Dialogic Relationships and Double-voiced Discourse in the Working Activity of the Proofreader in Academic Thesis: Tensions and/in Meaning Making / *Relações dialógicas e discurso bivocal na atividade de trabalho do revisor em teses acadêmicas: tensões e(m) sentidos*

Vanessa Fonseca Barbosa[*]

ABSTRACT

This paper is based on the study of the concepts of *dialogic relationships* and *double-voiced* discourse to analyze discursive interactions between a proofreader and a doctoral student during different stages of proofreading an academic thesis. The research material are discourses from: i) e-mails exchanges between the proofreader and the doctoral student regarding their understanding of the work the proofreader performs and ii) an excerpt of the thesis during the proofreading process with the proofreader's and the doctoral student's comments in the text. The analysis of these discourses allows us to see the tense dialogic relationships that constitute the proofreader's work, to observe the clues on the various stages of the writing process, as well as to discuss the double-voiced discourse that constitutes the work with proofreading based on the proofreader's words resounded in the doctoral student's final version of the revised text.

KEYWORDS: Proof-reading; Dialogic relationships; Double-voiced discourse

RESUMO

Este trabalho ancora-se no estudo dos conceitos de relações dialógicas *e de* discurso bivocal *para analisar interações discursivas estabelecidas entre uma revisora e uma doutoranda durante diferentes etapas de realização da atividade de revisão textual em uma tese acadêmica. O material da pesquisa é constituído por discursos advindos: i) de e-mails entre a revisora e a doutoranda, nos quais elas discutem o conceito da atividade de trabalho contratada; e ii) por um excerto do texto em processo de revisão, junto à inserção de comentários de ambas na escrita. Os discursos investigados possibilitam-nos contemplar as tensas relações dialógicas envoltas no fazer de um revisor de textos, trazer pistas dos diferentes estágios de desenvolvimento da tessitura textual, assim como nos permitem discutir o discurso bivocal constitutivo do trabalho com revisão textual, a partir das palavras da revisora ressoadas no texto da doutoranda, que compõem o texto acadêmico revisado em sua versão final.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Revisão de textos; Relações dialógicas; Discurso bivocal

---

[*] Universidade de São Paulo – USP, Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; CAPES, Proc. 2010/446; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2901-015X; vanessafonbar@usp.br

> La parola non è una cosa, ma l'ambiente eternamente mobile,
> eternamente mutevole dello scambio sociale.
> *Mikhail Bachtin*

> For the word is not a material thing but rather the eternally
> mobile, eternally fickle medium of dialogic interaction.
> *Mikhail Bakhtin[1]*

Introduction

It has been a recurrent practice in our research projects to investigate language considering it as a discursive, dialogic element, characterized both by the intrinsic relationship between *I* and the *other* and by the presence of social values through which some voices are given visibility and others are effaced. Relying on the postulates of Mikhail Bakhtin and other authors of the Circle we aim to analyze language by mobilizing words in relation to one another. This aspect of analysis allows us to materialize experiences and ways of seeing the world full of multiple and even differing evaluative accents.

Our studies based on the dialogic understanding of discourse have allowed us to think about language in its complex and multifaceted process of production and circulation of meaning. That means that the main role of production and circulation of meaning is taken by responsive subjects, who are situated in the most varied enunciative spheres. Since our master's degree,[2] our academic work has been grounded on the concepts elaborated by the authors of the Circle to investigate the development of the proofreading activity in the genres that circulate in the academic sphere, such as scientific papers and didactic materials.

In this research process, we have attempted to better understand the proofreader's work. Despite the great demand presented by authors of scientific papers, dissertations and even doctoral theses, in addition to the job's complex process of textual construction,

---

[1] BAKHTIN, M. M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. [1963]

[2] Our master's degree work, *A dialogic analysis of the activity of proofreading in Distance Learning*, defended in the year 2012 in the Graduate Program of Applied Linguistics of the Catholic University of Pelotas (UCPel), was supervised by Professor Adail Sobral. Our doctoral research, entitled *An excluded voice?* Analysis of the activity of proofreading of academic texts under the Bakhtinian and Ergological perspectives, defended in 2017 in the Graduate Program of in Letters of PUC/RS, was supervised by Professor Maria da Glória Corrêa di Fanti.

the proofreader's work remains invisible and has been the object of only a few scientific analyses. Therefore, by concentrating our studies on the proofreader's work in the academic sphere from a discursive-enunciative perspective of language, we intend to contribute to a better understanding of this enigmatic and multifaceted labor.

