

## Education and writing: In evidence the characteristics and examples of linguistic-discursive operations



<https://doi.org/10.56238/ptoketheeducati-039>

### Luan Tarlau Balieiro

Ph.D. student in Education at the State University of Maringá (UEM). Master in Education from the same University. Specialist in Teaching in Education and in Libras by the Metropolitan University Center of Maringá (UNIFAMMA). Degree in Letters, with qualification in Portuguese Language and Corresponding Literatures, also by UEM.

E-mail: [luan.tarlau@gmail.com](mailto:luan.tarlau@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this text is to characterize the linguistic-discursive operations by means of examples elaborated by the author himself. Based

on the theoretical assumptions of Applied Linguistics and studies on text rewriting, it aims to exemplify each linguistic-discursive operation and analyze how it is systematized in the rewriting process. In order to do so, it is problematized the fact of the student attend or not the reformulations suggested by the teacher in the revision and rewriting practices. The conclusion is that writing is a continuous action, in which the first version of a text cannot be defined as a finished product with the sole purpose of being evaluated by the teacher. It becomes important to conceive the text as a space for reflections, revisions, rereading, and rewriting, in an interlocutory process between teacher and student.

**Keywords:** Education, linguistic-discursive operations, rewriting, revision.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 INITIAL NOTES

In the process of textual production, it is seen that the text does not have its fixed outcome in a first writing. To direct the production of the learner to significant improvements in terms of content and form, it is important to be guided by correction strategies. In the ideas of Serafini (2004), correction can be defined as all the interventions that the teacher performs in the student's text through notes, questions and comments. As the author points out, "it is the set of interventions that the teacher makes in the writing highlighting the defects and errors, in order to help the student to identify their weaknesses and improve" (SERAFINI, 2004, p. 97).

Thus, correction strategies are understood as linguistic-discursive operations proposed by Fabre (1986), studied by Menegassi (1998), Balieiro and Menegassi (2017), Balieiro and Hila (2020) – and understood as "linguistic-discursive" activities by Moterani (2012). The linguistic-discursive operations are divided into four categories: addition, replacement, suppression and displacement.

Based on a qualitative and analytical method, this text has as its central objective to characterize the linguistic-discursive operations through examples elaborated by the author himself. Based on the theoretical assumptions of Applied Linguistics, in studies on text rewriting, especially Fabre (1986)



and Menegassi (1998), the objective is specifically to exemplify each linguistic-discursive operation and analyze how it is systematized in the rewriting process. Therefore, it is problematized whether or not the student meets the reformulations suggested by the teacher in the practices of revision and rewriting.

Initially, such practices are discussed in order to understand the four interventional correction approaches applied in the textual review. After that, the specificities of the linguistic-discursive operations are explained, based on theoretical and practical analyses of texts, to perceive how they manifest themselves in the rewriting and how they lead the students' production to the textual development. The action of characterizing the operations is justified by the importance of understanding how each linguistic operation works, in order to assist in the quality of the texts of students who value the constructive comments made by the teacher in the productions.

## 1.2 THE TEXTUAL PRODUCTION PROCESS

The stages of the written production process exposed by the literature are: planning, execution, revision and rewriting (MENEGASSI, 2010). With regard to planning, it is seen that there is the involvement of the set of actions that precede the execution of writing. With regard to the second stage of the writing process, the execution, it is noted that it is the moment in which the writer develops the production of the text from the actions carried out in the first stage, the planning.

When dealing specifically with the act of revising, the third stage of the writing process, it is observed that it is the moment in which the critical evaluation of the written text and the possibility of modifications in the original version occur. The review can be carried out both during and after the execution, in addition to being carried out from three different perspectives: a) the student-producer/writer; b) the classmate(s); c) the teacher himself. Menegassi (1998) explains that the practice of revising is an activity that provides the opportunity for the emergence of a new type of process, so that it enables a new phase in the composition of the text, since it is from modifications made in the text that the rewriting originates, the last stage of the writing process.

