author's expertise are fundamental criteria for the students to select the text. Nevertheless, there is a clear lack of previous knowledge regarding the selection criteria in Spanish as a second language or even the types of documents selected and why. At the same time, despite the abundant literature on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), the type of source adopted by educators or students and its effect on their learning have not received a lot of attention (Sylvén, 2019; Sendur et al., 2021).

For this reason, the key objective of this paper is to determine the document sources in four courses taught in the context of a language exchange program in Chile. This investigation not only focuses on the professor's choices, but also discusses the student's priorities and the reason behind them.

The relevance of this approach lies in offering a hands-on experience about how and which document sources to use to enhance Spanish L2 reading from multiple texts. Evaluating the sources is an indicator of metacognitive capacity that reflects how the reader can judge the content and make a decision about how much the sources can be useful for their comprehension process and achieve the reading goal set for a specific academic task (Stadtler et al., 2014; Stenseth & Strømsø, 2019).

Aiming to get an in-depth knowledge regarding this context, a case study was carried out in two History courses and two Literature courses, both taught in the first semester of 2019. Sixty students and four professors participated in this study, and content analysis was applied to determine the reasons for document selection and the most frequent sources reviewed by them. Nvivo 12 was used for the analysis to organize data in codes and themes that represent the types of sources and why students and professors prioritized their usage.

Results indicate the students' preference to use the secondary sources because they are much easier than the primary ones and that could help them to learn more. On the other hand, students had strategic use of secondary sources by complementing them with the primary ones to compensate for text difficulty. This usage was more common in case primary sources needed some clarification or allowed diverse interpretations, such as in narrative texts. This reflects the need for professors to reevaluate the possibilities to use both in class and to investigate more how to use each of them in Spanish L2 classrooms in order to guarantee a faster and easier process of learning the language and enjoying the reading tasks.

Theoretical framework

The notion of learning from text has been raised in the works of McNamara and Kintsch (1996) and McNamara et al. (1996), based on the premises of van Dijk & Kintsch (1983) and Kintsch (1986), whereby learning is conceived as a product of a modification in the reader's situation model. These authors associate learning from text with the

construction of a situation model, while reproduction is limited to the surface code or text base. Thus, for example, reading instructions on how to change a computer's hard disk is reduced to the surface code and the text base. However, if the reader associates this information that they are reading with their previous knowledge and experience, this situation model is updated during reading and is transformed into what these authors describe as "significant learning." Learning, in this case, takes place thanks to the interaction between the reader's knowledge and the information provided by the text upon completion of a certain task.

Rouet et al. (1996) have extended the investigation about learning from text to cover reading from multiple documents. The contribution of this work is to amplify the study of learning from a single text to other texts (Goldman, 2004; Britt & Rouet, 2012; Perfetti et al., 2012; Britt et al., 2013; Bråten et al., 2018). The authors suggest that understanding documents requires a literal level of comprehension that is reduced to the text base and another deep level that involves building a situation model from multiple documents. The models constructed from multiple documents interact in the following ways:

1. The models can overlap if both texts provide the same information or tell the same story.
2. Models can be integrated. This happens when one document can be part of the situation model of another. For example, when a letter is referenced in a novel or when one author cites another in his text.
3. Models can be opposed when the subject of the text is controversial and envisages several opposing or contradictory points of view in a debate.

As a first approach to the construction of a situation model in reading from multiple documents, Rouet et al. (1996) conducted two experiments with 24 undergraduate students. In the first one, the subjects are divided into two groups. In group one, primary and secondary texts are provided on a controversial topic in history, such as the Panamanian Revolution. The primary texts are written during the Revolution of Panama, while the secondary texts are written in a period

following this historical event. The second group receives only secondary texts written by reviewers who give their opinion on the controversy. Both groups have to write an essay on their opinion about this controversy at the end of the reading. Also, the subjects are included in the experiment by being asked about their opinion on the documents and under what criteria they find them reliable and/or useful.

The subjects in the first group declare that they rely more on the primary source, because the secondary sources give opinions that often lack trustworthiness. In contrast, the readers of the second group privilege secondary sources written by historians for presenting more facts than sources of opinions written by reviewers.

These results argue that both groups manage to learn from multiple document sources, because both have been able to integrate the various documents into a coherent essay. This essay is the result of building several situation models from all the texts read and integrating them into a new one. This new situation model not only emerges from extracting the important information from the text base, but also from a process of strategic and comparative research among these sources that results in a critical and proper position of the reader of the text (Salmerón, et al., 2018a; Ferguson, et al., 2012).

