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Abstract

This study is part of the European Project “Reading Communities from paper books to digital era” (READ-COM) whose purpose is to raise awareness among families, schools, teachers, and university students (future teachers) about the importance of reading and provide innovative resources to improve reading practices at home and at school. In this case, the actions in reading of the students of the last year of the Degrees of Early Childhood Education and Primary Education are examined as a means that facilitates the transit between stages in relation to the learning and consolidation of reading in students of 3-12 years.

The levels of acquisition of strategies in reading of fourth-year students of both degrees have been described comparatively. To this end, a quantitative study has been carried out, in which 237 university students have participated, of which 108 students correspond to the Degree of Early Childhood Education and 129 of Primary Education.

The language skills acquired at Degrees of Early Childhood Education and Primary Education have been identified. The competencies with the highest prevalence in the level of early childhood education have been the competence in Psychopedagogical Principles and Methodology of Learning and Organization of activities. There is a greater similarity in the scores related to Resources and Evaluation.

The differences detected ratify the hypothesis raised in this work, so it is evident the need for the initial training of teachers of these educational stages to enhance actions that connect and interrelate the educational process of students from 3 to 12 years.

Keywords: Teacher training, teaching practices, linguistic competence, reading competence, comparative study.

Resumen

Este estudio se enmarca en el Proyecto Europeo “Reading Communities from paper books to digital era” (READ-COM) cuya finalidad es sensibilizar a las familias, escuelas, profesorado y estudiantes universitarios (futuros docentes) sobre la importancia de leer y proporcionar recursos innovadores para mejorar las prácticas de lectura en el hogar y en la escuela. En este caso, se examina las actuaciones en lectura de los estudiantes de último curso de los Grados en Educación Infantil y en Educación Primaria como medio que facilite el tránsito entre etapas en relación con el aprendizaje y consolidación de la lectura en alumnado de 3-12 años.

Se han descrito comparativamente los niveles de adquisición de estrategias en lectura del alumnado de cuarto curso de ambas titulaciones. Se ha realizado un estudio de corte cuantitativo, en el que han participado 237 estudiantes universitarios, de los cuales 108 estudiantes corresponden al Grado en Educación infantil y 129 en Educación Primaria.

Se han identificado las competencias lingüísticas adquiridas en el Grado en Educación infantil y en el Grado en Educación Primaria. Las competencias con mayor prevalencia en el título de Educación Infantil han sido la competencia en Principios Psicopedagógicos y Metodología de Aprendizaje lector y Organización de actividades. Existiendo una mayor similitud en las puntuaciones relativas a los Recursos y Evaluación.

Las diferencias detectadas ratifican la hipótesis planteada en este trabajo, por lo que se evidencia la necesidad de que en la formación inicial del profesorado de estas etapas educativas se potencien acciones que conecten e interrelacionen el proceso educativo del alumnado de 3 a 12 años.

Palabras clave: Formación inicial del profesorado, prácticum, competencia lingüística, competencia lectora, estudio comparativo.
概要
本研究是欧洲项目“从纸质书到数字时代的阅读社区”（READ-COM）的一部分，其目的是提高家庭、学校、教师和大学生（未来教师）对阅读和阅读重要性的认识。提供创新资源以改善家庭和学校的阅读实践。在这种情况下，对幼儿教育和小学教育学位最后一年学生的阅读表现进行审查，作为促进 3-12 岁学生学习和巩固阅读相关阶段之间过渡的手段。
研究对这两个教育阶段的四年级学生的阅读策略习得水平进行比较描述，进行了一项定量研究。共有 237 名大学生参与，其中 108 名学生对应幼儿教育阶段，129 名学生对应小学教育阶段。
幼儿教育阶段和初等教育阶段所获得的语言技能已得到确定。幼儿教育中最普遍的能力与心理教育学、阅读学习方法和活动组织的能力相关。与资源和评估相关的分数有更大的相似性。
检测到的差异证实了本研究中提出的假设，该假设表明需要对这些教育阶段的教师进行初步培训，以促进将 3 至 12 岁学生的教育过程联系起来和相互关联的行动。

关键词：初始教师培训, 实习, 语言能力, 阅读能力, 比较研究.

