



REVISTA

PERSPECTIVAS

UFPS

Original Article

<https://doi.org/10.22463/25909215.3941>

Writing as an epistemic activity: a commitment to the construction of knowledge from a sociocultural perspective

La escritura como actividad epistémica: una apuesta a la construcción del conocimiento desde una perspectiva sociocultural

Denys Paola Galindo-Lozano^{1*}, Alexander Javier Montes-Miranda²

¹Magister en Educación, denysgalindo.est@umecit.edu.pa, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0823-6478>, Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencia, Innovación y Tecnología (UMECIT), Montería-Colombia

²Dr En Ciencias de la Educación, jmontesm2@unicartagena.edu.co, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7168-6295> Universidad de Cartagena, Colombia. Cartagena-Colombio

Como citar: Galindo-Lozano D.P. Montes-Miranda. A.J. 2023. “La escritura como actividad epistémica: una apuesta a la construcción del conocimiento desde una perspectiva sociocultural.”. *Perspectivas*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 111-126, DOI: 10.22463/25909215.3941.

Received: Septiembre. 5. 2022; Approved: Diciembre 10, 2022

RESUMEN

Palabras clave:

Escritura; Teorías
Implícitas; Perspectiva
Sociocultural.

El presente artículo de revisión tiene como finalidad analizar la categoría de escritura como actividad epistémica, que implica una puesta relevante en la construcción del conocimiento de los estudiantes, desde la perspectiva sociocultural del lenguaje. Lo anterior, visto a la luz de varias conjeturas teóricas que le apuestan a la enseñanza del lenguaje escrito una mirada más crítica, reflexiva e integral. Para ello, en primer lugar, se examinan los diversos conceptos y teorías que sustentan la escritura desde la perspectiva sociocultural por diferentes autores. En segundo lugar, se hace un análisis del manejo de la expresión escrita por los sujetos en la actualidad. Luego, una explicación de la perspectiva sociocultural del lenguaje y las teorías implícitas que se desprenden de la escritura. Finalmente, se brinda una reflexión acerca de la importancia de implementar procesos de expresión escrita en las aulas de clase desde una visión más constructiva, donde la cultura de los sujetos, como ente social, juega un papel predominante en los procesos de enseñanza-aprendizaje y en la que prima la formación de individuos democráticos, creativos y críticos, con altos niveles emancipatorios en busca de una sociedad más pacífica y tolerante.

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Writing; Implicit
Theories; Sociocultural
Perspective Of Language.

The purpose of this review article is to analyze the category of writing as an epistemic activity that as an epistemic activity, which implies a relevant role in the construction of students' knowledge, from a sociocultural knowledge of students, from the sociocultural perspective of language. This is seen in the light of several conjectures, seen in the light of several theoretical conjectures that bet on the teaching of written language, a more critical, reflective and a more critical, reflective and integral approach. To this end, first of all, the various concepts and theories that support theories that support writing from a sociocultural perspective by different authors. Secondly, an analysis is made of the management of written expression by the written expression by the subjects at the present time. Then, an explanation of the sociocultural perspective of language and the implicit theories implicit theories that emerge from writing. Finally, a reflection on the importance of Finally, a reflection on the importance of implementing processes of written expression in the classroom from a more constructive vision, where the culture of the subjects, as a social ente, plays a predominant role in the social, plays a predominant role in the teaching-learning processes, and in which the formation of democratic individuals is a priority. The formation of democratic, creative and critical individuals, with high levels of emancipation in search of an emancipatory in search of a more peaceful and tolerant society

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: denysgalindo.est@umecit.edu.pa (Denys Paola Galindo-Lozano)



Peer review is the responsibility of the Universidad Francisco de Paula Santander.
This is an article under the license CC BY 4.0

Introduction

Writing is an art that permeates the domains of the academic and social life of the individual. It serves not only to express ideas of thought, but also to generate knowledge. Seen in this way, writing is understood as an "integrating skill that is associated with the generation of situated knowledge, knowledge in context" (Silva et al. 2019, p.22), hence the art of writing has the function of transforming knowledge, since the writer engages in a dialogue with the text to understand it, judge it or criticise it, and from there constructs a particular position. Epistemic writing is therefore investigative, reflexive and metacognitive, because the writer "modifies his or her knowledge in terms of content and rhetorical elements, but also improves and learns about his or her discursive knowledge". (Miras, 2020, p.65).

In this sense, this article has the function of analysing the category of writing from different epistemic perspectives that show that the art of writing is not only a simplified activity, but that, on the contrary, it is complex due to the transformative and reflective power of knowledge that it intrinsically presents. From this point of view, then, this topic becomes an interesting phenomenon to study due to its interdisciplinary character and all the epistemic construction that the individual makes at the moment of generating it. Through the documentary review, it is shown that writing as an epistemic practice requires a whole investigative, reflexive, self-regulated and metacognitive process that the subject builds up as he/she acquires experience with the reading of his/her culture and the world.

Finally, understanding writing as an epistemic activity requires understanding that there are different ways of using language to investigate, recreate and reflect on reality in order to understand and transform it. Therefore, Mirna (2020) states that: "the writer who uses this writing strategy not only learns about what is written, but also learns how to write" (p.74).

Method

The literature review was carried out using the documentary analysis technique, understood as "the operation that consists of selecting the informatively relevant ideas of a document in order to express its content unambiguously and to recover the information presented in it" (Claustro, 1993, p.12). The phases applied for this study were: definition of criteria, search, selection and analysis according to the category addressed. In this sense, the search criteria were established in research articles concerning doctoral and master's studies published since 2011, and the following databases were used: Google Scholar, Scielo, Redalyc, Dialnet, University of Cordoba, Metropolitan University of Science, Innovation and Technology (UMECT). Finally, we selected and analysed the research that met the criteria and allowed us to understand the categories addressed in this study.

Results Linked to Theoretical Reflections

Theoretical debates on writing.