To gain a better understanding of the multiple sources, Britt and Rouet (2011) present the MD Trace model. This model aims to explain intertextual integration from multiple document sources and is based on five main steps:

1. Building a task model in which goals are set and previous knowledge related to other similar tasks is evoked.
2. Assessing the need for information (sometimes it is not necessary to have more details).
3. Processing the multiple documents available.
4. Creating a new text from the integration of these sources into a new situation model.
5. Evaluating the new text and deciding whether it is consistent with the objective set for this task or not.

The model also specifies two resources that encourage this intertextual representation: external resources represented in the accessibility

to information and how useful it is, and internal resources related to the reader's metacognitive capacity that allows them to evaluate how relevant the source is. Guided by this work frame, Perfetti et al. (1999) seek to explain how to process multiple sources through a document model. This model distinguishes four main elements that affect the integration of multiple sources:

1. The identity of the writer of the text (whether seminal or reviewer)
2. The context of the elaboration of the source:
 - a. The historical context in which the document is written
 - b. The institutional context, since belonging to a certain institution might influence the writer's ideology
 - c. The cultural context or place where the source is produced
3. The characteristics of the text: its style (academic, legal, diplomatic, among others) and type (book, article, treatise, among others)
4. The rhetorical objectives of the writers of these sources that allow the reader to classify a group of texts as contradictory or complementary or whether they are written for explanatory or persuasive purposes, etc.

These works have been a fruitful basis for several other studies that have focused on the use of document sources for academic and non-academic purposes. In both cases, readers determine an objective that allows them to decide which document sources they need (Rouet et al., 2017) and, consequently, influence the type of inferences generated from these texts (Narvaez et al., 1999). To fulfil this objective, sources may differ according to several aspects:

1. The discipline to which the text belongs, namely history (Rouet et al., 1997), literature (Bloome et al., 2018), science (Goldman & Bisanz, 2002), and mathematics (Weber & Mejia-Ramos, 2013).
2. Readers' cognitive or metacognitive strategies (Bråten & Strømsø, 2010; Bråten et al., 2013; Anmarkrud et al., 2014).
3. The comparative process between sources of expert and novice readers (Shanahan et al., 2011; Brand-Gruwel et al., 2017).
4. Individual differences in motivation to read from multiple sources (Bråten et al., 2013; Guthrie et al., 2018).

5. The objectives of reading from multiple sources (Stadtler et al., 2014; Rouet et al., 2017).
6. The effect of prior knowledge on the handling of multiple sources (McCrudden et al., 2016).
7. The support of sources, whether paper or digital (Mangen et al., 2013; Salmerón et al., 2018b).

Regardless of the characteristics of the sources on which each of the studies cited above focuses, they all consider the reading process to be a highly complex problem-solving process. In this process, readers are constantly comparing sources and making decisions “whether to retrieve, change, or select among competing actions or goals” (Britt et al., 2018, p. 21). This comparison of sources results in a selection of documents that readers find relevant to their reading objective.

According to McCrudden (2018), a document can be relevant as long as it fills a gap between the information that the reader knows and what he or she reads in order to know and to provide information that deserves to be considered part of the situation model resulting from the reading. Rouet and Britt (2011) define this criterion of relevance as “the extent to which the information is consistent with the readers’ needs and capacities” (p. 20). In other words, the source should be coherent with the reading goal of the students and their language skills to be able to interpret it.

In this case, reading is in service of a certain task or a specific objective that requires reliable and relevant information (Stenseth & Strømsø, 2019). In this line, according to some studies, the relevance of a source lies in facilitating the fulfilment of the task. This can be the elaboration of a written document (Rouet et al., 1996; Perfetti et al., 1999; Anmarkrud et al., 2013; List et al., 2019) and/or the creation of an oral presentation from multiple documents (Stenseth & Strømsø, 2019) and this last reading task constitutes a central focus in this paper.

All of them are works that investigate the process of integration from multiple sources, which is a process of comparative search among available sources, always bearing in mind that the reading objective is the criterion that determines how reliable and relevant a source can be (Britt et al., 2018).

As an example, for an analysis of the history of wildfires in Valparaiso, the most reliable sources are those written at the same time that each fire occurred and not later. A source is more reliable when it records actual experiences of witnesses who have experienced the situation and not opinions of people living in other countries. That is, a source is more reliable when the author is able to provide accurate and credible information regarding a topic (Pompitakpan, 2004).