Аннотация
данное исследование является частью европейского проекта «Читательские сообщества от бумажных книг к цифровой эре» (READ-COM), целью которого является повышение осведомленности семей, школ, учителей и студентов вузов (будущих учителей) о важности чтения и предоставление инновационных ресурсов для улучшения практики чтения дома и в школе. В данном случае рассматривается читательская деятельность студентов выпускного курса бакалавриата по специальностям «Воспитание детей младшего возраста» и «Начальное образование» как средство содействия переходу между этапами в отношении обучения и закрепления навыков чтения у школьников 3-12 лет.

проведено сравнительное описание уровней овладения стратегиями чтения студентами четвертого курса обеих специальностей. Было проведено количественное исследование, в котором приняли участие 237 студентов университета, из них 108 студентов соответствовали степени бакалавра дошкольного образования и 129 - степени бакалавра начального образования.

выявлены языковые компетенции, полученные в бакалавриате по специальности “Воспитание детей дошкольного периода” и в бакалавриате по специальности “Начальное образование”. Наиболее распространенными компетенциями в области дошкольного образования оказались компетенции “Психопедагогические принципы и методика обучения чтению” и “Организация деятельности”. Большое сходство наблюдается в оценках по компетенциям “Ресурсы” и “Оценка”.

выявленные различия подтверждают выдвинутую в данном исследовании гипотезу о необходимости начальной подготовки педагогов на этих этапах обучения для развития действий, обеспечивающих взаимосвязь и взаимообусловленность образовательного процесса учащихся от 3 до 12 лет.

Ключевые слова: Начальное педагогическое образование, Практика, Лингвистическая компетенция, Читательская компетенция, Сравнительное исследование, Языковая компетенция.
Introduction

One of the most crucial moments that a child can live in their childhood is the passage between the stages of Early Childhood Education and Primary Education, in which the child undergoes relevant changes on a social, academic, personal, and methodological level (Argos et al., 2019; Bakken et al., 2017; Castro et al., 2018; Parent et al., 2019; Sierra, 2018; Wong & Power, 2019). It is important to note that this will be the first of several school transitions the child will make throughout their learning, which facilitates success in the consecutive by favouring a positive result in the first (Castro et al., 2012).

The teachers lead this educational transition, ensuring it takes place in the best conditions. To this end, education professionals must have adequate training, both in their initial and continuous training (Castro et al., 2018; Kartal & Guner, 2018). It highlights the collaboration between teachers of both educational stages who need their common training points to help the evolution of the educational process of children without shocks or excessive anguish (Castro et al., 2018; González-Moreira et al., 2021; Sierra, 2018).

One of these common points is the approach to reading, which must be understood from the sense and functionality in both stages, bearing in mind that in Early Childhood Education, it approximates. To this end, it is crucial to foster the love of reading in children in Early Childhood and Primary, since it is a pleasant and enriching activity that allows them to access knowledge and develop their imagination and creativity. To achieve this, we must carefully select the appropriate books for their age and interests (Gutiérrez-Freneda, 2020; Pascual et al., 2013; Stavans & Tolchinsky, 2021). It is helpful to create a warm and quiet environment inviting reading and learning. A suitable space with good lighting, varied texts, and attractive materials can motivate students to explore different themes and literary genres (Loría-Rocha, 2020; Pascual et al., 2019, 2021).

Teaching reading should start with global approaches, which allow students to associate the meaning of words and sentences to their context. At the same time, students need to become aware of the language’s phonology, which involves developing the ability to identify and manipulate the sounds of spoken language, such as syllables, phonemes, and rhymes. This facilitates the comprehension and production of written texts (Gutiérrez-Freneda, 2019, 2020; Madrid et al., 2021a). To achieve education for life, it is essential to consider reading as a transversal tool that must be included in projects and didactic units (currently called ‘learning situations’) planned in collaboration by teachers and other professionals of the educational institution (Estrada et al., 2021; Vázquez-Cano et al., 2020).

In short, reading not only promotes the development of skills in various areas of knowledge but also stimulates creativity, critical thinking, text comprehension, and communication skills, which will have a positive impact on the personal and academic life of the student (Aznar-Díaz et al., 2022; Luo et al., 2020; Sánchez-García, 2018; Viramontes et al., 2019).

Collaboration between teachers early childhood education and primary education with regard to the teaching–learning process of reading is essential to ensure quality education and, thus, an effective transition from one stage to another (González-Moreira et al., 2020; Tao et al., 2019).
This supports the idea that professionals of both stages must work together to design coherent and progressive educational programmes that allow harmonious development in boys and girls. This means that professionals can coordinate their teaching objectives and strategies to develop effective reading skills in children from an early age and establish a solid foundation for continuous learning in Primary Education (Arrizabalaga et al., 2023).