Regarding the rewriting, it is important to understand it as a stage of improvement of the text, with the clear intention of making it more intelligible to the reader. From the perspective of writing as a work (FIAD; MAYRINK-SABINSON, 1991; MENEGASSI, 2016), rewriting is not a practice restricted to the elimination of formal aspects inappropriate to the standard written norm of the Portuguese language. As Menegassi (2010, p. 92) points out: "It is also to add, replace, suppress and displace information in the text that is in the process of construction." For this, the student, in addition to analyzing with caution what was pointed out in the review stage, resumes the tasks developed in the planning stage, in order to rescue the production conditions that guide the construction of the text, resuming or performing new readings and analyses for the consolidation of their previous knowledge.



It is for this reason that the stages of the textual production process (planning, execution, revision and rewriting) cannot be studied as species of separate sets, since they occur simultaneously to provide the learner with a coherent set of strategies and skills, in fact, they are concomitant and recursive in the writing process.

In the revision stage, before referring the student to the rewriting, the teacher performs interventional forms of correction in the texts, either to indicate a certain problem and solve it, or to classify the problem by means of known codes and establish an interlocution with the student in the form of tickets. For this, the literature names these interventional forms as indicative, resolute and classificatory correction (SERAFINI, 1989) and textual-interactive correction (RUIZ, 2001). These four correction approaches are discussed more emphatically in the following section.

### 1.3 THE INTERVENTIONAL FORMS OF CORRECTION

The work of correction is intended to draw the attention of the student to the problems that the text presents in its materialization; Thus, its realization is carried out by the teacher and, in some cases, by the student aware of the process. From this, it appears that the action of correcting is a kind of "error hunting" (RUIZ, 2001), since the teacher focuses his attention to what the text presents of incoherent and erroneous aspects, and not of aspects that favor the textual development. It is for this reason that the work of correction is based on the act of demarcating in the student's text the probable errors related to the content (theme and attendance to the command of the activity) and form (structure of the genre and linguistic performance).

Regarding the terminology "interventional forms of correction", Ruiz (2001) exposes that such forms are considered interventional texts carried out by the reviewing professor to, in fact, carry out the work of correction, which here are considered approaches, not just forms, as studied in the unfolding of the textual-interactive review by Menegassi and Gasparotto (2016). The intervening text is characterized as a text superimposed on the student's text, that is, to show the problems that the outline presents. It can be employed in three different regions of the sheet of paper: 1) in the body; 2) at the margin; 3) in sequence to the text of the learner, a form of correction named by Ruiz (2001) as "post-text". Ruiz (2001), in order to understand how the intervening forms occur, relies on the postulates of Serafini (1989), an author who recognizes the existence of three correction tendencies, all made by Portuguese language teachers: the indicative, the resolute and the classificatory. For Serafini (1989), as Ruiz (2001) highlights, most teachers alternate between indicative and resolute corrections, and the classificatory corrections are used in more sporadic circumstances.

In order to highlight a given aspect in the text, it is common for teachers to employ more than one interventional form, so that there is a mixture of the different correction strategies. Among the four correction methods applied in the writing activity (indicative, resolute, classificatory and textual-



interactive), the indicative correction is performed by the teacher in the margin or in the body of the student's text, marking words, phrases and periods written in an incoherent and disconnected way.

Serafini (1989) explains that the correction of resolutive character is a method used by the teacher-subject to correct all the errors detected in the student's text, rewriting words, sentences and entire periods. Because it has a resolutive character, it is seen that this approach is an attempt by the teacher to assume, through the learner, the reformulation of his text. At the moment of effecting the correction, the resolutive character reflects the four operations of textual reformulation: addition, substitution, suppression and displacement (FABRE, 1986), since, when indicating the probable problems for the student, the teacher points out the places of these reformulation operations in the text, sometimes to add information and replace a specific term, sometimes to exclude a word that compromises the meaning of the text, even, to shift shapes.

