USE OF SPEECH LABELS IN THE WRITING OF TEXTS

USO DE ETIQUETAS DISCURSIVAS NA ESCRITA DE TEXTOS

USO DE ETIQUETAS DISCURSIVAS EN LA REDACCIÓN DE TEXTOS

Marlenis MARTÍNEZ[1]
Katihuska MOTA[2]
Jennifer QUIÑONEZ[3]

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the research was to analyze the actions that favor the use of discursive labels in the writing of texts by the students of the College Particular San Javier, Comuna San Javier, Maule-Chile Region. Methodologically, the quantitative approach was used, type field with descriptive design. As findings, the knowledge that teachers and students have about the use of discursive labels for writing texts was diagnosed; the most frequent functions that the discursive labels perform in the writing of written texts were identified, the discursive deficiencies produced by their scarce or inappropriate use were determined; finally, the actions that favor the incorporation of discursive labels in the writing of texts by the students under study were defined.

KEYWORDS: Labels. Discursive. Writing. Texts.

RESUMO: O objetivo do estudo se enquadrou na análise das ações que favorecem o uso de rótulos discursivos na redação de textos dos alunos da Escola Particular San Javier, Comuna de San Javier, Região do Maule-Chile. Metodologicamente, utilizou-se a abordagem quantitativa, tipo de campo com desenho descritivo. Como constatações, diagnosticou-se o conhecimento que professores e alunos possuem sobre o uso de rótulos discursivos para a escrita de textos; Foram identificadas as funções mais frequentes desempenhadas pelos rótulos discursivos na escrita de textos escritos, determinadas as deficiências discursivas produzidas por seu uso escasso ou inadequado; Por fim, foram definidas as ações que favorecem a incorporação de rótulos discursivos na escrita dos textos pelos alunos em estudo.

[1] Miguel de Cervantes University (UMC), Chile. Academic Directorate of Postgraduation and Research. Postdoctorate in Knowledge Management (Libertador Experimental Pedagogical University). Doctorate in Educational Sciences (Fermín Toro University). Master's in Education, Mention in Educational Management (Libertador Experimental Pedagogical University -Pedagogical Institute of Barquisimeto). Teaching degree in Integral Education, Mention in Spanish and Literature and Natural Sciences (Experimental University of the Western Plains "Ezequiel Zamora") (UNELLEZ). ORCID. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5926-599X. E-mail: marlenism3@gmail.com

[2] Miguel de Cervantes University (UMC), Chile. Academic, Directorate of Postgraduation and Research. PhD in Educational Sciences, Master in Business Management with a mention in Operations, Petroleum Engineer. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4108-957X. E-mail: motakt@gmail.com

[3] Miguel de Cervantes University (UMC), Chile. Academic, Directorate of Postgraduation and Research. Master in Higher Education Sciences mention University Teaching, Graduate in Integral Education, Lawyer. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3724-0182. E-mail: jennifer.zurina@hotmail.com

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Rótulos. Discursivo. Escrita. Textos.*

RESUMEN: *El propósito del estudio estuvo enmarcado en analizar las acciones que favorezcan el uso de etiquetas discursivas en la redacción de textos de los estudiantes del Colegio Particular San Javier, Comuna San Javier, Región del Maule-Chile. Metodológicamente se utilizó el enfoque cuantitativo, tipo campo con diseño descriptivo. Como hallazgos se diagnosticó el conocimiento que tienen los docentes y estudiantes sobre el uso de etiquetas discursivas para la redacción de textos; se identificaron las funciones más frecuentes que desempeñan las etiquetas discursivas en la redacción de textos escritos, se determinaron las deficiencias discursivas que produce el uso escaso o inapropiado de las mismas; finalmente, se definieron las acciones que favorecen la incorporación de las etiquetas discursivas en la redacción de textos por los educandos objeto de estudio.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Etiquetas. Discursiva. Redacción. Textos.*