Writing is a process that is one of the most powerful resources for thinking and learning. Therefore, it is considered a pedagogical tool, since it not only allows the individual to express thoughts, experiences, research and reflections, but it itself functions as a clarifier of thought, of ideas, thus consolidating and structuring knowledge. Hence, Álvarez (2010) asserts "in accordance with the postulates of Vygotsky, Halliday and Bruner, that language is a tool used by man to give meaning to the world around him; and, consequently, the mastery of language is an important part in the construction of knowledge" (p. 36).

Now, since ancient times there have been two theoretical positions on writing. Firstly, there are those who conceive of it as a product, understood as the concretion embodied on paper. Secondly, it is seen as a cognitive process which requires a whole construction of before, during and after, that

is, it involves analysis, reflection, textualisation and revision, a whole work of art. However, studies from various disciplines, such as anthropology, history, linguistic semiotics, pragmatics and semantics show that the act of written expression is a much more complex process in which social and cultural factors are included. This is because the subjects possess knowledge that they have acquired in everyday practices in the different contexts in which they interact, such as the family and society, therefore, they enter schools with previous knowledge, the product of these daily interactions (Galindo and Doria, 2019).

In this regard, Morales (2011) conceives writing as a complex process, in which thinking, feeling, imagining and living are required. For him, ideas must be organised, woven, it is undoubtedly an art, because it requires vocation, connection with the text, polishing the ideas until the final product is concluded. For this reason, the best way to express what the individual feels or thinks is through written expression, because it is the transformation from the informal to the formal medium. Hence, it is an investigative, semantic and demanding activity for the writer himself.

Cassany (1993), for his part, affirms that writing is a manifestation of all human activity. He considers that it shares elements of verbal activity and at the same time constitutes a social fact, since it involves the action of interaction with others. Hence, it is understood as a process of action, since it does not begin at school, but in the original contexts where the individual is socialised and interacts, so that the school must fulfil the moulding function of refining it, giving it life and meaning. Therefore, the writer is seen as an active entity capable of constructing knowledge, knowledge that is the product of his or her experiences and the way he or she perceives and understands reality. In the words of Cassany (1993): "writing means much more than knowing the alphabet, knowing how to put letters together or sign an identity card. It means being able to put

together in a coherent and correct way so that it can be understood by other people" (p.10).

Lomas (n.d.) states that the use of communicative acts of human action always requires certain intentions. Therefore, he states that writing is not only a linguistic and cognitive skill, but also a social one, since it has a value that goes beyond the purely scholastic scenario. In this way, he states that the act of writing is a shared social fact, in that it is based on the experiences and worldviews of the subjects. For this reason, the school fulfils the function of working on the basis of concrete actions, coming from these situational and experiential acts of the subjects, with the aim of acquiring meaning and significance and, therefore, understanding written linguistic activity as a transforming act and not as purely transcriptive aspects. Thus, "to communicate is to do things with words with certain intentions: when issuing an utterance, its author intends to do something, the addressee interprets (or not) that intention and elaborates a response on it, whether linguistic or non-linguistic" (Lomas, n.d., p. 1).

Kalman (2003) argues that it is essential to study the context in the development of the practices of written culture, since this constitutes the medium or situation that allows the interaction of beings in social environments. For her, writing is a shared social practice, where cultural knowledge, ways of life and worldviews are interwoven. Therefore, in order for basic education to become meaningful programmes for learners, it is necessary to situate teaching in the learners' environment, "in order to understand written culture from the local context and consider the immediate community as a place for reading and writing" (Kalman, 2003). Hence, writing is seen as a situated practice, i.e. an act that requires collective participation, democratic intervention, situational, purposeful and for various historical and social purposes. In short, "language practices are part of the intellectual and cultural background of learners and constitute an exploitable resource for teaching and learning" (Kalman, 2003, p.7).

In accordance with the above, Jurado and Bustamante (1996) argue that "written language should be an instrument of social utility and not simply an academic subject". In this way, they assert that the school does not give written language the importance it deserves as a social activity, since its teaching is relegated to the purely grammatical, leaving aside the intentions, context and purposes it has for greater understanding. Thus, this act involves discursive, social, cultural and cognitive processes, which in most cases are omitted by teachers. Therefore, these theorists propose activities at school based on the real uses of language as a socially shared activity, so that students can understand it as an indispensable process for the acquisition of knowledge and of great use in society.

Along these lines, Lerner (2003) states that the school has the challenge of incorporating the entire student population into the written culture. However, this is not an easy task, since this practice involves reactions between the author and the text, between contexts and intentions, and therefore requires hard work. In this way, it proposes to understand the act of reading and writing as social practices, which have historical, ancestral and cultural uses in the community scenario, and which the school cannot ignore, in order to generate living and vital practices, which are powerful instruments that allow us to rethink the world, question it and therefore organise our own thinking, since these acts are legitimate rights to exercise and social responsibilities that must be assumed (Lerner, 2003). Thus, the school is the medium for transforming literate practices from an informal to a more formal context, thus making it possible to read and write in school.

Thus, Sraiki and Jolibert (2009) understand reading and writing "as an act of problem solving, i.e. as a processing, through intelligence, of a complex set of information (indices) that must be identified (for the reader) or output (for the writer)" (p. 54). This means that reading and writing are indissoluble processes, because in order to generate a product, every reader must decipher or understand

the multiple systems that constitute the text (context, intentions, grammatical marks, etc.) and then produce an interwoven product that makes sense and thus responds to the communicative demands required. In short, any writing process requires a prior act of good reading.

Serafni (1994), for her part, sees writing as a cognitive and meta-cognitive process, which is constituted by a self-regulated plan. She considers that in the first place it is necessary to establish a method, in which time is measured, because for her it is important to organise the process based on the time the subject has available to write. Thus, she considers that the act of written expression is unfinished and requires rigorousness, under a predetermined intention. Thus, firstly, pre-writing, as the prior preparation for writing, determines the collection, organisation and documentation of ideas. Secondly, writing, in which the grammatical, linguistic, semantic and syntactic processes are implemented for the execution of the process and finally, post-writing, which involves the continuous revision of ideas.