In our research trajectory, we have already shown that the proofreader's work can be carried out in quite different manners, depending, especially, on the understanding of language by the experts doing it. Thus, the plurality of ways to perform this activity is one of its main characteristics, which, very often, leads to some misunderstandings due to conflicts between the client's expectations about the proofreader and the actual work carried out by the latter (BARBOSA, 2017; 2018). We have also pointed out in our previous research that most academic genres fail to mention the proofreader's activity in the final version circulating in the academic sphere. This contributes to the invisibility and silencing of this field of work (BARBOSA, 2012; 2017).

An additional challenge in the proofreader's work that we discuss is the fact that proofreaders occupy a border zone between the author and the presumed reader of the final text. In other words, despite not being the author's presumed reader in the course of planning and writing the texts, once they are hired, proofreaders play an important role in the (re)organization and in the completion of the author's text. This place occupied by the proofreader

> [...] is characterized by approximations and distancing regarding both the author of the text and the textual production itself, falling upon proofreaders have to constantly seek the balance between occupying the place of the other – an empathic move – to understand the general construction of the writing, and distancing from this other – an exotopic move – to act as critical readers capable of seeing the whole of the author's project of saying as well as the best ways to finish the writing, in order to perform their work successfully (BARBOSA, 2017, p.193).[3]

One previous research of ours examined how the establishment of this important role of *other* was performed by proofreaders. The study showed some of the ways

---

[3] In the original: "[...] é marcado por aproximações e distanciamentos tanto do autor do texto quanto da produção textual em si, cabendo ao revisor a constante procura pelo equilíbrio entre o colocar-se no lugar do outro – movimento empático – para compreender a tessitura geral da escrita, e o afastar-se – movimento exotópico –, para atuar como um leitor crítico, capaz de observar o todo do projeto de dizer e de vislumbrar melhores possibilidades de finalização do texto, a fim de que possa desenvolver, com êxito, sua atividade laboral."

proofreaders come to have a constitutive role on the web of meaning-making present in the final product of a proofread text, in spite of the silencing and the invisibilities that remain connected to this work (BARBOSA; DI FANTI, 2018). We also had the opportunity of deepening our reflections on this enunciative position occupied by proofreaders and observed that, in a very similar manner to translators, proofreaders undertake a certain enunciative status on the web of the interlocution "[...] which is the author-reader relationship, something that makes them vital collaborators to the author, a voice present in the final result of that author's text, although not necessarily a recognized authorial name (SOBRAL; BARBOSA, 2019, p.22).[4]

Although we have some amount of scientific work dedicated to the proofreaders' work in the academic sphere, we underscore that this does not exhaust the subject nor reduces the importance of new inquiries on the subject. As we stated, proofreading is a very complex activity with multiple aspects yet to be investigated and that deserve greater visibility in scientific studies. Hence, we have developed the present paper to continue our investigative journey and to develop our current postdoctoral studies project. One of the aims of this project is the deepening of the reflection on conceptual aspects of the Bakhtinian thought as a way to subsidize the analysis of the activity of proofreading in academic texts.

In this inquiry, we will turn our attention to the study of the concepts of dialogic relationships and of the double-voiced word – present in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Creation* (*PDC*), in 1929, as well as in the second publication of this text, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (*PDP*), in 1963 – to approach the proofreader's work. We know that the focus of Bakhtin's reflections in these writings concern literary discourse, but the considerations made there allow to us to think about any discursive realization from a dialogic perspective of language, considering discourse and, in consequence, language, as elements to be taken "[...] in its concrete living totality" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.181).[5]

According to Brait (2015, p.55), by turning onto Bakhtinian studies of Dostoevsky's works, we come into contact with "[...] texts that are constantly intertwined with elements that point to the Bakhtinian perspective of language that go far beyond

---

[4] In the original: "[...] que é a relação autor-leitor, algo que faz dele um colaborador vital do autor, uma voz presente no resultado final do texto desse autor, ainda que não necessariamente um nome autoral reconhecido."
[5] For references see footnote 1.

Bakhtin's interest in Literature and Poetics." [6] From this perspective, we also assume that discourse is never monologic, but plurivocal, axiologically bearing a multiplicity of values, voices, truths and tones made real in the continuous and uninterrupted process of interlocutory communication. In fact, we are immersed in this process of interlocutory communication of which we are part of in the most varied enunciative spheres, as we intended to show with the present reflection.