Introduction

The need to learn information, to maintain knowledge through time and space seem to be natural. However, the individual conceived writing, in the long term, in a chain of initiating periods and in a broad process of accommodating the image to the idea first and then to the sounds. Therefore, writing is the archive of the memory of humanity (SANTANDER, 2016). In this way, written texts have had a great influence on the entire population, especially in the formal educational context. Therefore, the structure of a writing was deemed as a simple product in coding or transcription of orality, currently it is visualized that the communication scenario of the written discourse is completely different from the oral one, because they are not present, at the same time, the writer and the reader.

It is understood, therefore, that language is not only used to transmit information but also to create a version of reality that occurs in a certain environment and that it has a frame of reference in the different forms of publications and manifestations, where the use of invariable linguistic elements is evident, such as the so-called discursive labels, which unite different statements and guide the inferences that are generated from the interpretation of the discourse.

For SALAZAR (2016), discursive labels represent a type of phoric elements that make it possible to refer to a previous (anaphora) or later (cataphor) fragment while categorizing it with a noun (encapsulation). The importance of this mechanism is not only found in discourse analysis, but also in learning coherent and cohesive writing.

In this way, it is expressed that the effectiveness and coherence of a text result in part from the proper use of discursive labels in the writing of texts, in the case of this research, from academics. In other words, the logical and pertinent use of written language to generate a coherent and appropriate product. Based on the above, Salazar (2016) states that discursive labeling is framed as "a textual procedure that affects dimensions as diverse as the management of the discursive topic, the rhetorical organization of the text, the international connection or the persuasive power of discourse" (p. 37, our translation). Therefore, it is understood that the interest in investigating their behavior in writing in academic situations arises from the key role in the provision of derivations and, in the process of text production. In this regard, Calatrava (2016), which:

> At the level of educational institutions, a great variety of writings are generated with especially stereotyped formats and characteristics, demands such as the preparation of reports, essays, research, among others, and those who participate in them in one way or another need to efficiently manipulate the Textual diversity to produce texts that have cohesion and coherence. However, unfortunately, these skills are not always fully developed (p. 55, our translation).

This reference is supported by Cárdenas (2015), in a study carried out at the Santa María La Vieja University, Panama in which he indicates "high school students have difficulties in producing argumentative texts, exhibiting deficiencies in condensing content of discursive segments in a coherent and cohesive way" (p. 23, our translation).

Similarly, in Chile, studies related to the production of texts have been carried out, being evidenced in the framework of the First Study of Reading Behavior at the National Level (CNCA, 2015), cited by Leyton; Pardo (2016), in which "globally, 33% of the students have difficulties in generating a text, reflecting on and evaluating the contents of what they read, among other reading and writing tasks" (p. 4, our translation). It means that students lack the basic skills of analysis, interpretation and perception of reading and, therefore, also lacks in the coherent and logical production of written productions.

Likewise, Jiménez (2016), in his research entitled "Actions for the improvement in the writing of Chilean students: A revision proposal from the linguistics of the text", aimed to propose actions that favor the written productions carried out with writings of students of the Humanist Scientific Medium level (First to Fourth Medium). As conclusions, first, the author identified difficulties in the writing, being summarized in the following aspects: absent-minded punctuation and inexperience of its primary use; abundance of subordination induced by carelessness in punctuation; poverty of ideas: insufficient variety and excessive repetition;

variation of the logical and syntactic order of the sentence structure; disorder between title and content; lack of knowledge in the use of the paragraph, in its external and internal structure; duplication of words, atrocities, inaccuracy of synonyms. Consequently, the incidence in the deficiencies in the writing is specified, deficiencies are shown from the discursive representation in its textual and microcomposition dimension, which makes the presence of quality in the writing of the text impossible.