Also, an author's expertise and the prestige of their contributions are very important criteria when considering their work as a reliable source of information (Anmarkrud et al., 2014; Bråten et al., 2018). In contrast, a source is relevant when it can provide information about a specific event or place and not other one. For instance, an article could be relevant if it provides detailed information about wildfires in Valparaiso and not other types of fires in another country or region. In other words, a relevant source is one that succeeds in giving all kinds of useful information for the completion of the task and provides the necessary context to carry it out (McCrudden & Schraw, 2007; Braasch et al., 2009; Schraw et al., 2011; Andreassen & Bråten, 2013; List et al., 2017; Van Meter et al., 2020).

Finally, this literature review shows how remarkable the lack of research focused on the use of document sources in the field of second language teaching. In this context, studies in L2 have addressed the use of metacognitive strategies (Karimi & Alibakhshi, 2014; Karimi, 2018a) and prior knowledge in reading multiple sources (Karimi, 2018b). It is worth mentioning that these studies encourage future contributions in the field due to the scarcity of previous related work. Within this framework, the present study aims to contribute to the research of multiple sources of documents in two disciplines (History and Literature).

Methodology

Design

A descriptive qualitative study was conducted to get more insight into professors' and students' choices of sources while preparing an oral

presentation. The study triangulates data collected through three data instruments to provide a detailed and comprehensive description of the use of document sources in this context of teaching Spanish as a second language.

Participants

Four professors from a student exchange program in Chile specialized in the disciplines of History and Literature participated in the investigation. Two of the professors were specialized in History and the other two in Literature in Spanish L2 courses. In addition, 60 students participated in this investigation, all of them enrolled in these courses, which were held during the first semester of 2019 and which were designed and tailored to proficiency levels B2 and C1. These participants joined after signing an informed consent, and students were asked for a certificate of language proficiency. Also, participants were notified that they could withdraw from the study at any stage in case they decided to do so.

Instruments

Three data collection instruments have been used in this investigation. The first one is the Document Source Analysis Instrument (DSAI), which was developed based on the theoretical guidelines of Strømsø et al. (2010) and Brante and Strømsø (2018), with the aim of specifying the types of document sources used as reading material in the four investigated courses. Meanwhile, the second instrument consisted of a semi-structured interview that focused on the professors of the four courses of the exchange program with the purpose of learning more about their decisions associated with the incorporation of certain document sources. Finally, a focus group was held for the students of the four courses of the exchange program.

The three instruments have been designed by the researcher in charge of this work and have been validated by a pilot testing with 12 postgraduate students in Linguistics and an expert judgement with six academics specialized in written text comprehension and second languages teaching. The agreement between the evaluators according to the Huberman and Miles (1994) equation is 85% and 0.85 in the Kappa index (Cohen, 1960).

Procedure

The four interviews and focus groups are transcribed and then followed by systematization and codification of the data in preliminary categories that are united in general abstract categories that represent the case studied (Maxwell, 2012). A content analysis of professors and students' statements associated with the use of document sources in the classroom is carried out through the Nvivo 12 program and contrasted with the analysis of the DSAI results. The main theme that emerges from both data techniques points to a preference for using secondary document sources as a common feature between History and Literature classes, as summarized in Table 1. This use has been systematic and frequent in 28 observed class sessions in the four courses for sake of preparing the oral presentation according to the reading task assigned by professor.

Table 1. Summary of the theme emerging from codification

Text			
Research question:	What types of document sources are used in the four advanced level courses in the exchange program?		
Instruments used:	Focus group Semi-structured interview Document Source Analysis Instrument (DSAI)		
Theme	Definition	Example	Frequency
Preference for secondary sources	The preference for using simple document sources to compensate for the difficulty of the reading material.	“Now, in practice the vast majority instead of consulting the texts that are in the library end up using pdf texts. There are very good digital texts available on the internet, because they tend to be more general than the ones I present in the program and are more likely to be secondary sources” (I2. Pascual. UH. 40, Professor)	267
Total			267

Source: Own elaboration.

Results and discussion

The analysis of the results of the Document Source Analysis Instrument (DSAI) revealed that professors in both History and Literature courses mainly prefer to use primary sources. However, students tend to use secondary sources as long as the professor allows for their usage in the classroom.

To determine the sources of documents used by professors, two interviews were conducted with each of the four academics in charge of the Literature and History courses. In the Literature courses, the 27 documents assigned by the professors were classified as literary short stories by Chilean and Latin American authors written during the 19th Century. These texts were limited to primary sources of writers and journalists dedicated to narrative as classified by the DSAI, and as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of sources used by professors in Literature courses

Literature							
	Source		Criteria				
	Primary	Secondary	Author	Profession	Venue	Date	Adequacy to intended audience
Total	27	-	27	27	-	-	-

Source: Own elaboration.