In this paper, we resume the Bakhtinian studies to analyze the dialogue established by a proofreader and a doctoral student on the subject of the latter's thesis. The corpus of the research is composed of two e-mails exchanged between the doctoral student and the proofreader. The first one relates to the moment when the work was contracted, and the second one consists of an excerpt of the thesis in the process of proofreading. During the proofreading process, the two participants interacted through comments in the body of the text in focus. The selected discursive exchanges give us clues about the complex process that constitutes proofreading, but they also allow us to reflect on the (in)tense dialogic process in which proofreading is inserted.

1 Dialogic Relationships and Double-Voiced Discourse: Constitutive Phenomena of Discourse(s)

In Dostoevsky's novels, as Paulo Bezerra points out in the introduction of PDP available in Portuguese, "[...] the representation of the characters is, above all, the representation of their plural consciousnesses" (BEZERRA, 2015, p.X).[7] It is through the analysis of this ample and complex universe of plural character consciousnesses created by Dostoevsky that Bakhtin presents us his theory regarding the polyphonic novel. We learn that, in the constitution of the artistic work of the Russian novelist, all the elements are interconnected, because, as Bakhtin points out, there is an "[...] extraordinary artistic capacity for seeing everything in coexistence and interaction" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.30).[8]

In this new configuration of the novel, characters are not subordinated to pure objectification either by other interlocutors or by the author himself, since this latter is

---

[6] In the original: "[...] textos que vão sendo costurados com elementos que sinalizam a perspectiva bakhtiniana de linguagem e não somente seu interesse por Literatura e Poética" (BRAIT, 2015, p.55).
[7] In the original: "[...] the representation of the characters is, above all, the representation of their plural consciences."
[8] For references of all citations of Bakhtin 1984, see footnote 1.

not the absolute master of their voices. Characters not only have freedom and autonomy in the constitution of the literary work, but they are also not integral beings and closed in themselves. On the contrary, they are individuals resulting from the interaction among several consciousnesses, i.e., they are characters who have their own universes of values, maintaining several interactional in relation among themselves which "[...]have their voices take a completion movement to fill the evasive gaps left by their interlocutors" (BEZERRA, 2015, p.X).[9]

So, in Dostoevsky, "hero is not 'he' and not 'I' but a fully valid 'thou', that is, another and other autonomous 'I' ('thou art'). The hero is the subject of a deeply serious, real dialogic mode of address, not the subject of a rhetorically performed or conventionally literary one" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.63). As Bakhtin shows, these considerations are only possible if the analysis of these others' consciousnesses is done by means of their dialogic relationships. These consciousnesses, despite demanding logical and concrete-semantic relationships to develop, belong to another field, as they take part in the universe of discourse. Therefore, they characterize as a phenomenon much more complex than the relationship established by simple turn-taking of dialogue, "[...] an almost universal phenomenon, permeating all human speech and all relationships and manifestations of human life." In Bakhtin's words: *The polyphonic novel is dialogic through and through.*" (BAKHTIN,1984, p.40; emphasis in original), and all its elements full of dialogic relationships "[...] are juxtaposed contrapuntally" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.40).

Still according to the Russian philosopher, "Dostoevsky could hear dialogic relationships everywhere, in all manifestations of conscious and intelligent human life;" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.47). This way, in the dialogic universe established in the context of Dostoevsky's narrative, "[…] the author's discourse about a character is discourse about discourse. It is oriented toward the hero as if toward a discourse, and is therefore dialogically *addressed* to him" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.63). Nevertheless, we only manage to approach the dialogic relationships established between subjects if we take into consideration that words need to enter the vivacity of utterances to exist. For so doing, they "must clothe themselves in discourse, become utterances, become the positions of various subjects expressed in discourse" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.183).

---

[9] In the original: "[...] preenchem com suas vozes as lacunas evasivas deixadas por seus interlocutores."

When they enter the discursive scope to which the utterances belong, words gain an author and new shades of evaluation. As long as we can hear the voice(s) of other(s), we can see this dialogic perspective in "[...] any signifying part of an utterance" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.209), besides integral enunciations, styles of language, social dialects etc.

For Bakhtin, the establishment of this new paradigm that allows us to understand discourse makes the study of double-voiced discourses the main point of metalinguistic analysis. This type of discourse "[...] inevitably arises under conditions of dialogic interaction, that is, under conditions making possible an authentic life for the word" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.185). And in its enunciative concreteness, the word has a twofold direction, i.e., it is "[…] directed both toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and toward *another's discourse*, toward *someone else's speech*" (BAKHTIN, 1984 [1929], p.185).[10]

On dealing with this constitutive overlapping of discourses, Bakhtin also says that our daily life discourses are equally full of words of others. In some cases, others are disseminated as our own, then, we even forget to whom those words originally belonged to. Or others are used "[...] to reinforce our own words; still others, finally, we populate with our own aspirations, alien or hostile to them" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.195).