Cooperation between both sets of professionals can be fundamental for the holistic, coherent, and equitable development of children, as well as to improving educational-progressive change and foster a sense of belonging in the educational community. In addition, this collaboration can help identify and address children's individual reading needs and difficulties, promoting effective and personalized learning (Gómez-Marí & Gómez-Marí, 2021; Sierra, 2018; Stavans & Tolchinsky, 2021). In this regard, collaboration in the reading process between trainee teachers in Early Childhood and Primary Education during their school internships can benefit their professional development. It allows them to learn from each other, design and carry out effective reading activities, and receive constructive feedback. It also favours teamwork, reflecting on their teaching practice and developing communication and leadership skills. Ultimately, this can enhance children's meaningful learning and educational experience (Pascual et al., 2022).

Therefore, in this work, it has been considered essential to know the training of future teachers in linguistic competence from praxis because these periods of initial training are key to learning and transforming practical knowledge (Darling-Hammond & Oakes, 2019; Korthagen & Nuijten, 2018; Pérez Gómez, 2017), allowing the slow and experiential reconstruction of the fundamental competences that the exercise of the teaching profession demands.

The Present Study

The present study examined the degree of application of actions that help children (3–12 years) in learning and in consolidation in reading by fourth-year students of the degrees in Early Childhood Education and Primary Education to establish the strengths and weaknesses of each of the categories studied that help identify and/or propose strategies that facilitate continuity in the reading process.

The main objectives were to establish the levels of employment of the different actions for each of the categories by fourth-year students in their internship period of the aforementioned degrees, compare the levels and degree of reading performances in their internship when they act alone and/or with their professional tutor in the classrooms of Early Childhood Education and Primary Education. Following the objectives set, we postulate the following hypothesis: significant differences between the actions carried out by the students of the degree in Early Childhood Education and the degree in Primary Education hinder a healthy educational transition.

Methods

The study participants were 237 fourth-year college students (female n = 196, male n = 41). By degree, 108 students were from the degree in Early Childhood Education and 129 from the degree in Primary Education.
Instruments

The information was collected with two instruments built ad hoc: a questionnaire on language didactics in the degree in Early Childhood Education and another questionnaire on language didactics in the degree in Primary Education. For the construction of both questionnaires, the study and analysis of the specific competencies of the titles have been carried out, where the module ‘Language Learning and Literacy’ has been key to identifying the specific competencies of our project.

These questionnaires consist of two parts. The first addresses the perception of students about their teacher training in which they ask about 20 skills in Early Childhood Education and 21 in Primary that are necessary to develop reading competence in the pupils of a school, knowing how to involve both students and families, thanks to the training received in the title. And the second deals with the activities carried out during the last period of practice considering the broad experience they have had during them, in the classroom where they have been, asked if the student, the tutor, or both have carried them out.

This work has focused on this second part of the questionnaire, with questions on language skills organized into four categories: psycho-pedagogical and methodological principles of reading learning; organization of activities; resources; and evaluation. For the present study, the reliability obtained for this scale showed adequate results of Cronbach’s alpha .86, and McDonald’s Omega of .86.

Procedure

The survey design and the non-probability sampling technique called incidental sampling were used, whose selection criterion was to study fourth of the degree in Early Childhood Education or Primary Education at the University of Malaga. They were asked to participate through the teaching staff who were teaching in one of these courses at that time. Initially, the faculty were contacted by telephone and email to inform them about the research. Subsequently, a meeting was held with the students to provide in greater detail the relevant information about the study and to facilitate the instrument to be used. Once the university students’ consent to participate was obtained, the link was provided to complete the questionnaire, and it was also delivered in paper format to those who so wished.

Analytical Strategy

A descriptive quantitative analysis of the collected data has been carried out using the IBM SPSS Statistics v. 24 software package. Specifically, comparative analyses with chi-square contrast were performed to determine the differences in the response to the categorical distributions. In addition, the student’s t-test was used to compare the means between students in the Early Childhood and the Primary Education classes. Finally, reliability statistics such as Cronbach’s alpha and McDonald’s Omega were used.
Results

The results of the comparative analyses of the reading interventions carried out by the students of the Early Childhood Education and Primary Education degrees show significant differences in several actions of the different categories.