In this analysis, it has been realized that criteria such as the expertise of the author and his or her profession can be determining factors in classifying a source as a primary one. At the same time, criteria such as the date and setting where the source is written make it secondary if it is written at a different date or place than the historical event addressed by these texts, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of sources used by learners in Literature courses

Literature							
	Source		Criteria				
	Primary	Secondary	Author	Profession	Venue	Date	Adequacy to intended audience
Total	-	147	-	-	45	45	57

Source: Own elaboration.

Students have stated, in the focus groups, that they choose secondary sources because they make primary sources easier to read. Hence, one of the characteristics of the secondary source is the simple content and its appropriateness to the student's level. The overall frequency of the secondary sources that students used in the 28 sessions was 267. The analysis showed that one-hundred twenty of them were used in History, whilst one hundred forty-seven were identified in Literature.

The documents in the History courses were fragments of State bulletins, articles and books that discussed historical and political events that took place in Chile and Latin America in the 19th and 20th centuries. According to the DSAI analysis, twenty-seven of these documents came from primary sources and ten from secondary sources, as shown in Table 4. According to the results of the analysis, the place and date of publication of the documents determined whether a source was primary or secondary. The twenty-seven primary sources were written in the same place and date of the events mentioned in the texts. On the other hand, criteria such as the identity of the author and their profession could be fulfilled in both primary and secondary sources, despite the fact that, in literature, they were a distinctive feature of the primary sources.

Table 4. Summary of sources used by professors in History courses

History							
	Source		Criteria				
	Primary	Secondary	Author	Profession	Venue	Date	Adequacy to intended audience
Total	27	10	37	37	27	27	10

Source: Own elaboration.

The analysis of the texts used in History courses pointed out that a source was primary when its author was a politician or historian. In some cases, not only did the author's identity and profession determine whether a source was primary or secondary, but also the place and date when the document was written. It was noted in the texts of the History course material that some historians or politicians discussed the events without necessarily being part of them. These findings were in line with the theoretical foundations of Perfetti et al. (1999) and Strømsø (2017). In this case, the sources used by the professors are primary since they were written in the same place and time where events took place. They were written by witnesses of this era or people directly involved in the historical event such as politicians, unlike the secondary source, which can be written in another period, for example, by a commentator who analyses these events from his or her point of view and when they are already done.

Based on the analysis of the material collected in this study, it was discovered that most of the history material was reported as part of the primary sources, as it provided a public statement by Government officials. The statements communicated, in writing, certain government decisions in the face of a crisis. They also provided political statements that were published through the official state newsletter or publications by government officials. The statements identified in the course material are declarations, state reports, political party programs, draft laws, and letters exchanged between state officials.

The secondary source, on the other hand, was written by experts who were interested in analyzing the key events reported in the primary sources (Table 5). Reviewing these events allowed students to judge the effectiveness of certain policies adopted in previous times

or to reflect on some historical events by presenting arguments for or against them.

Table 5. Summary of document sources used by students in History courses

History							
	Source		Criteria				
	Primary	Secondary	Author	Profession	Venue	Date	Adequacy to intended audience
Total	-	120	-	30	30	20	40

Source: Own elaboration.

The findings of the analysis showed that the secondary sources were mainly produced by researchers or historians who were interested in the subject and were part of research centers or universities. Through a systematic analysis of the secondary sources, it was revealed that students tended to use the following sources, which are ordered according to their frequency as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of secondary sources used by students in History

Secondary sources used in History	Frequency
Interviews with witnesses	40
Academic articles	30
Books	20
Press news	20
Historical reviews	5
Government websites such as the website of the Municipality of Valparaiso	5
Total	120

Source: Own elaboration.

Generally speaking, integrating from primary and secondary sources in History courses is conscious. The academics suggested both types of sources to their students so that they could read them and organize a discussion about them, as one of the professors pointed out in the semi-structured interview:

So, I want them to make a decision and determine their political position based on the analysis of all those circumstances and in most of the cases they use secondary sources for that purpose and in class several secondary sources have been recommended following this logic. (I2. Francisco.MH.35, Professor)

The analysis of the teaching materials indicated that, in the Literature courses, the primary sources were mainly assigned by professors. According to them, the secondary sources were not necessary unless the student decides to look for them.