In this sense, the author proposes actions oriented to the use of discursive labels, hyperonyms and encapsulators that allow generating referential cohesion relations in the writing of texts. These elements are understood to be based on the context not only for the characterization of their referent, but also to finalize the conceptual meaning of their nominal nucleus and the empty or schematic space that exists in the semantic structure of the names that perform this discursive function.

Within the exposed approaches it is understood that a handling of basic linguistic elements is required for an adequate construction of texts. Therefore, specific mention is made of the use of discussion labels, which play an important role, fundamentally by granting cohesion and grammatical coherence to ideas in written discourse, considering from the cognitive-discursive function, on the one hand, the encapsulation or condensation of the content and, on the other hand, the categorization or conceptualization of the same to give entity to the discourse.

With reference to the categorization of discursive labels according to the main types of discourse, it is pointed out that they agree to concentrate the content of one or more predicative structures, conceptualizing it as a second or third order entity, maintaining a close relationship with the different types of texts; Therefore, it classifies them into two large groups: informative functions and discursive meta, considering for these linguistic-discursive criteria (SUÁREZ, 2017). Understanding that they impose a set of linguistic marks that specify, condition, give meaning to the comprehension and textual elaboration, responding to the correct progression of the information, by imposing on a chain of order propositions, to achieve a specific end.

Consequently, from the understanding of the usefulness of teaching and learning one of the mechanisms of lexical cohesion, discursive labels, as an academic writing technique, is raised the reality of students belonging to the fourth level of the Humanist Scientific Medium of the Private School "San José", located in the Commune of San Javier in the Maule Region-Chile, understanding that it is necessary to generate greater attention in written productions, locating it as an object of learning in the communicative context, by virtue of the fact that

they are close to completing the tuition stage for their admission to higher education institutions, in which they will demand the construction of more complex coherent units of meaning, in order to advance in their educational process.

Therefore, in a general way, the objective of this work sought to establish the functioning, from the actions that favor the use of discursive labels in the writing of texts, by this sector of students, to think how a writing skill that admits representing the text as a unit of linguistic communication organized and related to each other and, that explicitly or implicitly, contribute to its construction from the syntactic, pragmatic and semantic perspectives in correspondence with the properties of the texts.

Methodology

The type corresponds to a descriptive field investigation in which the data collection arises directly from the subjects investigated or from the reality in which the events occur (primary data). Hence, the design has a non-experimental character (ARIAS, 2016). On the other hand, to support the research, it relies on documentary sources, to which Bavaresco (2016) points out that "it is practically the research that starts almost all the others, since it allows prior knowledge or bibliographic documentary support linked on the subject of study […]" (p. 27, our translation). The documentary contribution supports the development of each of the variables by presenting a theoretical framework that allows the researcher to support or refute the considerations expressed there.

This collection of information is necessary to fulfill the purpose of reviewing the problem and offering viable alternatives, allowing to inquire about the knowledge that teachers and students have about the use of discursive labels for writing texts, as well as the distortions and discursive deficiencies that produces the scarce or inappropriate incorporation of the same in the written discourse, in order to these data to generate actions that manage to consolidate the construction of texts in which it is possible to enhance, not only the coherence and cohesion, but the presence of the different elements that characterize good writing.

The guiding questions of the research process were: What knowledge do teachers and students, belonging to the fourth level Humanist Scientific School of the "San José" Private School, have about the use of discursive labels for writing texts?; What are the frequent functions that discursive labels perform in the writing of written texts?; What discursive deficiencies does the scant or inappropriate use of discursive labels produce in the writing of written texts by students of the fourth level Humanist Scientific School "San José"?; What

actions will favor the incorporation of discursive labels in the writing of texts by the students of the fourth level Humanist Scientific School of "San José" Private School?

Regarding the intervention subjects, a general preparatory meeting was initially held, in this way, the population to which the researcher applies the generalizations obtained to try to formulate statements that are valid for that cluster; being made up of six (6) teachers and twenty-two (22) students of the fourth level Humanist Scientific Medium who develop the subject Language and Communication.