Finally, writing is seen as a complex process that requires rigorousness and is therefore understood as a social and cultural practice, i.e. socially constructed and generated in real and authentic contexts of communication. Thus, the school as a space for socialisation and construction of learning and knowledge must start from there in order to foster democratic environments, with the aim of training critical readers and writers who are capable of thinking, proposing and generating changes in the societies they are part of, promoting change and emancipation towards a culture of peace and dialogue. Hence, Zavala (2002) states that: "literate practices reflect the cultural and ideological values inherent in civil society and at the same time reinforce and shape them" (p. 34).

A look at the writing of contemporary man

Since the beginning of human history, writing has been seen by the social subject as a need to organise his ideas and thus express his feelings and emotions. Thus, it is thanks to writing that the sciences, the arts, politics, among others, have emerged. Hence, it is considered the representation of thoughts, that is to say, the most faithful copy of the human soul, the exact and lasting description of knowledge. In short, a marvellous creation, which allowed man to leap from the savage to a truly human condition.

In this way, writing is seen as an art, because it requires not only thinking, but also feeling, imagining and living. It is a process in which, little by little, ideas are woven together until they are given a meaning that generates an intentional message, because it is written for something, for someone and for something to happen. Therefore, writing is a process that implies collectivity, it is not a merely individual act, as it requires effort, contemplation, creativity and knowledge of the language itself in order to emerge. Thus, it is a socio-semiotic act in which language, culture and the world are involved.

In this sense, the act of writing is not considered a simplified process, on the contrary, it is complex and this is due to the fact that as an activity it demands a lot of intellectual production. It involves rewriting ideas several times to produce a final product. It is necessary to read the text repeatedly until it is polished, as well as to give meaning to the ideas so that they express a clear and coherent message to the readers.

In ancient times, for example, the only medium for writing was paper, so ideas had to be written down in handwriting, crossed out and rewritten again. Nowadays, with the advent of technology, we have moved on to writing texts on electronic processors, with the advantage of being able to modify what we have written, obtain several copies and share them in a matter of seconds.

However, with the emergence of this new technological society and later the knowledge society (Sakaiya, 1997), the formation of a new man appears and with it, a new writing. Various changes in thinking, ways of understanding reality, the collapse of meta-narratives, a term coined by Lyotard (1991) and the emergence of a liquid society (Bauman, 2000) immersed in consumption, generate new changes and behaviours in today's society.

Thus, a new society is given life, called by Serres (2013), the thumbs, a new generation whose contexts, cultures and histories are quite the opposite of their predecessors. In the first instance, because knowledge in the past was transmitted solely and exclusively by the teacher. This was the guide of knowledge; on the contrary, in the current times, knowledge is expanded, thanks to the different digital platforms and the contextual demands of the subjects.

Similarly, according to Serres (2013), contemporary society is far removed from the countryside, as far as urban locations are concerned. Today's children do not know the animals in rural areas, let alone where the milk they consume every day comes from, as they only know that they have a technological world, which provides them with all kinds of information, in the words of Seres (2013):

This new schoolboy, this new student has never seen a calf, a cow, a pig or a brood. In 1900, the majority of people on the planet worked in farming and herding; in 2011 in France, and in similar countries, there are only 1% of peasants. This is undoubtedly one of the biggest ruptures in history since the Neolithic period. Our cultures, once based on georgic practices, have suddenly changed. (p. 15)

This means that technology has transformed society, causing it to change its way of thinking, feeling and reasoning, which has given birth to a new subject that has evolved in all its splendour. Among these changes, we can perceive a reader who

has left libraries behind and a writer who has left paper behind to enter a new scenario.

Now, with the emergence of this new little thumb (Serres, 2013), new problems have appeared in schools, both for teachers and students, and even for families. Today's students come to class with tablets and mobiles and do several things at the same time, they chat, they do the work of other subjects while they attend to the teacher. They do not write down explanations as notes in their notebooks; on the contrary, they take a photo and leave their records stored in the memory of their mobiles. Thus, there is evidence of a type of student with the ubiquity of being in several scenarios at the same time.

This form of ubiquity has undoubtedly had an impact on young people's writing, as the excessive eagerness to do several tasks at the same time has led to the loss of the pleasure and enjoyment of reading and writing as indispensable processes for access to knowledge and, therefore, the development of critical thinking. This is supported by the report that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) publishes year after year, highlighting the problem that today's young people have in relation to language skills.

Today's students, then, have switched from writing on paper to using laptops, to using their thumbs to spend hours playing on various digital platforms (Roblox, free fire, etc.), ignoring the fact that access to knowledge is largely acquired through reading and writing and that, therefore, the success of academic culture depends on subjects achieving a good command of written discourse. In this way, we see rebellious youth, with multiple emotions, because they no longer converse, they live immersed in their own world, a world that overwhelms and tires them (Han, 2012).

Teachers have also transformed their teaching methods. The emergence of standardised assessment to measure results (ICFFES, PISA PRILS), the Bologna plan for higher education and the teacher

accreditation system have brought about such changes. The first has generated competition between the same institutions to achieve better results, leaving aside teaching and knowledge in the classroom in exchange for the preparation of students to answer a Censal test, which basically does not show the social and formative competences of the students. The second, for its part, links universities to the labour market, generating an accelerated educational process with a lack of learning. Last but not least, accreditation has led to an overload on teachers, as it is now not enough to demonstrate their knowledge to students, but they are required to present it to other institutions. Teachers are required to publish in indexed journals and to conduct research that contributes to the improvement of the education system. However, in order to do so, they demand multiple formats, which undoubtedly generate wear and tear and do not lead to improved classroom processes with students.

In the same way, these transformations have also been noticed in the families, as they have gone from a solid base to a volatile and changing one. There is no evidence of parental accompaniment in the formative processes of the students. Nowadays, marriages are unstable and children are often left in the care of grandparents or a caregiver, because many of them work and do not have enough time to look after them.

The above panorama can be analysed from the perspective of Bauman (2000), who conceives the emergence of a liquid, unstable, changing society, overwhelmed by the eagerness and vicissitudes of time. A society that is the product of consumerism, where the excessive pace of satisfying needs leaves social life itself, collective encounters, to be forgotten, generating individualism and loneliness. This indicates, then, that people almost always live in a continuous anxiety for something new, given that what they currently consume does not satisfy them and does not offer something that can be preserved in the long term. In the words of Bauman (2000):

We are used to a fast time, sure that things will not last long, that new opportunities will appear and devalue the existing ones. And this happens in all aspects of life. With material objects and with relationships with people (p.101).