This way, we understand that double-voiced discourse is also present in our daily lives, especially in dialogic exchanges, where "one speaker very often literally repeats the statement of the other speaker, investing it with new value and accenting it in his own way-with expressions of doubt, indignation, irony, mockery, ridicule, and the like" (BAKHTIN, 1984 [1929], p.194).[11] That means that when introduced in our discourses the other's words (someone else's words) gain new refractions, "[...] Someone else's words introduced into our own speech inevitably assume a new (our own) interpretation and become subject to our evaluation of them; that is, they become double-voiced" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.223).

---

[10] While there is no English translation of this 1929 edition, all translations of the 1929 version in this article are either from the Italian translation (1997), which is provided in footnotes, or, when possible, from the 1963 version translated by Emerson in 1984, which includes fragments of the 1929 version in the Appendix. For references see footnote 1. In the Italian translation: "[...] la parola qui ha um duplice orientamento, sia verso l'oggetto del discorso, come la parola comune, sia verso un *'altra parola, il discorso altrui.*"

[11] In the Italian translation: "[...] dove l'interlocutore molto spesso ripete letteralmente l'affermazione dell'altro interlocutore, deponendo in essa una nuova intezione e dandole um suo proprio accento: con espressione di dubbio, di sdegno, di ironia, di irrisione, di scherno, etc."

As for the classification of double-voiced discourses, Bakhtin also presents us with a plan of various types: unidirectional, vari-directional and the active type. He defines the unidirectional type as being the one in which there is a fusion of voices: the author's and the other's, as, for instance, in some types of narration, stylization and in "unobjectified discourse of a character who carries out (in part) the author's intention" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.199). In vari-directional double-voiced discourse, "objectification is reduced and the other's idea activated, [and] these become internally dialogized and tend to disintegrate into two discourses" (BAKHTIN,1984, p.199). In this type of discourse not only the dialog among the voices is more perceptible compared to the first type, but also the other's words can be introduced by various axiological accents, such as scorn, rejection, mockery, sarcasm etc.

In double-voiced discourses of the active type, the focus is turned to the dialog with someone else's voice not exactly to the word, therefore, "the other discourse exerts influence from without; diverse forms of interrelationship with another's discourse as well as various glance at someone else's word; degrees of deforming influence exerted by one discourse on the other" (BAKHTIN,1984, p.199). This is the case of hidden internal polemic and the rejoinders of a hidden dialog. Concerning the analysis of Dostoevsky's novel, Bakhtin points out that, although often difficult to concretely delimit the frontiers among such types of voices when observing the use of languages, their differences in signification are considerable and deserve to be pointed out.

Overt polemic is "[...] quite simply directed at another's discourse, which it refutes, as if at its own referential object" (BAKHTIN,1984, p.224). In other words, the author uses the other's words to oppose to it, to question it and to refute it. In hidden polemic, though, "[...] discourse is directed toward an ordinary referential object, naming it, portraying, expressing, and only indirectly striking a blow at the other's discourse, clashing with it, as it were, within the object itself" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.224). In hidden polemic the other's discourse is not explicitly presented but rather inferred by the author's discourse; it is the case, for example, of the varied types of irony.

Bakhtin (1984, p.197) adds that "analogous to the hidden polemic is a rejoinder from any real and profound dialogue." This is because all the words of the dialog are usually "directed toward its referential object, is at the same time reacting intensely to someone else's word, answering it and anticipating it. [...]. Such a discourse draws in, as

it were, sucks into itself the other's replies, intensely reworking them" (BAKHTIN 1984, p.225).

Despite the potential of these reflections, one must point out, however, Bakhtin's caveat regarding the mentioned classification. The author warns us that, despite the importance of such classification, a concretely enunciated word may present a range of varieties and types of double-voiced discourses because in dialogic communication the word maintains its dynamic and lively character.