Nevertheless, students tended to look for secondary texts that would facilitate and complement the reading of the stories, as reported by one female student in the focus group:

Many times, the secondary source does the effort of analyzing, contrasting and contextualizing the primary sources. Then, I prefer to use a secondary source, because it is easier to understand what happened and why it happened. (FG2. Pascual.UH.69, Student 6)

As reported in the semi-structured interviews with professors and the focus groups with students of the Literature courses, the secondary sources most consulted by the students, according to the order of frequency, were the following (detailed in Table 7):

- 1) Essays and articles of popular science published in specialized journals that explain or summarize the story (65)
- 2) Books of literary review that analyze, discuss, and evaluate the stories (29)
- 3) Bibliography of the author to clarify the relationship between the writer's life and the short story (25)
- 4) Interviews with the author that contextualize the work and the reasons why he wrote the story (20)
- 5) Press articles and blogs (8)

Table 7. Summary of secondary sources used by students in Literature

Secondary sources used in Literature	Frequency
Academic articles	35
Essays	30
Books	29
Bibliography of the author	25
Interviews with the author	20
Press articles	4
Blogs	4
Total	147

Source: Own elaboration.

According to the results of the focus groups, students experienced a high degree of complexity while reading the primary sources in Literature. These are sources that include infrequent or double meaning words. Also, they usually communicate an indirect message or with a metaphorical sense and, therefore, they require more contextualization to reach a critical reading of all the details of the text. The same happened with the primary sources in History due to the lack of historical context to clarify their circumstances. However, given that the historical sources were mostly expository texts, students found them more user-friendly than the literary sources, since they allowed a faster and easier visualization of the content thanks to their informative and direct style, as commented by the students in one of the focus groups of the Literature course:

Understanding is important for the literary text, because you have to analyze the different readings, because the texts of this class are more abstract and you cannot compare these readings with those of the History class, because historical texts provide more information and are more direct. (FG1. Pamela.111, Student 4)

Sometimes the difficult words that describe a historical fact are long words, but they are almost the same in English, yet in the texts we are studying in Literature class the words are adjectives and complex words to deduce what they mean, they are full of emotion and have double meanings. (FG 1. Pamela.112, Student 9)

The literary text sometimes makes it a little difficult to present the idea, because sometimes the author does not want you to understand

the message in a direct way and does not use a more common vocabulary, while the historical source tells you in 1998 that such an event happened. (FG 1. Pamela.108, Student 2)

At that time, according to the students' perceptions, the literary text was more abstract, gathered difficult vocabulary and had an indirect style. Nevertheless, these differences do not deny that the primary sources in both disciplines studied share some features, and they offer authentic texts that target readers of literary works. They usually offer short stories whose author does not necessarily intend to simplify the text or adapt it to a certain audience. In contrast, secondary sources provide a more simplified version through the analysis or discussion of the main aspects of the primary source and, although they are not adapted to the level of a student of Spanish as a second language, they offer a simpler version of the primary text. In other words, it is a synthesis that describes and criticizes the primary text.

The secondary source decreases the workload of the reading task without ensuring that the text is understood. That is, these secondary sources may still require student work to assimilate them, such as searching for unfamiliar vocabulary in the texts. This is one way of reducing the complexity of the task and the difficulty of the texts that students are facing. Thus, the strategic use of secondary sources of documents reflects a high awareness of the students in the way that they can use them as raised by students 5 and 6 in one of the focus groups of the History courses:

When I am studying, I rely on secondary sources, because they are easier to understand and have some research as a reference. (FG2. Pascual.74, Student 5)

However, the fact that the secondary sources are easier does not deny the fact that the primary sources have some advantages, as commented by the students from the four courses in the different focus groups:

Because, it gives evidence that the secondary sources can not give. (FG1. Pascual.78, Student 3)

It lets you know if what you find on the Internet you can cite or not. (FG1. Pascual.83, Student 1)

Sometimes I read from primary sources and want to read the original version, because there are things that get lost in translation. (FG2. Pamela.82, Student 3)

In summary, the students were aware of the types of document sources and when it was beneficial to use them. It was a comparative process of integrating from multiple document sources, where students made strategic use of these sources to overcome the difficulties of the texts assigned in class. Ultimately, students not only became aware of the complexity of the text they were required to read, but also tended to be strategic in dealing with the difficulty of the texts and, for this reason, they used secondary sources because they help with their learning process.

Conclusions

Despite the innovation that the approach of learning from multiple sources has offered in its beginnings and to date, the definition of a document remains unclear. It does not give clear answers regarding the discursive genres to which these documents belong, what is the difference between the genres in constructing a situation model from multiple documents, and how these genres interact in a particular case. However, findings in this study showed that students tended to use more sources in History than in Literature. Perhaps this could be attributed to the need to verify the sources in History and ensure their trustworthiness. Also, this could be due to the fact that narrative texts in Literature needed less sources than expository texts in History. At the same time, it could be because professors in Literature do not ask for the use of secondary sources to prepare for the oral presentation.