In this regard, Han (2012) states that a society of performance is evident, where multiple tasks must be fulfilled at the same time in order to survive, and in this excessive eagerness, being, ethics and true knowledge are forgotten in the classroom. Thus, we see teachers tired, to give an example, of filling out documents and forms, and students overwhelmed by the various loads of activities assigned to them, which have nothing to do with their intellectual training and critical thinking, since what is sought is to train subjects for working life. Thus leaving values, customs and access to knowledge through writing in the past.

As a result of the above, young people today, in search of adjusting to the needs of their contexts and thanks to the speed, comfort, spontaneity and freedom that social networks privilege, have led them to create their own ways of expressing themselves and communicating in written form. This has given rise to many positions on the subject, as for some, we are facing "a re-signification of writing, a new variety of language, or a new form of expression" (Vanegas, 2014, p. 12). On the contrary, others argue that language is deteriorating, since young people lack lexical skills, are very careless in spelling, punctuation and accentuation and that, therefore, social networks are contributing to this situation (Lozano, 2017). In the current context, Lozano (2017) states that students do not develop the necessary linguistic skills that would allow them to have a basic knowledge of how to use the Spanish language.

Now, although it is true that the emergence of the media has given rise to a new form of writing, it is also relevant to note that it is plausible to see how they have lost the taste and pleasure for good writing.

In the first place, there is evidence of a multitude of plagiarised activities in the students' writings, as they use "cut and paste" in their productions for the sake of speed. Secondly, it is "frequent to find written discourses in these networks lacking coherence and cohesion, isolated words and sentences, total absence of punctuation marks and accentuation of words, in addition, they take little account of spelling rules" (Lozano, 2014, p. 85). They have also included images as a creative factor in writing, including emoticons to express their different moods, desires, feelings and tastes.

This shows that there is less and less time in people's lives to listen to each other; today's young people no longer write letters to each other to express their feelings or emotions, as a social practice, because the desire for pure receptivity gets in the way. It is necessary to save time, words, and even writing itself has been transformed. In this way, one only wants to perceive the message, but not the messenger, nor his pauses, nor his feelings. Hence, the subject is addicted to speed, immediacy, because everything makes him lazy, unwilling and worn out. We live, in the manner of Han (2012), in a dark reality, called the society of tiredness.

Finally, it is evident that contemporary man has forgotten the strokes and clarity of his handwriting, as an exercise in motor skills, in exchange for the use of his thumbs, thus inventing and rewriting his history. However, it is necessary to rescue the cleanliness, coherence and cohesion of writing in order to give life to this art with which knowledge is immortalised. Hence, it is necessary to understand the environment in which the current subject lives in order to take advantage of technological tools, that is, to make them a practical and interactive act of learning, where dialogical communities are formed to exchange knowledge, experiences and experiences through the principles of equality, freedom of expression, coercion, validity in language and seriousness in the processes to reach consensus and thus understand the differences (Habermas, 1993).

Writing, then, needs to gain importance in the classroom so that students can propose, express their ideas clearly, reactivate their critical thinking, but not from a transcriptive writing, but from a more dialogical one that allows them to generate democratic and dynamic environments. Therefore, as proposed by Han (2012), it is necessary to slow down the pace, at a speed in which both students and teachers can meet and in this way their voices are reinvented from a more consensual and adjusted to the needs of the current contexts. For this reason, it is necessary to resort to action research in schools, as a form of self-reflective enquiry, which makes it possible to generate transformative proposals in the teaching-learning processes, through listening, reflection and evaluation. In this way, written language should be an instrument of social utility and not simply an academic subject" (Jurado and Bustamante, 19996, p.138). The above, in order to give writing the relevance it deserves, since this academic activity involves discursive, social and cultural processes that allow individuals to build knowledge and recreate their realities.

The socio-cultural perspective of language

To speak of sociocultural theory is undoubtedly to enter into the pedagogical position proposed by the Soviet Lev Vygotsky, as an epistemic approach that arose in reaction to the behaviourist methods of the time. The main premise of this proposal was to consider "that every form of human mental activity of a higher order is derived from social and cultural contexts and that it is shared by the members of that context, because these mental processes are adjustable" (Mota and Villalobos, 2007, p.411). Thus, knowledge is a profoundly social phenomenon that shapes the ways in which the subject has available to think and interpret the world around them. All of this is mediated by language, which is why it is considered an indispensable tool in the cognitive development of the individual.

Vygotsky (1995) also considered that knowledge is a profoundly social fact. This means that the different learning processes of subjects occur thanks to interaction, to social exchange in which ways of life, cultures and world views are shared, all mediated by language. For this reason, language represents, according to Vygotsky (1987) as cited in Mota and Villalobos (2007) "a very important bridge between the socio-cultural world and the mental functioning of the individual" (p. 412). Thus, the interaction of the subjects favours the construction of meanings, which they internalise in their communicative acts, an example of this is the learning of language in infants, in which the mother helps the child to develop it and thereby transmits a whole cultural and ideological richness as a result of that same contact.

This is because language is a profoundly social activity and is acquired through interaction with others. In this way, Vygotsky (1995) states that all activity carried out by the individual, including those performed alone, is collaborative. This is due to the fact that the subjects demand from themselves a degree of understanding and interpretation of what they do, because they dialogue with themselves, they are always cautious not to make mistakes that prevent them from developing their goals, they organise their ideas in written form in such a way that they acquire a meaning, for example, when children read a book, do writing exercises, fill in a crossword puzzle, among others. This is how collaborative activity is always present both at the individual and social level of the subject, therefore, "the role that language plays in learning and development is made explicit during these same processes, because language is the mechanism through which the negotiation of meaning occurs" (Mota y Villalobos, 2007, p. 413).