First, significant differences were found in the category of psych pedagogical principles and reading learning methodology, specifically in the performance of ‘my students are offered directed readings to promote the development of social skills that help them face and resolve conflicts in the classroom’ \( \chi^2(3) = 3.08; p = .378 \). Students of the Primary Education degree achieved a higher response rate (29.5%) than those of the Early Childhood Education degree (9.3%). The rest of the psych-pedagogical principles and reading learning methodology categories did not show significant differences in the response rate between the students of the two degrees (Table 1).

Table 1
Comparative Results in the Category of Psychopedagogical Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>Tutor (%)</th>
<th>Student (%)</th>
<th>Both (%)</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions are asked of my students as they read texts to ensure their understanding.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities are proposed for my students to summarize and synthesize knowledge after a reading (themes, main ideas, protagonists, events, inferences, ...).</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students receive targeted readings to promote the development of social skills that help them cope with and resolve conflicts in the classroom.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>21.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, in the comparative results in the category of organization of activities, there are significant differences in several of the actions. First, with regard to ‘reading activities are done individually’ \( \chi^2(3) = 17.27; p < .001 \). Table 2 shows significant differences in favour of the Early Childhood Education students concerning the Primary Education students when the actions are carried out alone by the practice students in the classroom. However, when readings are carried out in pairs \( \chi^2(3) = 19.10; p < .001 \), says not to do it (52%) in Primary, as well as 33.3% in Early Childhood Education; and conversely when they are done by the professional tutor, where the response is overwhelmingly higher in Early Childhood Education (36.1%) compared to those of Primary (13.2%).
When asked whether the reading activities ‘begin with a joint project with the rest of the curricular areas’ \( \chi^2(3) = 39.63; p < .001 \), students of the Primary Education degree report a higher response rate (42.6%) than students in Early Childhood education (7.4%) in the no response, and a higher response rate of the Early Childhood students (48.1%) than Primary students (23.2%) when carried out jointly by the tutor and the degree students (Table 2).

Regarding ‘the need or not to modify the classroom schedule according to the needs of the students throughout the course’ \( \chi^2(3) = 30.19; p < .001 \), students of the degree in Primary Education report a lower response rate (15.5%) than students on the Infant degree course (44.4%) in no response, and a higher response rate of the Primary student (34.1%) than students in Early Childhood Education (15.7%) in the tutor’s response (Table 2). When we talk about ‘the need to organize groups taking into account that there are pupils with different levels of reading’ \( \chi^2(3) = 20.27; p < .001 \), students in the Primary Education degree achieve a lower response rate (36.4%) than Infant students (60.2%) in both answers (Table 2).

**Table 2**

*Comparative Results in the Category of Organization of Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>Tutor (%)</th>
<th>Student (%)</th>
<th>Both (%)</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization of activities (programming or planning, calendar, student grouping)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading activities are carried out in a large group.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading activities are done in a small groups.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading activities are done individually.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>17.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lectures are carried out in pairs.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reading activities are based on a joint project with the rest of the curriculum areas.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>39.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom schedule is modified according to the needs of my students throughout the course.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>30.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The groups are organized taking into account that there are students with different reading levels.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>20.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the results in the category of Resources, they show significant differences in ‘the participation of families in activities to promote reading in the educational centre, such as the cultural week and/or theatrical performance’ \( \chi^2(3) = 47.52; p < .001 \) where students of the Primary Education degree obtain a lower response rate (34.9%) than those of the Early Childhood Education (13.9%) in the no answer and a higher response rate in Early Childhood students degree (51.9%) than Primary students (19.4%) in both answers.

When we refer to the appropriateness of ‘using a textbook in the language area’ \( \chi^2(3) = 19.95; p < .001 \), students in the Primary Education degree reach a higher response rate (60.5%) than Infant students (34.3%) when inquiring about the preferences of their tutors, inverting the response value when mentioning both, in which Infant (43.5%) is significantly higher than in Primary (27.9%).

Everyone knows the motivation that encourages the use of ICT in children from an early age. Therefore, participants were asked about the use of ICT to promote the development of language competence \( \chi^2(3) = 35.07; p < .001 \), Primary students achieved a lower response rate (15.5%) than Infant students (48.1%) in the responses of the tutors and there was a higher response of the Primary student (48.1%) than students of the degree in Early Childhood Education (26.9%) to joint actions (Table 3).

To complete the category of resources, the feasibility of ‘using different techniques to analyse a text read’ \( \chi^2(3) = 13.29; p = .004 \), students in Primary Education report a lower response rate (19.4%) than Infant students (37.0%) in the response of tutors and a higher response rate of Primary students (39.5%) than Infant students (25.0%) in joint actions (Table 3).