It is highlighted that, from the selection, the people, after being informed of the characteristics of the study and requesting their collaboration, must voluntarily express their willingness to participate in the research, this is confirmed in the form called Informed consent. This represents the manifestation of the autonomy of the personnel who voluntarily participate in the study, corresponding to the legal and ethical basis of the research.

The following techniques were used: (a) Documentary analysis, to examine different relevant and necessary documents in order to support the theory of the problem under study; (b) Survey, aimed at teachers, in this sense its structured form was used and, it is defined by Hurtado and Toro (2016), as "a technique that seeks to analyze, obtain information provided by a group or sample of subjects about themselves, or in relation to a particular subject" (p. 72, our translation).

This facilitates the obtaining of reliable exact data through contact with reality, contributing to the realization of the diagnosis that described the situation under study and; (c) Qualified Practice, aimed at students, this is defined by Martínez (2015) as one that "allows to check the skills and abilities acquired by the students in the development of a certain task, representative of the behavior to be measured" (p. 34, our translation).

The same topic that they had to develop in the stipulated time was indicated for the entire sample. The twenty-two (22) essays had to have a page and a half in length on some Chilean problem and its possible solutions, conceived as a formal academic text. In this sense, it is understood that the requested compositions meet the objective of informing about a problem and dissuading the reader about a position around it (causes, consequences, solutions, among others), just as an essay for any educational course does.

The following instruments were selected: To attend the documentary analysis technique: (a) Files; (b) Computers and their storage units and; (c) the Analysis Matrix, through which the information is extracted from the revised documents that support this study. For teachers: a structured questionnaire was designed with closed questions with multiple choice, in some of them it is requested to expand the answer, in order to facilitate the

analysis of the data, which allowed obtaining the corresponding information on the knowledge of discursive labels for writing texts. For students: the application of the Descriptive Assessment of Practices is considered as established by Torres (2015) under the incorporation of discursive labels, linking them with the standards of cohesion, coherence and informativeness in the writing of texts that students have. The result of reading the written productions is recorded in an Analytical Rubric for this type of texts.

The Validity of the Instrument as established by Hernández, Fernández and Baptista (2016), was through content or expert judgments, with the purpose of obtaining information and checking if the items clearly reflect the objectives that are intended to be achieved. In this sense, two specialists in the areas of methodology and Spanish were selected, to whom the instrument to be evaluated and the observation sheet with their respective instructions were sent through written communication; The pertinence, clarity and coherence of each of the elaborated items were considered, subsequently, observations were made from them, which are incorporated and then applied to the study sample.

When considering the data analysis technique, the criterion of Méndez (2015) is postulated, for this, after the application of the instruments, they are reviewed, a double entry matrix is elaborated for the transcription of the answers given in each Item supported by the SPSS program version 11.5, determining the simple and percentage frequencies in each response alternative offered. Next, we proceeded to the elaboration of descriptive tables and, to carry out the interpretation and analysis of the information collected, for which the descriptive analysis based on the percentage interpretation was used, confronting the relationship with the general theoretical framework, establishing its relationship with the objectives and the variables, highlighting the most relevant aspects found.

Results

Regarding the Teachers: 67% of the interviewees were female and 33% male; furthermore, 50% were in the age range 32-41 years and 50% between 42-51 years. They expressed that they do not have full knowledge about the possibilities of cognitive functioning of discursive labels (DL) as a textual mechanism with the capacity to organize the text, so they do not incorporate it into educational practice. However, they point out that they do guide the use of other mechanisms that allow cohesion and coherence in written texts.