Thus, Vygotsky (1995) proposes a clear epistemic conception called sociocultural theory. This theory considers that each subject, whether educated or not, develops a set of competences, which he or she learns from the most skilled members of the social environment, who act as instructors,

which the Soviet called: "an apprenticeship of thought". It is through such learning that individuals develop various cognitive competences through the tasks they perform with more experienced members of society. In this way, this position underlines the relationship between the individual and the society and culture in which he or she is born and interacts. It is here that human beings learn to incorporate symbolic tools such as language, calculus, writing, painting and other social inventions into their thinking. In short, the social learning proposed by Vygotsky (1995) is that which is produced through social contact and interaction with others and with the environment. This is a product of the existence of a society in which various beings live together, sharing diverse experiences, under specific contextualised determinations.

It is important to note that the approach proposed by the Soviet clearly shows the active vision of the subject as a social entity, which is why it differs from the purely behaviourist postulates. Vygotsky (1981), as cited in Mota and Villalobos (2007): "considered children as active agents in development, who contribute to the creation of internal mental processes through collaboration with others in meaningful socio-cultural activities (p.414). This means that the subject is active in that he or she constructs learning through cooperation and social relations with others and the environment.

Now, in this position Vygotsky (1995) embraces the postulate of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZDP), understood as "the region in which this transfer of ability from the shared world to the individual occurs" (Mota and Villalobos, 2007, p.414). This means that every individual moves between "act", what he/she is able to do for him/herself at the moment, and potency, i.e. what he/she is prepared to do. Between these two assumptions, we find the Zone of Proximal Development, which is linked to what the subject is capable of doing if he/she is helped or guided to achieve it. Thus, in the educational scenario, the teacher must start from the previous knowledge that the student has, which

he/she has acquired thanks to his/her experience and interaction with others, in order to generate new significant and lasting learning, under his/her guidance and orientation.

Similarly, Vygotsky proposed the concept of scaffolding, which consists of joint, collaborative and shared activities that help the child to develop meaningful learning. Scaffolding involves several factors: firstly, joint problem solving, which involves shared, guided and oriented work, providing the learner with the possible tools or aids so that he or she can provide a solution to the situation presented. Secondly, intersubjectivity, which is nothing more than the relationship between subjects through communication, since learning experiences are shared through dialogue, interaction and the exchange of knowledge. Finally, self-regulation, which consists of the subject's capacity to organise his own ideas, thanks to the help or scaffolding provided by his guide and which enabled him to develop or reach his potential.

Duranti (2000), for his part, proposes an interesting approach to the socio-cultural from an anthropological perspective. In the first instance, he conceives language as a social and cultural practice. Thus, thanks to the linguistic socialisation of individuals, ancestral knowledge is transmitted. Hence, when a child is given to a different family, he or she acquires the ways of life and the worldview of the new family as the days go by, thanks to this interaction with language. Thus, Duranti (2000) defines culture as "what others have, what makes and keeps them different" (p.24). Thus, language development and culture interact in various ways to produce the unique phenomenon of human language.

Viewed in this way, Duranti (2000) sees culture as a learned activity mediated by language, which is the premise of seeing culture as knowledge of the world. This means that not only do the subjects belonging to a particular community have to know the objects, places and people with whom they interact, but they must also share models of thought

about their use and utility, that is, different ways of understanding the world they inhabit and at the same time make predictions and inferences about them, which is what he calls "the cognitive perspective of a culture". In short, cultural activity is not a material fact, that is, it is not only a matter of knowing things, people, emotions, but, on the contrary, it is a whole organisation of all of them, which must, without a doubt, be interpreted by the subject.

In this way, then, we speak of propositional knowledge and procedural knowledge. The former refers to beliefs that can be represented through practical propositions involving "what is known", e.g. cats "are domestic felines". The second refers to information about "how it is known", i.e., what activities cats perform. This latter knowledge is usually interpreted through observation and experience, including the relationships that people have with the phenomena. In that sense, the linguistic activity determined by culture includes a whole cognitive process that the subject must process in his mind, in order to understand whether the propositions of his reality are true or not.

However, in order to encompass a broader concept than the one proposed by cognitive anthropology, Duranti (2000) states that although it is true that the notion of culture is a cognitive activity, not everything is there, as this link also includes the body, action and culturally organised scenarios. Therefore, he argues that knowledge of culture is socially distributed. The latter is understood as recognising "that the individual is not always the end point of the acquisition process and not everyone has access to the same information, nor does everyone use the same techniques to achieve certain objectives" (Duranti, 2000, p. 28). Hence, different views and representations may coexist within a community.

In this context, he proposes the idea that culture is also communication. This is understood as a system of signs conventionalised by a society. A semiotic theory is then evident, that is, a representation of

the world. This is how he proposes that the various cultural products generated or created by social groups, such as myths, legends, fables, among others, need to be communicated to the world to give it life and thus establish symbolic relationships between individuals. In the words of Duranti (2000): "to believe that culture is communication also means that for a community to exist it must communicate its theory of the world in order to live it" (p. 30).

At the same time, it sees culture as a system of practices inherent to communication and that this, like any action in the world, is eminently social, participatory and collective. In this way, language is seen as a valuable tool, because it is through language that the exchange of knowledge takes place. Individuals are not alone in the world, they live with others and in order to generate environments of interrelation they require socialisation and the transmission of knowledge. Hence the power of language as a social and cultural fact, in the words of Duranti (2000):

Words carry within themselves hundreds of possibilities to connect us with other human beings, other situations, events, acts, beliefs and feelings. This is due to the ability of language to describe the world, as well as to connect us with its inhabitants, objects, places and periods, reaffirming at each moment a socio-historical dimension to other dimensions of human action. (p.38)

A broad panorama of the theory of culture is thus presented, from a complex viewpoint. However, it has become evident that language has acquired a highly relevant value, from the cognitive level to the point of conceiving it as a metalanguage and even as a participatory and democratic tool. This means that language is an indispensable tool for knowing, understanding, interpreting and transforming the world. This is because language maintains a close relationship with thought, since thanks to language the subject can express his or her thoughts and at the same time analyse, criticise, question and share those of other beings. Thus, having a rich language allows

a much broader thinking, when all the multiple semiotic systems are understood, which come from the different languages to the mind of the subject when he abstracts his reality and thus, to be able to express them in a clear and coherent way without any difficulty.