The Document Source Analysis Instrument (DSAI) was developed to distinguish between primary and secondary sources (Strømsø et al., 2010; Strømsø, 2017; Brante & Strømsø, 2018) and therefore allowed to determine the sources used in class. In addition, focus groups highlighted the students' preference for using secondary sources and that this preference depended on how easy the source is, the contextualization, and the analysis it offers. The results of the semi-structured

interview gave insight into the learners' reasons for preferring secondary sources. The three instruments allowed providing a taxonomy of the secondary sources usually used by Spanish learners as L2 during the exchange program.

In this study, the preference of using secondary sources was due to the fact that students developed an awareness of how and when they could use a secondary source and why it was important to do so. This is in line with previous studies in the literature that distinguish reading from multiple documents as a comparative and strategic process in which readers take control of source selection (Rouet et al., 1996; Stearns et al., 2000; Anmarkrud et al., 2014; Stenseth & Strømsø, 2019). This awareness allows students to choose the most useful document sources to achieve the goal set for the reading task.

The fact that students are aware that primary texts are difficult and try to find some alternative from secondary sources shows strategic skill that students develop throughout experience during task preparation. Readers are capable of distinguishing when to use a primary source and when to use a secondary one, as well as knowing when to combine the two and when the reviewer in secondary texts may have a misinterpretation that alters the primary source. Those findings highlight the relevance of the usage of the secondary sources in Spanish L2 courses and opens the way for future research that outlines its use in other disciplines or setting of second language teaching.

References

- Andreassen, R., & Bråten, I. (2013). Teachers' source evaluation self-efficacy predicts their use of relevant source features when evaluating the trustworthiness of web sources on special education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(5), 821–836. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01366.x>
- Anmarkrud, Ø., Bråten, I., & Strømsø, H. I. (2014). Multiple-documents literacy: Strategic processing, source awareness, and argumentation when reading multiple conflicting documents. *Learning and Individual Differences*, (30), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.01.007>

- Anmarkrud, Ø., McCrudden, M. T., Bråten, I., & Strømsø, H. I. (2013). Task-oriented reading of multiple documents: Online comprehension processes and offline products. *Instructional Science*, 41(5), 873–894. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9263-8>
- Bloome, D., Kim, M., Hong, H., & Brady, J. (2018). Multiple source use when reading and writing in literature and language arts in classroom contexts. In J. L. G. Braasch, I. Bråten, & M. T. McCrudden (Eds.), *Handbook of multiple source use* (pp. 254–266). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315627496-15>
- Braasch, J. L., Lawless, K. A., Goldman, S. R., Manning, F. H., Gomez, K. W., & MacLeod, S. M. (2009). Evaluating search results: An empirical analysis of middle school students' use of source attributes to select useful sources. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 41(1), 63–82. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.41.1.c>
- Brand-Gruwel, S., Kammerer, Y., Van Meeuwen, L., & Van Gog, T. (2017). Source evaluation of domain experts and novices during Web search. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 33(3), 234–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12162>
- Brante, E. W., & Strømsø, H. I. (2018). Sourcing in text comprehension: A review of interventions targeting sourcing skills. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(3), 773–799. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9421-7>
- Bråten, I., Ferguson, L. E., Anmarkrud, Ø., & Strømsø, H. I. (2013). Prediction of learning and comprehension when adolescents read multiple texts: The roles of word-level processing, strategic approach, and reading motivation. *Reading and Writing*, 26(3), 321–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-012-9371-x>
- Bråten, I., McCrudden, M. T., Stang Lund, E., Brante, E. W., & Strømsø, H. I. (2018). Task-oriented learning with multiple documents: Effects of topic familiarity, author expertise, and content relevance on document selection, processing, and use. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 53(3), 345–365. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.197>
- Bråten, I., Stadler, M., & Salmerón, L. (2018). The role of sourcing in discourse comprehension. In M. Schober, D. Rapp, & M. Britt (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse processes* (pp. 141–166). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315687384-10>
- Bråten, I., & Strømsø, H. I. (2010). When law students read multiple documents about global warming: Examining the role of topic-specific