On the other hand, 100% of teachers affirm that writing generates in students great concern for the inadequate mastery of writing skills, making it impossible to achieve effective

written communication, within the academic variety, that allows fluent transmission of their ideas and the final construction of knowledge. Likewise, 87% of the teachers interviewed maintain that students propose the use of writing for almost exclusively evaluative purposes; the difficulty in achieving coherence in the written text is related to the fact that the generated discourse may not regulate the task when being overcome by a disorderly flow of ideas in the face of the perceived demands of the evaluation.

Therefore, among the main discursive deficiencies that are indicated that are presented in the writing of students are: 33% lack of clarity and order, 33% incoherence, 17% redundancy and 17% lack of consistency. These data suggest that not all teachers in educational dynamics conduct a process that allows the participant to generate written products, from the incorporation of textual mechanisms, developing lexical-cohesive links in the writing corpus with a semantic relationship that stands out as a textual mechanism, the ability to organize the text.

Regarding the results, descriptive assessment of practices applied to the students: the corpus studied corresponded to twenty-two (22) essay-type writings, the topic was aimed at writing about a problem in Chile and its possible solutions, allowing the reader to be dissuaded from a position on this (causes, consequences, solutions, among others). For this, three of the standards that are valued from the final written product were taken into account, namely: cohesion, coherence and informativeness; understanding that these provide the ability to organize the text, this being the element where the relevance of the discursive label as a lexical resource and textual mechanism actually resides.

First Phase: The production of texts was assessed through levels that were adapted to identify how the student used discursive labels (DL), through their different functions in the content of the text, as follows:

Level 1. The text does not present DL that allows cohesion and coherence;

Level 2. The text presents some DL that allow cohesion and coherence, words are repeated excessively;

Level 3. The text presents adequate DL that allows cohesion and coherence, but repeats some words more than twice;

Level 4. The text presents adequate DL that allows cohesion and coherence.

Table 1 – Individualized results presence DL in the text

Student	Level	Observations
E1	1	Excessive repetition of the word "country". Lack of punctuation marks between propositions. Absence of DL
E2	1	Absence of DL and cohesion mechanisms. Repeat the terms "and", "also"
E3	2	Moderate repetition of words "place", "time". Inappropriate use of punctuation marks. Presence of some DLs that allow textual cohesion
E4	3	Moderate repetition of words "these", "what". Proper use of punctuation marks. Presents adequate DL that allows cohesion and coherence
E5	1	Absence of DL and cohesion mechanisms. Repeating excessive "too"
E6	2	Inappropriate use of punctuation marks. Excessive use of the demonstratives "these". Presence of some DLs that allow textual cohesion
E7	3	Correct use of DL, as well as other cohesion mechanisms such as relative pronouns (that), possessive (their) and demonstrative (these).
E8	1	Excessive repetition of the words "accident", "cars", "roadblock", "pollution". Absence of punctuation marks. Absence of DL.
E9	3	Use of cohesive mechanisms in a correct way, mainly pronouns of types: relative, possessive, demonstrative. Punctuation marks used appropriately. Presents adequate DL that allows cohesion and coherence but repeats some words more than twice.
E10	1	It does not have any cohesion mechanism, not even the basic one that are punctuation marks. Written in the first person plural and in the second person singular. The text does not present enough DLs to allow cohesion and coherence.
E11	1	Repetition of the word "the cell phone" and "connector" too. The text does not present enough DLs to allow cohesion and coherence.
E12	2	Excessive repetition of the relative pronoun "que" and the demonstrative "este". The text presents some DL that allows cohesion and coherence.
E13	1	Excessive use of the conjunction "and", text does not present enough DL to allow cohesion and coherence.