Finally, it is clear, through the authors mentioned above, that the sociocultural approach places special emphasis on the fact that the construction of knowledge is not an eminently individual act, but on the contrary, it is social, that is, it requires interaction, dialogue and constant collective participation to promote exchanges of knowledge, worldviews that generate learning. It is through the encounter with the other that culturally significant activities are generated and at the same time, these social practices regulate and transform the mind of the subject. This is due to the fact that language, as an activity of discursive mediation, becomes an essential act for the social construction of knowledge. In short, then, in linguistic activity, in which a set of social and cultural practices converge, there is a complex network of semiotic resources that link the subject with his or her life, history and interpretations, and which should not be ignored when carrying out the teaching-learning process in the classroom (Duranti, 2000).

Implicit theories of writing

The various studies that have been carried out on the subject of writing provide evidence of a solid field of research on this topic. This is thanks to the main contributions of the cognitive, communicative and socio-cultural theories of the eighties and nineties respectively. In this way, a considerable conceptual contribution of special heuristic and epistemic rigour has been achieved, which has inspired multiple educational proposals. However, in recent decades, according to Aguilar et al. (2016), the way in which people conceive writing processes has begun to be of eminent interest. This is because "the conception that the subject has of the process has an impact, in some way, on the writing results and

on the levels of motivation and self-efficacy in the task" (Hidi (2006), as cited in Aguilar et al. (2016), p. 10). In this regard, Hernández (2008) asserts that the conceptions that individuals have about writing undoubtedly influence the writing process. Thus, implicit theories play a preponderant role in the writer's process of written expression.

Now, implicit theories, therefore, are conceived as "epistemic constructs of representation of reality that mediate knowledge, guide the actions of subjects and reflect the influence of various cultural models" (Errazuriz, 2017, p. 39). This means that subjects possess epistemic constructions that they have been developing in their memory throughout their experience and that are activated based on the demands of the social and cultural context in which they find themselves. Thus, these experiences are characterised by being culturally shared knowledge products of the experiences of individuals, they are unconscious, since they are of implicit origin, in addition, they have an internal coherence or meaning and finally, they are resistant to change. In short, implicit theories are unconscious experiential constructions of the subjects as a result of their communicative, social and contextual interaction in which they reflect their lifestyles, worldviews and their entire cultural background.

In this regard, Camps (2003) states that the classification of implicit theories depends on several actions, including: the conceptions held of such practices, genres, intertextual relations, dialogical communities and the interaction between the text-reader, writer and context. In this way, various implicit theories emerge with different names, but which point to the same thing, among them, Errazuriz (2017) highlights the following: transmissive, transactional, reproductive, pre-constructivist and constructive.

Transmissives are models proposed by White and Bruning (2005). They are present in inexperienced writers. "They are characterised by reproducing knowledge without putting different positions in

dialogue and questioning the content" (Errazuriz, 2017, p.40). A low level of commitment on the part of the subject is therefore evident, as writing here is centred more as a process of reproducing content than as an act of dialogical construction that possesses intentionalities. In short, writing is understood as a product and not as a process of interaction with the text, and therefore does not involve metacognitive strategies.

Transactional, on the other hand, as another model proposed by White and Bruning (2005), is the opposite of transmissive. These correspond to more experienced writers with a higher level of experience. They are characterised by making their own constructions and transforming knowledge, i.e. the subject does not reproduce the writing, but makes a new contribution. Intentions, context, dialogue, among other intertextual and extra-textual factors, intervene in this process, which is why these models see writing as a social and cultural process. Hence, then, its metacognitive character, since the construction of the writing process requires planning, textualisation, revision, regulation and control of the actions proposed.

On the other hand, Hernández (2012) proposes three models of implicit theories, in which he highlights: reproductive, pre-constructivist and constructivist. The first refers to the reproduction of knowledge, i.e. it does not take into account intentions or context; its ultimate aim is to issue a copy of the base text. In the second, there is an attempt to make a transformation of the text read, but it does not reach the level. There is a cursory description of the intentions, but it does not reach a discussion or confrontation with the text. In the last one, the writer takes into account the context, the enunciative and dialogic situations, and thus encourages a transformation of knowledge. Here, the writer analyses, discusses, proposes and sees the text as a signic construct which is the product of a social and cultural situation.

These models of implicit theories constitute great contributions at the level of teaching-learning of writing processes, however, "there are still several gaps and opaque sides that are evident in the field. One of the least explored aspects is the study of how people develop a conceptualisation" (Hernández, 2012, p.3). Therefore, it is necessary to study the implicit theories in students to determine the degree to which they organise their written expression processes, since these "affect or influence the written performance of the subjects, especially in the ability to generate their own or transforming points of view in the face of the contrast of the various ideas presented" (Errazuriz, 2017, p.46). The above indicates, then, that these models are aimed at determining whether students, because of the theoretical constructs they have acquired over time, see writing as a product, that is, as a finished element, whose purpose is the reproduction of ideas or, on the other hand, as an unfinished construction process that interweaves a whole art and in which various elements both external and internal to the text intervene. In this respect, Carlino (2005) considers the act of writing to be an act that stimulates the critical analysis of one's own knowledge, due to the fact that its exercise grants the possibility of maintaining concentration on ideas and the transforming and restructuring power of the same.

Finally, the various models of writing presented here show the simplified and complex conceptions of writing. They determine the degree to which the writer is involved with the text and the type of demands made at school for the development of this act. Thus, the simplified part corresponds to the representation of it as graphic signs on paper, which includes the reproductive and the transmittive. The complex, on the other hand, involves the cognitive, the social, the metacognitive and the cultural. The latter, bearing in mind that the subjects have developed collective practices through their life experiences and their interrelation with others, which they have acquired through contact with their families, friends and other contexts in which they interact.

In this way, the complex is related to transactional and constructivist theories. In short, these positions allow us to understand the epistemic character of written expression as a "restructured process of consciousness" (Jurado, 1992, p.37), because thanks to it, new conceptual constructions are generated in the minds of the subjects, which transform their ways of abstracting reality and, therefore, generate significant contributions to knowledge.