The concepts briefly presented here will be important for our approach to the interactions analyzed below, considering that after Bakhtin's studies on the Dostoevsky's works, we have learned that "[...] it never gravitates toward a single consciousness or a single voice" (BACHTIN, 1997, p.211),[12] since its entire life consists "[...] in its transfer from one mouth to another, from one context to another context, from one social collective to another, from one generation to another generation" (BACHTIN, 1997 p.211).[13] That allows us to say that, although the assumptions elaborated by the author thoroughly focused on the analysis of Dostoevsky's novels, dialogic relationships and double-voiced discourse are constitutive phenomena of discourse(s) produced in different spheres and situations of communication. This process of pluri-accentuation, of multiplicity of senses, voices and values discursively established is what we focus on this work.

2 Dialogic Movements of Proofreading: Double-voiced Discourses on the Web of Meaning-making

The discourses present in this work are the result of interactions that took place in 2014 between a doctoral student and a hired proofreader. The exchanges were made by e-mail having as its focus an excerpt of the text of the thesis that was in proofreading process.[14] The thesis author who requested the work had a licentiate degree in Sciences, a master's degree in Education in Sciences and, at the time, was attending a Doctorate Program in the same area of her master's degree. The proofreader had a degree in

---

[12] In Italian: "[La parola] non è mai sufficiente a una sola voce, a una sola coscienza."
[13] In Italian: "La vita della parola è nel passagio di bocca in bocca, da un contesto all'outro, da un colletivo sociale all'outro, da una generazione a un'altra generazione."
[14] The material used in the research was approved by the Research Ethics Committee (CEP) of Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUC/RS).

Languages and a master's degree in Applied Linguistics. In the discourses at hand, the interlocutors talk, among other topics, about the work that was requested, its methods, and discuss the rewriting of one paragraph of the thesis.

This material will allow us to reflect upon the various types of double-voiced discourses established by the utterances exchanged as well as to examine to which social voices the discourses of both interlocutors belong. This will be possible by observing the dialogic relationships that reveal the (in)tense dialogic process in which the activity of proofreading is developed. Before moving on to the presentation of the dialogues and to the analysis of the material, it is important to explain that the selected discourses display signs of a longer dialog, constituted by a total of 27 e-mails and five *Microsoft Word* files, which contain versions of the text during the proofreading process.

For this article, however, we selected utterances in which the participants mention the work in process directly: they talk about the definition of the work, their comprehension of the task and the stages of development of the text. This selection allows us to observe a plurality of voices that the discourses of the interlocutors adopt in their utterances and, in consequence, to treat the types of double-voiced discourses established by their differing understanding of the proofreader's activity.

In the following, we present the first enunciative exchange established between the doctoral student and the proofreader. In it, we see the service being requested via electronic mail. Next, we turn to the proofreader's answer. After that, we analyze an excerpt of the thesis in the course of the work carried out by the hired proofreader. All the presented discursive exchanges are followed by their respective analyses.

2.1 Axiologies and Tension in Discourse: E-mails in Focus

Requesting of the activity

Hello [Proofreader],

My name is [a Name], I am in the final stage of writing my thesis and you were highly recommended to me to proofread my work. Some parts of my research are composed of papers that have already been submitted to a linguistic proofreading by [name of another proofreader]. However, I broke the papers into pieces and mixed everything up (hehe). The thesis will have at most 130 pages, spacing 1.5 and font Arial size 12. It has several charts, figures, and graphs, but I believe that the part that needs proofreading will require only a quick check, because, as I said, a part of that has already been proofread. My deadline to hand over the thesis in the Program is day [x]. In the beginning of the next

week I will already have two finished chapters [name of the chapters] to send you (70 pages for the two chapters together). And in the following week, I'd send you the remaining ones. Are you able to proofread and send it back until the [date]? They can be sent back separately just as I will be sending you. I know that this will be exceedingly difficult, and it is not the best way of doing it, but I am Brazilian!!! I leave everything to the last minute. Can you do the linguistic proofreading? Say yes!!! Looking forward, [Author].[15]

As Bakhtin shows us, "when a member of a speaking collective comes upon a word, it is not as a neutral word of language, not as a word free from the aspirations and evaluations of others, uninhabited by others' voices. No, he receives the word from another's voice and filled with that other voice" (BAKHTIN,1984, p.202). In the analysis of the discourse that constitutes this first e-mail sent by the doctoral student to hire the proofreader, we can have a glimpse of the plurality of voices present in their discourses, such voices are embedded in her words to convince the proofreader to accept the task.