Ruiz (2001) enters into the third approach recognized by Serafini (1989): the act of classifying. Thus, the classificatory correction is a strategy that consists of the unambiguous identification of errors from a specific classification. The teacher suggests modifications, but what becomes habitual is the fact that he leads the student to correct the error alone. For this, the correction is effective through a classification of errors that is known to the learner. Teachers, in cases of this correction, use a specific set of written symbols located in the margins of the student's text in order to classify the type of problem identified. These sets of written symbols compose a correction code that alternates from teacher to teacher, in which the initial letters of a metalinguistic expression concerning the origin of the detected problem are used, for example: assigning the symbol "A" to deal with problems related to accentuation.

In view of the presentation of the specificities of the three major correction trends theorized by Serafini (1989), it is important to deal with the last interventional form not recognized by this author: the textual-interactive. Unlike the methods of indicative, resolutive and classificatory character, the textual-interactive correction is carried out through more extensive comments written in sequence to the text of the learner, or, in the terminology of Ruiz (2001), characterized as being the "post-text". Such comments are materialized in the form of tickets, without a determined extension, containing two demarcated purposes: 1) to talk about the review task by the student; 2) talk about the task of correction itself performed by the teacher in a metadiscursive way. It is noteworthy that the textual-interactive approach fosters the work of rewriting by the student, in which the positive commitment of the revision made is confirmed, all this in the materialization of notes that evidence affectivity between the subjects involved in the writing process, in this case, teacher and student.

The analysis materials evidenced here correspond to elaborated texts that present notes constructed by a reviewing professor. After the explanation of the correction strategies, it is pertinent to continue to analyze the practice of textual revision, focusing on the use of the linguistic-discursive



operations systematized by Fabre (1986) and studied by Menegassi (1998), Moterani (2012), Balieiro and Menegassi (2017) and Balieiro and Hila (2020).

#### 1.4 THE LINGUISTIC-DISCURSIVE OPERATIONS: DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES

In order to characterize the operations of addition, replacement, suppression and displacement (FABRE, 1986; Menegas, 1998; MOTERANI, 2012; BALIEIRO; MENEGASSI, 2017; BALIEIRO; HILA, 2020), the examples are divided into two versions of writing (the first, considered the original, and the second, considered the rewriting of the first version) to verify the effectiveness that such operations have in the rewriting, to the extent that they provide significant improvements in terms of content and form in the students' writing, provided that they are adhered to.

Relying on the theoretical estimates of Fabre (1986), Menegassi (1998), Moterani (2012), Balieiro and Menegassi (2017) and Balieiro and Hila (2020) on the behavior of students at the time of correcting their drafts of texts, five strategies used by them are defined from the applicability of these operations: 1) fully attend to the correction of the teacher and reformulate from what was suggested by him; 2) partially attend to the teacher's correction and make only some reformulations; 3) attend to the teacher's review and complement only with a reformulation, in addition to that suggested by him; 4) choose not to meet the teacher's suggestions for review or not reformulate from what was suggested by him due to lack of understanding in relation to the comment/appointment/questioning; 5) present reformulations that exhaust the suggestions of the reviewing professor. In this strategy, the student has the need to reread his text and rewrite it going beyond what was suggested by the teacher through guiding notes (MENEGASSI, 2016).

Next, the four linguistic-discursive operations are theoretically discussed: a) addition; b) replacement; c) suppression; d) displacement, with the presentation of examples of texts in which the use of each of these strategies in the rewriting activity is observable.

In the addition operation, it is noted that there is the act of adding new information in the rewriting of the text in order to make its content broad, properly explained and coherent to the reader. As a way to exemplify the use of the addition operation in the rewrite, there is the exposition of two examples of text fragments, specifically the first version (Chart 1) and the rewrite (Chart 2).