Source: Devised by the authors Elaboración propia

Table 2 – Individualized results presence DL in the text (continuation)

Student	Level	Observations
E14	1	Excessive repetition of words. Lack of global unity in the text since the topic is lost in the third paragraph. Inappropriate use of punctuation marks. The text does not present enough DLs to allow cohesion and coherence.
E15	1	Excessive repetition of demonstrative "this" Absence of punctuation marks. The text does not present DL that allows cohesion and coherence.
E16	2	Repetition of the word "development". Absence of punctuation marks between propositions. It presents some DLs that allow cohesion and coherence.
E17	1	Juxtapositions without semantic connection between propositions. Repetition of words "environment", "our", "country", Chile ". Lack of punctuation marks. The text does not present DL that allows cohesion and coherence.
E18	1	Repeated repetition of the words "companies", "consoles", "noises", "what", "which", "then". Lack of punctuation marks. Repeated use of "and". The text does not present DL that allows cohesion and coherence.
E19	1	The text does not present DL that allows cohesion and coherence Excessive repetition of "and", "also".

E20	2	Use of the word "that" in a reiterated way. The text presents some DL that allows cohesion and coherence.
E21	1	There are no punctuation marks. The text does not present DL, it lacks cohesion, coherence and information.
E22	1	Excessive repetition of words "human being". Punctuation marks used improperly. Does not present DL lacks cohesion, coherence.

Source: Devised by the authors

Table 3 – DL presence frequency distribution in the text

DL presence level	Number of students	Result (%)
Level 1	14	63
Level 2	5	23
Level 3	3	14
Level 4	0	0
Total	**22**	**100**

Source: Devised by the authors

According to the data presented, it is interpreted that 63% of the students are in Level 1, Insufficient, referring to the production of texts that do not present DL that allows cohesion and coherence, 23% in Level 2, Minimum, in which the text presents some DLs that allow cohesion and coherence, repeating words excessively and; 14% in Level 3, Satisfactory, those who generated a text with adequate use of the DL, giving it cohesion and coherence, however, the repetition of some words persists. Second Phase: Some of the qualitative assessments generated in the revision of the texts that allowed the identification of the discursive deficiencies produced by the scarce or inappropriate use of discursive labels in the writing of written productions are presented:

Table 4 – Deficiencies due to the scarce or inappropriate use of discursive labels in the writing of written productions

Discursive textual deficiencies	
	Lexical repetition, redundancy, incorrect identification of textual entities
	References far from the text. Lack of textual cohesion. There is no presence of unity in the paragraph
	Limited informative structuring (Use of words with the same root in little space). Use of textual categories that do not correspond to discursive labels
	Ignorance of the textual location of the discursive label

Source: Devised by the authors

Discussion

There is no full knowledge about the possibilities of cognitive functioning of discursive labels as a textual mechanism with the capacity to organize the text. This approach supports what is indicated by Calatrava (2016), when he points out that at the level of educational institutions a great variety of writings are generated with especially stereotyped formats and characteristics and require efficient manipulation of textual diversity. These competences are not fully developed, finding the lack in the use of discursive labels as phoric elements that allow coherence and cohesion in the written discourse.

It is perceived how the orientation and teaching for the writing of texts is emphasized in lessons that are aligned from a traditional normative grammar, without leading reflection and expertise around the function of linguistic resources that allow a quality textual construction, such as indicated by Castellano (2016). Therefore, it is essential that their skills operate intrinsically in grammatical resources, spelling, connectors and discursive labels that affirm and maintain an adequate grammar, which allows coherence and cohesion in the writing of texts.

The results show the need to generate actions that allow the teacher to use discursive labels in the teaching of writing texts, with the ultimate goal of empowering the student to appropriate a network of basic concepts that strengthen their performance in the use of both morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and cognitive linguistic conditions: from morphological suffixation, to cognitive considerations, which the beginning writer requires to carry out in the planning of his text, to enrich the semantic content of the entities encapsulated giving fluidity to written speech.

Depending on the purposes defined for the study, it is concluded that the teacher does not have knowledge, therefore does not use the teaching of discursive labels for the creation of written texts as part of the development of the Language and Communication subject. Indeed, students show problems to originate argumentative texts, presenting difficulties in concentrating the content of discursive segments in a coherent and cohesive way. This estimate rises when assessing that the lack of lexical precision, textual coherence, thematic progression, grammatical and spelling rules, among others, which converge in the same writing, obviously, and cause the text to be perceived as highly deficient.