At the beginning of her e-mail to the proofreader, the doctoral student uses the utterance: "you were highly recommended to proofread my work." In other words, by using unidirectional double-voiced discourse, she fuses her voice with the other voices about this proofreader and, in addition to establishing a friendly relationship between them, tries to show that a good professional reputation can be used as an argument for her to accept the request. Although the student is aware of the issue with the deadline for the proofreading, she resumes voices in her enunciation that reinforce the proofreader's expertise. Such voices aim to make the proofreader sympathetic of her situation since being "highly recommended" is not the usual qualification for any regular worker.

We may realize that the sign *recommended* gathers voices that not only reflect the recommendation of the proofreader's work but also refract the legitimation of her work, who, due to the praise, would be more understanding and more supportive to the request made, as expected by the student. We also know that because proofreading is more often

---

[15] In the original: "Olá [Revisora], Me chamo [Nome], estou na fase final da escrita da minha tese e você me foi me foi muito bem recomendada para fazer a revisão do trabalho. Algumas partes da minha pesquisa são constituídas de artigos que já passaram pela revisão linguística realizada por [nome de outra revisora]. No entanto, eu desmembrei e misturei tudo (hehe). A tese terá no máximo 130 páginas, espaçamento 1,5 e letra Arial tamanho 12. Tem várias tabelas, figuras e gráficos, mas acredito que a parte da revisão será necessário só uma olhadinha, porque, como falei, já foi revisado uma parte. Tenho até o dia [x] para entregar a tese no Programa. Já no início da próxima semana terei dois capítulos [nome dos capítulos] para te repassar (70 páginas somando os dois). E na outra semana te entregaria o resto. Tens como fazer a revisão e me entregar até o dia [data]? Pode ser devolvido em partes como eu estarei te enviando. Sei que está muito apertado e não é a melhor maneira de fazer, mas sou brasileira!!! Fica tudo pra última hora. Tens como fazer a revisão linguística? Diz que sim!!! Aguardo, [Autora]."

than not an informal occupation, the "word-of-mouth" recommendation is the best propaganda in this field of work. For this reason, it is essential that clients are satisfied in order to recommend the proofreader to prospective clients as a guarantee of new offers. The doctoral student dialogs with these voices in the construction of her enunciative project.

In other words, the doctoral student is possibly aware of the peculiarities of working as a proofreader, such as relying on recommendations as one of its main forms of advertisement. Then, she uses this awareness in the attempt to persuade the expert to agree with the request done. Therefore, we also observe the repetition of the student's question (with an anticipation of the expected reply inserted) full of exclamation marks that reinforce the request and aim to reach her goal, as the utterances show: "Are you able to proofread and send it back until the [date]??" and "Can you do the linguistic proofreading? Say yes!!!"

We can also observe double-voiced discourses both unidirectional and of the active type in the doctoral student's utterances. The student anticipates possible refusals on the proofreader's part by mentioning beforehand the probable obstacles to the development of the proofreader's work. In this case, bringing back those voices unfolds a double movement: first she agrees with them, assimilates them, and takes them as if they were her own – when she predicts possible negative replies to the requested service – and then she reorganizes these voices in order to persuade the proofreader to accept the proposed offer.

To this end, the doctoral student presents four counterarguments that support the simplicity of the task and which, in consequence, should encourage the proofreader to accept the request. The first one is an approximation to social voices that support a naive understanding of the proofreading activity by believing that "[...] the part that needs proofreading will require only a quick check" so that the work is ended.

The second counterargument seeks to legitimate the previous discourse by mentioning that her work had already been proofread by another expert: "Some parts of my research are composed of papers that have already been submitted to a linguistic proofreading by [name of another proofreader]." For the doctoral student, the fact that parts of her text had already been proofread would help the newly hired proofreader in her own activity and make the completion of the required service easier.

The third counterargument is directed to possible answers likely to be conveyed in the proofreader's voice given the length of the thesis. As a matter of fact, the text is said to be relatively short for a thesis and also composed of many images, which again should simplify her work. This is supported by the voice present in the utterance: "The thesis will have at most 130 pages, spacing 1.5 and font Arial size 12. It has several charts, figures, and graphs […]." The fourth counterargument concerns the issue of flexibility in the dynamics of the work: "In the beginning of the next week I will already have two finished chapters [name of the chapters] to send you (70 pages for the two chapters together). And in the following week, I'd send you the remaining ones." So, despite the short deadline for the completion of the proofreading, in the doctoral student's voice, we hear discourses that aim to neutralize the time issue and to support the simplicity of the proposed task.