Chart 1 – First version of the beginning of a text, with questions that a teacher could ask

Once three boys\* decided to make a bet. The postlet was like that [...].

\*Who were the boys? What's their name? Where did they live?

Source: own elaboration.

Chart 1 shows the beginning of a text, with markings made by the reviewing teacher. Such markings express characteristics of a textual-interactive correction (RUIZ, 2001), since a dialogue is established with the producer of the text in the form of questions, with mixtures of indicative correction



(SERAFINI, 1989), because it is pointed to the student where he will implement the suggested data. In this case, however, the teacher proposes changes, as it instigates the student to think about some details about the characters.

When writing "Who were the boys?", "What's their name?" "Where did they live?", the teacher requests that new information be added to the materialization of the student's text, in order to make the content complete, coherent and elucidative to the reader, so that it contributes to the thematic progression. In this circumstance, the addition operation is effective from the insertion of new information in relation to the identification of the characters involved in the story. The following is the rewriting of the beginning of the text.

Table 2 – Rewriting of the beginning of the text

Once three brothers: Pedrinho, João and Jorge, who lived in a neighborhood and were the children of a cook [...].
---

Source: own elaboration.

In Chart 2, the student attends to the teacher's questions in the rewriting of the excerpt, specifying the names of the characters Pedrinho, João and Jorge, who these characters were in the story (children of a cook) and where they lived (in a neighborhood). When answering the questions proposed by the reviewing teacher, it is noted that the addition operation helped the student to amplify the content of the text, to consider that new information was provided for the literal understanding of the characteristics of the subjects that integrate the narrative. In accordance with Menegassi (1998), the student used the first strategy of application of linguistic-discursive operations: to fully attend to the correction of the teacher and reformulate from what was suggested by him, without exhausting the direction of the educator.

With regard to the substitution process, there is a suppression, followed by substitution by a term, a new expression. This operation is applied on a word, a phrasing, a grapheme, or on generalized sets. To exemplify the use of the substitution operation, two examples of excerpts from texts stand out, specifically the first version (Chart 3) and its rewriting (Chart 4).

Table 3 – First version of the excerpt of a narrative, with comment from a reviewing professor

The old man liked Daniel and they became father and son because the boy had neither father nor mother and Daniel went to live more the old man.
---

X, your story is good, but you didn't use punctuation marks. Read your text and see that you have repeated it many times, and in its place, put a period and start new sentences.
---

Source: own elaboration.

In Chart 3, the reviewing teacher highlighted the letter "e" used by the student throughout the text, in order to indicate the repetition that such use caused. Following the student's text, or, in the words of Ruiz (2001): the "post-text", the teacher makes a comment, praising the developed history, in order to highlight the formal slips found: "X, your story is good, but you did not use punctuation



marks. Read your text and see that you have repeated it many times, and in its place, put a period and start new sentences." From this comment, it is evident the predominance of a textual-interactive correction (RUIZ, 2001), since the comment was affected in a guiding note (MENEGASSI; GASPAROTTO, 2016) to the student, as well as an indicative correction (SERAFINI, 1989), through the act of circulating the problem found: the redundancy of the "e". The rewrite of the text looked like this:

Table 4 – Rewriting of the narrative excerpt

The old man liked Daniel, they became father and son because the boy had no father and no mother. Daniel went to live with the old man.
---

Source: own elaboration.

When analyzing the rewriting (Chart 4), it appears that the student complied with what had been determined by the teacher, replacing the excessive use of "and" by a full stop: "[...] and went to live more the old man." (Table 3, first version); "[...] He had neither father nor mother. Daniel went to live more the old man" (Chart 4, rewritten). Thus, the student fully complied with the teacher's suggestions, not extrapolating them, restricting himself, therefore, to the first strategy highlighted by Menegassi (1998).