Based on all the approaches, teachers consider that, by virtue of recognizing the function and usefulness of discursive labels, understanding that they facilitate writing, concomitant with the increase in the repertoire of expressions and ideas that enrich the written

product, giving it cohesion and, consequently coherence to writing, it is important to incorporate actions that contribute to its use, through the exercise of this resource to develop cognitive processes from writing.

Consequently, the importance of the functions performed by discursive labels (DL) in the writing of written texts as an anaphoric mechanism of lexical cohesion is corroborated, contributing to the textual coherence that limits the continuity and unity in the writing, according to Salazar (2016). From this, the actions are presented that allow their appropriate use: (1) contextualize the thematic unit of the writing, (2) attend to the lexical and grammatical property, textual cohesion, coherence, clarity and lexical variety, (3) Correct incorporation of the DL, requiring for this: the conceptual delimitation of it (use of the main lexical-grammatical patterns), generation of nominalization processes (transformation of an informational block into a discursive entity), develop conceptual integration (Integration of the meaning of a complex conceptual content into a less complex conceptual entity). This is supported by the position of Santander (2016).

REFERENCES

ARIAS, F. **El Proyecto de Investigación**: Guía para su Elaboración. 7. ed. Caracas: Episteme, 2016. ISBN: 980-07-3868-1.

BAVARESCO, P. **Procesos, estrategias y técnicas de aprendizaje**. España: Síntesis. 2016.

CALATRAVA, P. **La redacción en estudiantes universitarios**. Un estudio de análisis. 2016. Tesis (Doctoral) – Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela, 2016.

CÁRDENAS, L. **Análisis en la redacción formal de textos por los estudiantes de educación media**. 2015. Tesis (Doctoral) – Universidad Santa María La Vieja, Panamá, 2015.

CASTELLANO, O. **Lingüística del texto**. Madrid, España: Arcos y Libros: 2016.

HERNÁNDEZ, R.; FERNÁNDEZ, C.; BAPTISTA, P. **Metodología de la investigación**. México: McGraw-Hill, 2016

HURTADO, I.; TORO, J. **Paradigmas y métodos de investigación en tiempos de cambio**. Venezuela: CEC, S.A, 2016.

JIMÉNEZ, U. **Acciones para el mejoramiento en la redacción de los estudiantes chilenos**: Una propuesta de revisión desde la lingüística del texto. 2016. Tesis (Doctoral) – Universidad De Concepción, Chile, 2016.

LEYTON, A.; NÚÑEZ, J.; PARDO, D. **¿Cómo incide el programa de fomento lector en el desempeño académico de los estudiantes de los establecimientos educacionales intervenidos?** Available: https://fundacionluksic.cl/wp-content/iploads/2016/11/Informe-Estudio-Leyendo-en-Red-2016.pdf. Access: 10 June 2019.

MARTÍNEZ, F. **Redacción y ortografía**. Una opción para todos. Heredia: Ediciones Marwal, 2015.

MÉNDEZ, U. **Contra el método**. Barcelona, España: Folio, 2015.

SALAZAR, M. **Las estrategias de aprendizaje en el proceso de composición escrita**. España: Valparaíso, 2016.

SANTANDER, P. **Redacción y escritura**. Caja de herramientas. Bogotá, Colombia: Xpress Estudio Gráfico Digital S.A, 2016.

SUÁREZ, L. **Las etiquetas discursivas**: categorización de entidades del discurso en la escritura profesional. 2017. Tesis (Doctoral) – Universidad de Córdoba, España, 2017.

TORRES, A. **Construcciones conectivas que encapsulan para la escritura experta**. 2015. Tesis (Doctoral) – Universidad de Córdoba, España, 2015.

How to reference this article