It is noteworthy, regarding the issue of time, the following utterances: "I know that this will be exceedingly difficult, and it is not the best way of doing it, but I am Brazilian!!! I leave everything to the last minute." In these utterances, we can observe characteristics of double-voiced discourse in the words of the doctoral student directed both to the proofreader and to herself. That happens when she uses voices from a social collectivity to naturalize the postponement of deadlines as a supposedly common characteristic of every Brazilian. The student is reaching for effects of meaning that not only attenuate the request for the completion of the task in a short time, but also reduce her probable guilt in that regard, since the delay is resignified in her discourse as a constitutive element of her being a Brazilian.

Next, we look at the proofreader's reply to the doctoral student's request, followed by the analysis of an excerpt of the thesis.

Proofreader's reply to the requested work of proofreading
Hello [Name], how are you?

In fact, as you said, the deadline is really short, but I understand the rush and the hassle of this stage of submitting the Thesis! So, I think we can try, hehe. However, first of all, I need to tell you how I conceive proofreading and justify why it never really is "only a quick check," hehe, after all, despite some parts of the text having already been proofread, firstly, I do not know how this proofreading happened and, secondly, you must know that, in the form of a paper, your writing had a certain identity and, now, in the form of a thesis, it will have certainly another one. I need to check the general organization of the text, to see if the parts are cohesive and coherent, if they are properly integrated etc. That,

however, requires time, especially because I do this work, but I do not modify the texts without talking to the authors beforehand and making suggestions for rewriting. For me, proofreading needs to be a job of cooperation built through intense dialog between author and proofreader. Therefore, [Name], I like to make my method clear, for I believe this is the best way to proofread. As for your text, I think that, although I am thorough in my work, I will try to make the least questions possible, so that your reply to the proofread text will be more dynamic. What do you think? My price for page is [a price]. Alright? I am looking forward to your reply. Kisses and keep strong in this final stage [Proofreader].[16]

When studying Dostoevsky's work, Bakhtin claims that the discourse of his characters is filled with voices that hold "[...] the position enabling a person to interpret and evaluate his own self and his surrounding reality" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.47). This is also true for any concrete discursive exchange, and it becomes quite clear when we focus on the analysis of utterances by the doctoral student and the proofreader in the examples above. We see that both participants evaluate the activity of proofreading according to their respective surrounding universes, hence, the doctoral student's discourse is completely focused on persuading the proofreader to accept her request, to which she uses voices that simplify the activity and point out the easiness of the work at hand. On the other hand, despite accepting the invitation and trying to understand the doctoral student's position, especially regarding the due date ([...] "as you said, the deadline is really short, but I understand the rush and imagine the hassle of this stage of submitting the Thesis!), the proofreader organizes her discourse in order to outline her understanding of her job. The proofreader, then, refutes some of the voices present in the interlocutor's discourse, establishing an overt polemics with them. We will discuss that in the sequence.

---

[16] In the original: "Olá [Nome], tudo bem? Na verdade, conforme disseste, o prazo realmente é bastante curto, mas eu compreendo a correria e imagino o sufoco desta etapa de entrega da Tese! Sendo assim, penso que podemos tentar, hehe. No entanto, antes de qualquer coisa, preciso te dizer como compreendo a revisão e justificar o porquê nunca se trata apenas de "só uma olhadinha", hehe, afinal, mesmo parte do texto já sendo revisada, primeiramente, não sei como essa revisão ocorreu e, em segundo lugar, deves saber que, em forma de artigo, a tua escrita tinha uma identidade e, agora, em forma de tese, certamente terá outra. Preciso averiguar a organização geral do texto, ver se as partes estão coesas e coerentes, se estão devidamente amarradas etc. Isso, no entanto, demanda tempo, até porque eu faço esse trabalho, mas não modifico os textos, sem antes conversar com os autores dos trabalhos e dar sugestões de reescrita. Para mim, a revisão tem de ser um trabalho cooperativo, construído através do diálogo intenso entre autor e revisor. Por isso, [Nome], gosto de deixar clara a minha metodologia, pois acredito que esta é a melhor maneira de fazer revisão de textos. Quanto ao teu texto, penso que, embora seja bastante detalhista no trabalho, vou procurar colocar o mínimo de questões possível, a fim de que, quando retornares a leitura, ela possa ser mais dinâmica. O que achas? Meu preço por página é [preço]. Tudo bem? Aguardo teu contato. Beijos e muita força neste finalzinho [Revisora]."