Conclusions

The art of writing is not a simplified activity; on the contrary, it is complex. Its complexity lies in the whole process of elaboration that it involves, as it requires a whole procedural plan before, during and after the process. It does not fulfil the role of reproducing information, but, on the contrary, it demands a key function for learning, that is, linked to the construction of knowledge. For this reason, Serafini (1994) states that all written production starts with a plan, a process of prior preparation, which she calls pre-writing. Then comes a second step, the actual writing, which consists of putting ideas on paper and, finally, revision, which is nothing more than identifying frequent errors and cleaning up the written product until it is polished and finished.

For this reason, Vygotsky (1985) proposes a close relationship between language and thought, given that in the link between the two are completely interwoven in human life, they constitute, together with attention and logical memory, a system of internal relations that characterise human consciousness. For this reason, the relevance of collaborative work, because through socialisation, dialogue and the use of words, knowledge is constructed and learning is built through action and the exchange of knowledge. For this reason, he argued that written language is the most concrete and elaborated form of evidence of cultural appropriation.

In this sense, the role of writing on thought becomes evident when it is understood that through written expression one gains access to new ways of

knowing, reasoning, thinking and interpreting the world. This is a product of the interpretations that are woven in the mind of the subject when he/she carries out the reading process, since all writing makes use of reading for its construction, while the latter makes concrete the knowledge that is constructed in representations and then organised into categories and structures during the reading process. In this way, the potential of both acts becomes evident, which fulfil the essential role of shaping thought, what Wells (as cited in Serrano, 2014) "called the epistemic function of written language" (p.6).

Thus, the epistemic function constitutes the domain of writing, which represents the way of using language for the development of thought and, therefore, the construction of knowledge. For this reason, at this level there is a conversation with thought to shape the word and transform it, so that when the individual performs the act of writing, he puts into action a complex cognitive activity, since what he writes is not the hand, but the mind, so that he himself questions, proposes and raises processes internally which are then translated into tangible actions that generate new conceptual constructions. In short, epistemic refers, then, "to the ways in which written language is used to construct knowledge and learn. It also refers to the cognitive operations that are employed when using language to think, discover, transform, create and construct knowledge" (Serrano, 2014, p. 6).

Thus, the art of writing, as a social and cultural practice, is nothing more than an epistemic tool, because it becomes a semiotic activity to the extent that it transforms the conditions of the human mind to generate new conceptual contributions. Hence, the power of the written word, which, in addition to constructing knowledge, allows us to liberate, to determine the meanings of the world, to think and to transform the intentionality of an utterance into objects of discourse. Therefore, Olson (1998) asserts that "written language not only helps us to know and remember what is thought and what is said, it also

invites us to see what is thought and what is said differently" (p. 16).

Seen in this way, writing has a dual function. On the one hand, the communicative function and, on the other, the representative function. The first is conceived as a way of expressing the knowledge acquired through the reading process. The second, on the other hand, as a way of creating or recreating the ideas that come out of thought. However, both have an indissoluble link in the written process, since it is understood as an instrument that represents, communicates and reworks the development of thought and, at the same time, becomes a powerful art of consciousness and intellectual self-regulation (Serrano, 2014). This is where written language differs from oral language, since its unique character of transforming thought is evident.

Now, writing as a self-regulating process of consciousness presents a reflexive vision. This is due to the fact that when the writer has an elaborated product, he/she must revise it and in this exploration he/she carries out an analysis of his/her own ideas, converses again, includes other new points, makes a rigorous interpretation of what has been proposed in order to generate a complete product without errors, which makes the leap to what Carlino (2006) calls public writing. In short, the subject begins to problematise what he writes by means of a reflective attitude, to take a more critical look at his ideas in order to objectify them, making sure that they express his true intention or purpose and respond to his required aims.

For this reason, writing leads the writer to maintain a dialogue, not only with himself, but also with the world. Likewise, he contrasts his points of view, changes his perceptions of the topic he is working on, begins to establish his own interpretations, with the aim of transforming his mental processes and acquiring greater skill in his writing experience. "Hence, composing a text is not only an expression of ideas, but an activity of meaning construction, an instance of knowledge

generation and development of thought" (Serrano, 2014, p. 15). In short, writing is an art, which requires a whole procedure for its construction.

Finally, these contributions reveal how literate activity possesses a whole epistemic potential that is essential for the transformation of thought. This is because the subject analyses his or her own knowledge, reflects on it, acquires a dialogical and communicative interaction with the text and generates new learning that allows him or her to make contributions to science. The semiotic nature of writing requires devotion, dedication so that the product is rich, rigorous and at the same time, pleasing to the reading public. Hence, this activity is constituted as a true art, since it not only cultivates the writer's cultural and ideological competence, but also his or her investigative and transformative character.

References

- Aguilar, P. Albarrán, P. Errazúriz, M. Lagos, C. (2016). Teorías implícitas sobre los procesos de escritura: Relación de las concepciones de estudiantes de Pedagogía Básica con la calidad de sus textos. *Estudios pedagógicos*, 42(3), 7-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052016000400001>
- Álvarez, A. (2010). *Competencias básicas en escritura*. Octaedro.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). Modernidad líquida. <https://catedraepistemologia.files.wordpress.com/2009/05/modernidad-liquida.pdf>
- Camps, A. (2003). *Secuencias didácticas para aprender a escribir* (pp. 47-50). Graó. <https://docplayer.es/36348742-Texto-proceso-contexto-actividad-discursiva-puntos-de-vista-diversos-sobre-la-actividad-de-aprender-y-de-ensenar-a-escribir.html>
- Carlino, P. (2005). Representaciones sobre la