### Table 3

*Comparative Results for the Resource Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>Tutor (%)</th>
<th>Student (%)</th>
<th>Both (%)</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The participation of families in the organization of reading activities</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>47.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cultural week, performance of works, ...)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students use a textbook in the language area.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>19.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT is used to promote the development of language competence.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>35.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader sponsorship takes place in the centre, where my students tell</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stories to lower levels students.</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different techniques are used to analyse a reading text (concept maps, dramatizations, murals, portfolios, opinions, debates, ...).

Finally, in the comparative results in the Assessment category there are significant differences in performance ‘specific times during the course are used to test my students with a reading test’. \( \chi^2(3) = 23.40; p < .001 \) where students studying for a degree in Primary Education get a higher response rate (31.8%) than students in Infant (8.3%) in no response, and there is a higher response rate of Infant (68.5%) than Primary (41.9%) in the response of tutors (Table 4).

Table 4
Comparative Results in the Evaluation Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>Tutor (%)</th>
<th>Student (%)</th>
<th>Both (%)</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different techniques are used to analyse a reading text</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 5, the comparative analyses grouped by categories of the mean scores show significant differences in ‘Psycho-pedagogical principles and reading learning methodology’ \( t (235) = 4.95; p < .001 \) as well as ‘Organization of activities’ \( t (235) = 2.17; p = .034 \). The results show significant differences between the degree in Early Childhood Education students and those taking the degree in Primary Education, where the linguistic actions applied treated in their practices are presented to a greater extent in the title of Early Childhood Education.

Table 5
Comparative results by category in the students of both grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psycho-pedagogical principles and methodology of learning to read</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of activities</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the initial objectives proposed, the linguistic actions have been identified in the four categories worked in the Early Childhood Education and Primary Education degrees. The categories with the highest prevalence in the degree in Early Childhood Education were Psycho-pedagogical Principles and Methodology of Reading Learning and Organization of Activities. There is a greater similarity in the scores related to Resources and Evaluation.

**Discussion**

There are doubts about the effectiveness of teacher training with regard to the competency development of teachers in training. Theory is part of teacher education but is not integrated into teaching practice (Álvarez-Álvarez & Diego-Mantecón, 2019; Hennissen et al., 2017; Medina & Pérez, 2017). From this point of view, it is essential to introduce the programming actions that allow adequate knowledge about the curriculum of the language and literature, the evolution of the language, the mastery of different techniques of expression and oral and written comprehension, as well as resources for the promotion of reading (Iñesta & Pascual, 2015; Madrid et al., 2021b; Pascual et al., 2021).

Through the results obtained, it has been possible to ratify the hypothesis raised in this work, showing in the initial training of teachers of Infant and Primary the need to plan actions that connect and interrelate the educational process of pupils from 3 to 12 years (Abellán, 2019; Castro et al., 2018; Correia & Marques-Pinto, 2016; Gómez-Mari & Gómez-Mari, 2021; Madrid & Pascual, 2022; Sierra, 2018). For this, as we have mentioned, it is significant that the educational, evolutionary, and social framework of the two stages are enhanced in both degrees, especially in the last level of Early childhood Education with the first cycle of Primary Education (Pascual, 2015; Sierra, 2018). The educational transit is studied as the process of change from one phase of education to another and the challenges that arise at the level of social relations, coordination of teachers and teachers with families, organization of space and time, teaching styles, groupings and/or learning contexts are known (Castro et al., 2018; González-Moreira et al., 2021).
On the other hand, considering the objectives initially proposed, it is stated that there are actions with a higher prevalence in some of the degrees compared to others whereby there is a greater agreement to carry them out in both stages. With regard to the category 'Psycho-pedagogical and methodological principles of learning to read', there seems to be consensus, among the students of practices and the professional tutor, to favour actions with their pupils that ensure the comprehension of the reading. At the same time, it propose at the end of the text, other activities such as synthesis, description of the character, etc.

However, there is no agreement when we talk about experiences in reading focused on promoting social skills in our students in favour of the degree in Early Childhood Education with respect to Primary Education. The different types of texts, among which are stories, allow students the peaceful resolution of conflicts as well as a satisfactory emotional education (Campos & Ortiz, 2019; González et al., 2020; Serrano, 2019).