Regarding the deletion process, there is a withdrawal, but, unlike the previous operation, there is no replacement of the element that was suppressed. The act of suppression applies to multiple units, accents, syllables, syntagmatic words, graphemes, as well as to one or several sentences and sentences. Two examples are presented that show the occurrence of the suppression operation. The first refers to the initial version of a text (Chart 5) and the second to the rewrite (Table 6).

Table 5 – First version of the beginning of the narrative, with indicative and resolute corrections

On a beautiful full moon night in the middle of Friday the 13th? It was me and two other friends, Tamires and Yasmim, but we were passing by the semintério and we heard a noise [...].
--

Source: own elaboration.

When considering the first version of the text (Chart 5), it is observed that the reviewing teacher does not make any comments or questions, only points out the grammatical slips verified in the body of the text itself. In the fourth line, the teacher crosses out the adversative conjunction "but", performing a correction of a resolute character (SERAFINI, 1989), without marks of interlocution, that is, there is no existence of a dialogue (BAKHTIN, 2003) established from notes between teacher and student. What is called for is the obvious deletion of the conjunction, which, in view of the context, is not used coherently. The following is the rewriting of the fragment.



Table 6 – Rewriting of the beginning of the narrative

On a beautiful night of the full moon, in the middle of Friday the 13th, I and two other friends, Tamires and Yasmim, were passing near the cemetery and heard a noise. We decided to go in there.

Source: own elaboration.

The excerpt presented (Chart 6) proves that the subject-learner made the resolute corrections proposed by the teacher, removing the conjunction "but", as is verifiable before the use of the verb "we were" and after the name "Yasmim". By being fully guided by the teacher's correction, the student made use of the first strategy postulated by Menegassi (1998), not extrapolating the teacher's resolute correction, nor ignoring it. This removal of the adversative conjunction "but" consists in the applicability of the act of suppression, having, in the analyzed situation, a resolute correction with suppression operation.

With regard to the displacement operation, there is the record of a commutation of elements, which change their order in the process of chaining the information of the student's text. With this, the offset is applied to sentences, words or phrasings. Two examples are presented (Tables 7 and 8), following the same scheme as the previous operations.

Table 7 – First version of the end of a narrative, with a note from a reviewing professor

\* The boy was so scared that he ended up falling asleep and slept in the haunted house, the other day the house was locked and the boy could not get out of there anymore and had to live forever with the man, and the man did not give anything to the boy to eat and neither did he eat anything until one day they died, they became ghosts and haunted people.

End.

\*This sentence is very large. Break it down into smaller sentences!

Source: own elaboration.

Chart 7 shows the final part of the narrative. In it, the reviewing teacher demarcates with an asterisk the exact place where the student will pay attention to make any changes in the rewriting. The professor points out: "\*This sentence is too big. Break it down into smaller sentences!". Thus, the student will focus specifically on the structure of the text, thinking about how the division of sentences can occur in order to avoid the extension of periods. In this case, there is the textual-interactive correction (RUIZ, 2001) marked by the teacher's comment written in the left margin with direction to the student, as well as the indicative correction (SERAFINI, 1989) made by the demarcation of the asterisk, in which the problem to be analyzed and corrected at a later time is located. The rewriting of the final fragments of the narrative stands out below.

Table 8 – Rewriting of the final fragments of the narrative

The boy became so scared that he fell asleep and slept in the haunted house.

The other day, the house was locked and the boy couldn't get out of there anymore and had to live forever with the man.

The man didn't give the boy anything to eat and neither did he eat anything until they died, became ghosts and kept haunting people.

End.

Source: own elaboration.





Based on this excerpt, the change that the text presented from the first version (Chart 7) to the rewritten version (Chart 8) is notorious. Aesthetically, the organization of the paragraphs is presented adequately. The student, in this way, considered the appointment of the reviewing professor, dividing the sentences by means of displacements for the formation of new paragraphs, as is observable in: "[...] in the haunted house. [New paragraph] The other day, the house was [...]" (Table 8); "[...] and had to dwell forever with the man. [New paragraph] The man gave nothing to the boy [...]" (Table 8). There was total attendance of the teacher's appointment, since the student complied with what had been determined by him, not going beyond the suggestion given (MENEGASSI, 1998).