- beliefs about the nature of knowledge and knowing. *Instructional Science*, 38(6), 635–657. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9091-4>
- Rouet, J. F., & Britt, M. A. (2011). Relevance processes in multiple document comprehension. In M. T. McCrudden, J. P. Magliano, & G. Schraw (Eds.), *Text relevance and learning from text* (pp. 19–52). Information Age.
- Britt, M. A., & Rouet, J. F. (2012). Learning with multiple documents: Component skills and their acquisition. In M. J. Lawson & J. R. Kirby (Eds.), *Enhancing the quality of learning: Dispositions, instruction, and learning processes* (pp. 276–314). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139048224.017>
- Britt, M. A., & Rouet, J. F. (2020). Multiple document comprehension. In L. Zhang (Ed.), *The oxford encyclopedia of educational psychology* (pp.10–25). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.867>
- Britt, M. A., Rouet, J. F., & Braasch, J. L. (2013). Documents as entities: Extending the situation model theory of comprehension. In M. A. Britt, S. R. Goldman, & J.-F. Rouet (Eds.), *Reading: From words to multiple texts* (pp. 160–179). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203131268>
- Britt, M. A., Rouet, J. F., & Durik, A. (2018). Representations and processes in multiple source use. In J. L. G. Braasch, I. Bråten, & M.T. McCrudden (Eds.), *Handbook of multiple source use* (pp. 17–33). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315627496-2>
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104>
- Ferguson, L. E., Bråten, I., & Strømsø, H. I. (2012). Epistemic cognition when students read multiple documents containing conflicting scientific evidence: A think-aloud study. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(2), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2011.08.002>
- Goldman, S. R. (2004). Cognitive aspects of constructing meaning through and across multiple texts. In N. Shuart-Faris & D. Bloome (Eds.), *Uses of intertextuality in classroom and educational research* (pp. 317–352). Information Age.
- Goldman, S. R., & Bisanz, G. L. (2002). Toward a functional analysis of scientific genres: Implications for understanding and learning processes. In J. Otero, J. A. León, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *The psychology of science text comprehension* (pp. 19–50). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Goldman, S. R., Braasch, J. L., Wiley, J., Graesser, A. C., & Brodowinska, K. (2012). Comprehending and learning from Internet sources: Processing patterns of better and poorer learners. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(4), 356–381. <http://wiley.lsr.uic.edu/personal/jwiley/rrq.pdf>
- Goldman, S. R., Britt, M. A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., Lee, C. Shanahan, C., & Project READI. (2016). Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: A conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 219–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1168741>
- Guerrini, M. (2009). CLIL materials as scaffolds to learning. *CLIL Practice: Perspectives from the Field*, 1, 74–84.
- Guthrie, J. T., Braasch, J. L. G., Bråten, I., & McCrudden, M. T. (2018). Promoting multiple-text comprehension through motivation in the classroom. In J. L. G. Braasch, I. Bråten, & M. McCrudden (Eds.), *Handbook of multiple source use* (pp. 382–400). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315627496-22>
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428–444). Sage Publications.
- Karimi, M. N. (2018a). The mediated/unmediated contributions of language proficiency and prior knowledge to L2 multiple-texts comprehension: A structural equation modelling analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(6), 912–932. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw059>
- Karimi, M. N. (2018b). Prior topical knowledge and L2 proficiency as determinants of strategic processing in English for Academic Purposes multi-texts comprehension. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(3), 235–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1177058>
- Karimi, M. N., & Alibakhshi, G. (2014). EFL learners' text processing strategies across comprehension vs. integration reading task conditions. *System*, 46, 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.013>
- Kintsch, W. (1986). Learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction*, 3(2), 87–108. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0302_1
- List, A., Alexander, P. A., & Stephens, L. A. (2017). Trust but verify: Examining the association between students' sourcing behaviors and ratings of text trustworthiness. *Discourse Processes*, 54(2), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2016.1174654>

- List, A., Du, H., Wang, Y., & Lee, H. Y. (2019). Toward a typology of integration: Examining the documents model framework. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, (58), 228–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.03.003>
- Narvaez, D., Van Den Broek, P., & Ruiz, A. B. (1999). The influence of reading purpose on inference generation and comprehension in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(3), 488.
- Mangen, A., Walgermo, B. R., & Brønnick, K. (2013). Reading linear texts on paper versus computer screen: Effects on reading comprehension. *International journal of educational research*, (58), 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2012.12.002>
- Maxwell, J. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage publications.
- McCrudden, M. T. (2018). Text relevance and multiple-source use. In J. L. G. Braasch, I. Bråten, & M.T. McCrudden (Eds.), *Handbook of multiple source use* (pp. 168–183). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315627496-10>
- McCrudden, M. T., & Schraw, G. (2007). Relevance and goal-focusing in text processing. *Educational psychology review*, 19(2), 113–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9010-7>
- McCrudden, M. T., Stenseth, T., Bråten, I., & Strømsø, H. I. (2016). The effects of topic familiarity, author expertise, and content relevance on Norwegian students' document selection: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(2), 147–162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000057>
- McNamara, D. S., & Kintsch, W. (1996). Learning from texts: Effects of prior knowledge and text coherence. *Discourse processes*, 22(3), 247–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539609544975>
- McNamara, D. S., Kintsch, E., Songer, N. B., & Kintsch, W. (1996). Are good texts always better? Interactions of text coherence, background knowledge, and levels of understanding in learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction*, 14(1), 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690x-ci1401_1
- Milne, E. D., Llinares, A., & Morton, T. (2010). CLIL across contexts: A scaffolding framework for CLIL teacher education. *Current Research on CLIL*, 19(3), 12–20. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269464750_CLIL_across_contexts_A_scaffolding_framework_for_CLIL_teacher_education

- Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P., & Smit, U. (2016). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096145>
- Perfetti, C. A., Britt, M. A., & Georgi, M. C. (2012). *Text-based learning and reasoning: Studies in history*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203053065>
- Perfetti, C. A., Rouet, J. F., & Britt, M. A. (1999). Toward a theory of documents representation. In H. Van Oostendorp & S. R. Goldman (Eds.), *The construction of mental representation during reading* (pp. 99–122). Erlbaum.
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades' evidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(2), 243–281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02547.x>
- Rouet, J. F., & Britt, M. A. (2011). Relevance processes in multiple document comprehension. In M. T. McCrudden, J. P. Magliano, & G. Schraw (Eds.), *Text relevance and learning from text* (pp. 19–52). IAP Information Age Publishing.
- Rouet, J. F., & Britt, M. A. (2014). Multimedia learning from multiple documents. In R. Mayer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning*. (pp. 813–841). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139547369.039>
- Rouet, J. F., Britt, M. A., & Durik, A. M. (2017). RESOLV: Readers' representation of reading contexts and tasks. *Educational Psychologist*, 52(3), 200–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1329015>
- Rouet, J. F., Britt, M. A., Mason, R. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1996). Using multiple sources of evidence to reason about history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(3), 478. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.88.3.478>
- Rouet, J. F., Favart, M., Britt, M. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1997). Studying and using multiple documents in history: Effects of discipline expertise. *Cognition and Instruction*, 15(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1501_3
- Salmerón, L., Gil, L., & Bråten, I. (2018a). Using eye-tracking to assess sourcing during multiple document reading: A critical analysis. *Frontline Learning Research*, 6(3), 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v6i3.368>
- Salmerón, L., Gil, L., & Bråten, I. (2018b). Effects of reading real versus print-out versions of multiple documents on students' sourcing and

- integrated understanding. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, (52), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.12.002>
- Salmerón, L., Strømsø, H. I., Kammerer, Y., Stadtler, M., & Van den Broek, P. (2018c). Comprehension processes in digital reading. In M. Barzilai, J. Thomson, S. Schroeder, & P. van den Broek (Eds.), *Learning to read in a digital world* (pp. 91–120). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/swll.17.04sal>
- Schraw, G., McCrudden, M. T., & Magliano, J. P. (2011). *Text relevance and learning from text*. Information Age Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_354
- Sendur, K. A., van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2021). Undergraduate L2 students' performance when evaluating historical sources for reliability. *English for Specific Purposes*, 61, 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.08.004>
- Shanahan, C., Shanahan, T., & Misischia, C. (2011). Analysis of expert readers in three disciplines: History, mathematics, and chemistry. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4), 393–429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X11424071>
- Stadtler, M., Scharrer, L., Skodzik, T., & Bromme, R. (2014). Comprehending multiple documents on scientific controversies: Effects of reading goals and signaling rhetorical relationships. *Discourse Processes*, 51(1–2), 93–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2013.855535>
- Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P., & Wineburg, S. (2000). *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives*. New York University Press.
- Stenseth, T., & Strømsø, H. I. (2019). To read or not to read: A qualitative study of students' justifications for document selection in task-oriented reading. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(5), 771–788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1434828>
- Strømsø, H. (2017). Multiple models of multiple-text comprehension: A commentary. *Educational Psychologist*, 52(3), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1320557>
- Strømsø, H. I., Bråten, I., & Britt, M. A. (2010). Reading multiple texts about climate change: The relationship between memory for sources and text comprehension. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(3), 192–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.02.001>

- Sylvén, L. K. (2019). *Investigating content and language integrated learning: Insights from Swedish high schools*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788922425>
- Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. Academic Press.
- Van Meter, P., List, A., Lombardi, D., & Kendeou, P. (2020). *Handbook of learning from multiple representations and perspectives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429443961>
- Weber, K., & Mejia-Ramos, J. P. (2013). The influence of sources in the reading of mathematical text: A reply to Shanahan, Shanahan, and Mischia. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 45(1), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X12469968>