In the dimension ‘Organization of activities’, in both degrees, there is a belief in the need to carry out different types of grouping when it comes to reading competence, being very similar to the results in the actions in a large and small group. An intelligent spatial organization must contemplate teamwork that allows the progress of oral and written expression and comprehension (Cortés et al., 2018; Darretxe et al., 2021; Sanahuja et al., 2020; Suárez-Lantarón & García-Martínez, 2022). The individual activities say they are not carried out by the students of the Degree in Early Childhood Education. At the same time, there is an affirmative answer when they are carried out with a professional tutor. This suggests that these are individual actions that are carried out in the classroom usually to compensate for inequalities in the beginnings of reading learning affected by various circumstances, such as little involvement of families, lack of motivation, or resources not appropriate to the age of the pupils (Pascual et al., 2021; Romero et al., 2019).

However, in the students of the Primary Education degree, it seems that there are defined moments for individual activities (readings in silence, expansion of information on a topic, ...) that entail a reading enrichment, all of which are beneficial to the improvement of academic performance (García et al., 2018; Viramontes et al., 2019). Reading in pairs is a good predictor of healthy classrooms where students with different competence levels help each other, providing an innate, intrinsic motivation (Duran & Valdebenito, 2014; Flores & Durán, 2016; Valdebenito & Duran, 2015). Likewise, reader sponsorship is a widely used approach in schools, sometimes promoted by the initiative of the library manager. These are encouraged by teachers of Early Childhood Education who find in the reading of texts, by the students of Primary Education to the students of Infant. This model sensitizes the taste for reading. In our study, this action is mainly organized by teachers and students of Primary Education practices.

The organization of schedules in schools in the Primary Education stage, with diverse professionals who teach different subjects makes it difficult to carry out project work whereby the basic knowledge of the different subjects are combined (Gairín, 2020; Gairín & Castro, 2021), facilitating the organizational structure of Early Childhood Education where the tutor is responsible for teaching the three curricular areas. With regard to the ‘Resources’ category, it should be noted that the participation of families (Estrada et al., 2021) in schools when activities such as cultural weeks, anniversaries, and reader sponsorship are taking place, are more valued in Early Childhood Education, reversing the response when the tutor does it alone.
The use of a textbook in the area of language for learning as the consolidation of reading, despite the limitations in its use, receives an overwhelming response in Primary Education by the tutor (Molina & Alfaro, 2019; Suárez, 2019).

For its part, the school's use of new technologies in teaching practices is understood so that it cannot remain alien to the needs of today's society. Authors such as Luna et al. (2019) highlight the innate interest that awakens in the pupils from an early age. But we also know that these must be subject to the service of learning strategies that help acquire basic knowledge in preferably shared environments, (Furenes et al., 2021; Medellín, 2018; Orellana et al., 2021; Sánchez-Rivero et al., 2021).

In terms of the ‘Evaluation’, the use of reading tests that allow the competency level of the students to be known, is potentially more interesting to teachers in Early Childhood Education compared to Primary teachers, altering the results slightly when the reading tests are carried out between both in favour of Primary. It is thought that the pressure that exists in Early Childhood Education by society, especially in the later levels, where it is perceived more as a pre-primary, causes an unproductive feeling, which leads to uneasiness in contexts limited by dedicating the level of 5 years to learning reading as an almost exclusive competence. As indicated by Sancho and Delgado (2021), ‘The pressure of teaching to read and write ends up perverting all the purposes and contents of the stage before primary school, which is where learning to read and write must be carried out’ (p.263).

With regards to lines of improvement, the results obtained lead us, on the one hand, to the reflection made by Castro et al. (2018) on the global and ecological commitment contemplated the educational transition from a triple perspective: the macrocontext (with educational policies that facilitate personal, organizational, and curricular resources for an adequate transition); the mesocontext (related to the collaboration and coordination of all the agents involved in the education of the minor, especially the family and teachers); and, finally, methodological orientations in school classrooms, which would be the microcontext in which these practices are evidenced and implemented to facilitate a desirable educational transition. And on the other, to highlight the urgent need to improve the conditions in which the practical training of teachers is developed in the university context, generating spaces that allow the school and university – and, therefore, the professional tutor and the academic tutor – to connect, whereby both have the opportunity to meet, enrich, and respect each other. Finally, it should be noted that the adequacy of the sample is the main limitation of this study because it has only analysed the titles of a single university, it difficult to generalize the conclusions. which makes it difficult to generalize the conclusions.
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