## 2 FINAL NOTES

From the theoretical assumptions and the exemplificative analyses (Tables 1-8), it was verified that the work with the linguistic-discursive operations allows the students to think about their own acts of writing, leading them to understand that a text does not have a determined outcome after delivering it to the teacher. You need to review it carefully and rewrite it in search of significant improvements in content and form plans.

Fiad and Marynk-Sabinsin (1991), Sercundes (1997) and Menegassi (2010) confirm this information, postulating that writing is a continuous action, in which the first version of a text cannot be defined as a finished product with the sole purpose of being evaluated by the teacher. It is important to conceive the text as a space for reflections, revisions, rereadings and rewritings, in an interlocutive process (BAKHTIN/VOLOSHINOV, 1997) between teacher and student.



## REFERENCES

- BAKHTIN, M. Estética da criação verbal. Tradução de Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.
- BAKHTIN, M.; VOLOSHINOV, V. N. Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1997.
- BALIEIRO, L. T.; MENEGASSI, R. J. A operação linguístico-discursiva de acréscimo na reescrita de textos de alunos do 5º ano do Ensino Fundamental. Claraboia, Jacarezinho, v. 8, p. 30-49, jul./dez. 2017.
- BALIEIRO, L. T.; HILA, C. V. D. As operações linguístico-discursivas na reescrita de textos do gênero conto de mistério de alunos do 5º ano do Ensino Fundamental. (Con)Textos Linguísticos, Vitória, v. 14, n. 27, p. 287-306, 2020.
- FABRE, C. Des variantes de brouillon au cours préparatoire. Études de Linguistique Appliquée, (62): 59-79, avril-jun. 1986.
- FIAD, R. S.; MAYRINK-SABINSON, M. L. T. A escrita como trabalho. In: MARTINS, M. H. (org.) Questões de linguagem. São Paulo: Contexto, 1991. p. 54-63.
- MENEGASSI, R. J. Da revisão à reescrita: operações e níveis linguísticos na construção do texto. 1998. 263 f. Tese (Doutorado) – Faculdade de Ciências e Letras de Assis, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Assis, 1998.
- MENEGASSI, R. J. A produção textual e o ensino. In: SANTOS, A. R.; GREGO, E. A.; GUIMARÃES, T. B. (org.). Escrita e ensino. Maringá: Eduem, 2010. p. 75-102.
- MENEGASSI, R. J. A escrita como trabalho na sala de aula. In: JORDÃO, C. M. (org.). A linguística aplicada no Brasil: rumos e passagens. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2016. p. 193-230.
- MENEGASSI, R. J.; GASPAROTTO, D. M. Revisão textual-interativa: aspectos teórico-metodológicos. Domínio de Linguagens, Uberlândia, v. 10, n. 3, p. 1019-1045, 2016.
- MOTERANI, N. G. A reescrita de textos nas 7ª e 8ª séries do ensino fundamental: caracterização de aspectos linguístico-discursivos. 2012. 164 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Letras) – Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Maringá, 2012.
- RUIZ, E. D. Como se corrige redação na escola. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2001.
- SERAFINI, M. T. Como escrever textos. Tradução de Maria Augusta Bastos de Mattos. 6. ed. São Paulo: Globo, 1989.
- SERAFINI, M. T. Como escrever textos. Tradução de Maria Augusta Bastos de Mattos; Adaptação de Ana Maria Marcondes Garcia. 12. ed. São Paulo: Globo, 2004.
- SERCUNDES, M. M. I. Ensinando a escrever. In: CHIAPPINI, L. (org.). Aprender e ensinar com textos de alunos. Vol. 1. São Paulo: Cortez, 1997. p. 75-96.