- escritura y formas de enseñarla en universidades de América del Norte. *Revista de Educación*, (336), 143-168. <https://www.aacademica.org/paula.carlino/130.pdf>
- Cassany, D. (1993). *La cocina de la escritura*. Ediciones ANAGRAMA. <http://llavevirtual.22web.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/cocina-escritura-cassany.pdf?i=2>
- Duranti, A. (2000). *Antropología lingüística*. Cambridge, University Press. <https://reflexionesdecoloniales.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/antropologia-linguistica-alessandro-duranti-copia.pdf>
- Errazuriz, M. (2017). Teorías implícitas sobre la escritura académica en estudiantes de programas de formación inicial docente: ¿inciden en el desempeño escrito? *Revista signos y Pensamientos*, 7(XXXIV), 36-52. Doi:10.11144/Javeriana.syp36-71.tiea
- Galindo, D. y Doria, R. (2019). Lectura, escritura y oralidad desde la perspectiva sociocultural del lenguaje. *Revista investigación desarrollo e innovación*, 10 (1), 163-176. Doi: 10.19053/20278306.v10.n1.2019.10020
- Habermas, J. (1993). El discurso filosófico de la modernidad. <https://sociologiaycultura.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/habermas-jurgen-el-discurso-filosofico-de-la-modernidad.pdf>
- Han, B. (2012). *La sociedad del cansancio* (2 ed). Herder editorial.
- Hernández, G. (2008). Teorías implícitas de lectura y conocimiento metatextual en estudiantes de secundaria, bachillerato y educación superior. *Revista mexicana de investigación educativa*, 13(38), 737-771. <http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/rmie/v13n38/v13n38a4.pdf>
- Hernández, G. (2012). Teorías implícitas de la escritura en estudiantes pertenecientes a dos comunidades académicas distintas. *Perfiles Educativos*, 34(136), 42-64. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/132/13223068004.pdf>
- Jurado, F. (2009). La evaluación de la lectura para la evaluación de la escritura. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*, (2)1, 130-146. <https://revistas.uam.es/index.php/riee/article/view/4573>
- Jurado, F. y Bustamante, G. (1996). *Los procesos de la escritura. Hacia la producción interactiva de los sentidos*. Cooperativa. Editorial Magisterio.
- Kalman, J. (2003). Cultura escrita. El aprendizaje de la lectura y la escritura para su uso en la vida cotidiana. *Decisio. Cultura escrita y educación para adultos*, 6(1), p. 3-9. https://cdn.designa.mx/CREFAL/revistas-decisio/decisio6_saber1.pdf
- Lerner, D. (2003). *Leer en la escuela: Lo real, lo posible y lo necesario*. Fondo de cultura económica. https://coleccion.siaeducacion.org/sites/default/files/files/9-lerner-delia_2003leer_y_escr.pdf
- Lomas, C. (s.f). *La enseñanza de la lengua y el aprendizaje de la comunicación*. https://formacioncontinuaedomex.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/la-enseñanza-de-la-lengua-carlos_lomas.pdf
- Lozano, M. (2017). El aprendizaje de la escritura inicial desde una perspectiva sociocultural: una experiencia de formación en investigación. *Enunciación* 22(2), 166-177. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.14483/22486798.11953>
- Lytard, J. (1987). La condición posmoderna. <https://www.uv.mx/tipmal/files/2016/10/J-F-lyotard-la-condicion-posmoderna.pdf>
- Miras, M. (2000). La escritura reflexiva. Aprender a escribir y aprender acerca de lo que se escribe.

- 23(1), 65 - 80. <http://mariajesusorueta.blogspot.com/2015/11/la-funcion-epistemica-de-la-escritura.html>
- Morales, E. (2010). *Conceptos y Normas útiles para escribir*. Ediciones Paloma.
- Mota, C. y Villalobos, J. (2007). El aspecto sociocultural del pensamiento y del lenguaje: una visión Vygostkiana. *Educere*, 11 (38), 411-418. <http://ve.scielo.org/pdf/edu/v11n38/art05.pdf>
- Olson, D. (1998). *El mundo sobre el papel. El impacto de la escritura y la lectura en la estructura del conocimiento*. Editorial Gedisa. <https://lecturayescrituraunrn.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/olson-el-mundo-sobre-el-papel.pdf>
- Sakaiya, T. (1998). ¿Qué Cambios se Están Produciendo Hoy? ¿Qué Significa ‘Posmoderno’?, en *Historia del Futuro: La Sociedad del Conocimiento*. Editorial Andrés Bello. <https://www.probidadenchile.cl/wp/sakaiya-taichi-historia-del-futuro/>
- Serafini, M. (1994). *Cómo se escribe*. Ediciones Paidós. <https://retoricaprofesional.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/cocc81mo-se-escribe-teresa-serafini.pdf>
- Serrano, S. (2014). La lectura, la escritura y el pensamiento. Función epistémica e implicaciones pedagógicas. *Lenguaje*, 4(1) ,97-122. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/leng/v42n1/v42n1a05.pdf>
- Serres, M. (2013). Pulgarcita. <https://www.textosenlinea.com.ar/textos/Serres%202013%20-%20Pulgarcita.pdf>
- Sraiki, C., y Jolibert, J. (2009). *Niños que construyen su poder de leer y escribir*. Ediciones Manantial. <https://www.emanantial.com.ar/archivos/fragmentos/JolibertSraikiFragmento.pdf>
- Silva, A. y Limongi, M. (2019). Escritura académica en contextos académicos- profesionales: desafíos de investigación educativa, cognitiva y neurocientífica. *Revista Educación Superior y Sociedad (ESS)*, 18(18), 36-53. <file:///C:/Users/cpe/Downloads/5-Texto%20del%20art%C3%ADculo-12-2-10-20190716.pdf>
- Vanegas, M. (2014). La escritura y las redes sociales [Tesis de maestría, Universidad del Tolima]. <file:///C:/Users/cpe/Downloads/51068099.pdf>
- Vygotsky, L. (1995). *Pensamiento y Lenguaje. Teorías del desarrollo cultural de las funciones psíquicas*. Ediciones Fausto. <https://abacoenred.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Pensamiento-y-Lenguaje-Vigotsky-Lev.pdf>
- White, M. y Bruning, R. (2005). Creencias implícitas de escritura y su relación con la calidad de la escritura. *Psicología educativa contemporánea*, 30 (2), 166-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2004.07.002>
- Zavala, V. (2002). *(Des) encuentros con la escritura: escuela y comunidad en los Andes Peruanos*. <https://repositorio.up.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/11354/1041/ZavalaVirginia2002%281%29.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y>