This overt polemics in the proofreader's utterance, established by the refuted orientation of others' discourses, can be observed when she brings to her own discourse the doctoral student's voice and highlights it with quotation marks, "I need to tell you how I conceive proofreading and justify why it never really is "only a quick check," hehe." That discourse put in dialogic relationship with the doctoral student's words reveals a discursive tension established mainly by the different refractions that the ideological sign "quick check" fosters for both subjects. Although the proofreader seeks to mitigate the conflict by using laughing marks after resounding the doctoral student's utterance, the discursive conflict is not avoided, and we can only understand it if we consider the analysis of the dialogic relationships between the utterances.

Indeed, we may state that there is a polemic established by the sign "quick check" since, in the thesis author's voice, there is reference to a previous proofreading of those parts of the thesis. Therefore, she only requires a "quick check" on the part of the newly hired proofreader to certify that linguistic quality of her writing and to enable the submission of the thesis to the evaluation committee. Notwithstanding, in the voice of the proofreader, the sign "quick check" was reflected as a simplistic view of her work with language and refracted a voice that seemed to reduce the importance and the complexity of her professional activity.

Objecting to the voice that seems to belittle her work, the proofreader establishes a polemical relationship with her interlocutor's voice by organizing her discourse to express the meaning of proofreading through her own experiences and by mentioning her own understanding of the task of proofreading demands. This shows that the proofreader's discourse brings together the voices from the whole field of expertise that defines her profession. In other words, those are voices that emphasize the multiplicity of factors and even some peculiarities present in the work of proofreading. This movement eliminates the voices that resounded simplistic ideas about the job, as put by the doctoral student. These considerations can be observed when the proofreader says to the author of the thesis:

> However, first of all, I need to tell you how I conceive proofreading and justify why it never really is "only a quick check," hehe, after all, despite some parts of the text having already been proofread, firstly, I do not know how this proofreading happened and, secondly, you must know that, in the form of a paper, your writing had a certain identity and, now, in the form of a thesis, it will have certainly another one. I need to check the

general organization of the text, to see if the parts are cohesive and coherent, if they are properly integrated etc. (Proofreader).

As a matter of fact, no discourse is neutral and it produces meaning independently of the general discursive project related to the objectives of the interlocutors. In this case, when the proofreader organizes her discourse, we can also understand that she not only answers her interlocutor, but she also dialogues with discourses that circulate socially regarding this more mechanical and even reductionist view of her job. And, despite looking for a more pleasant tone in the construction of the overt polemic set up between both their voices – through the laughing expression (hehe), after resounding the doctoral student's discourse –, the proofreader does not refrain from stating her conception of proofreading from the beginning of the conversation. The very use of "[...]first of all [...]" in the beginning of the e-mail is itself a confirmation of the importance of this position. In other words, it is only after stating which voices align to her own enunciative position that the proofreader asks her interlocutor to position herself in relation to her claims: "What do you think? My price for page is [a price]. Alright? I am looking forward to your reply."

In this case, we may still observe in the doctoral student's and the proofreader's voices their objectives of their enunciations, which, as we have shown, albeit different, are also complementary. On the part of the author, the discursive project aims at persuading the proofreader to accept her request through the argument that, despite the short deadline, the work is not complex nor will it take much time. On the part of the proofreader, we see an effort to emphasize a voice focused on arguing for a particular conception of her work with language. In other words, the proofreader intends to make the doctoral student see proofreading as an activity with a certain degree of complexity that demands some time from the proofreader.

Indeed, the issue of time needs to be approached since it is rather complex and is at the heart of the performed activity. On the one hand, in the academic world we know the importance of meeting deadlines, mainly in sending and defending monographs or thesis. So, time is a main factor and one of the main problems of the doctoral student, as we read in the excerpt. On the other hand, according to what we hear in the proofreader's voice, proofreading is presented as an activity that takes language and texts as processes, not as products. Since the proofreader emphasizes the need for time to dialogue with the

author of the thesis and to construct the writing from their discursive exchanges, time becomes essential.

Nevertheless, as Bakhtin demonstrated in the analysis of the characters in Dostoevsky's works, we are also plural consciousnesses in an eternal and constant relationship of unfinishedness. We can observe this lack of closure or, better, this non-unicity of beings, in the voices of the two protagonists of the dialogue we are now analyzing. We realize that the doctoral student is aware of the shortness of her deadline, even so she wants her text to be proofread before the conclusion and the actual submission of the text; in the same way, although the proofreader opposes to the doctoral student's considerations of what proofreading means, she does not want to refuse the offer. It is just in this tense dialogic environment that the interaction between the two elapses having as a result the acceptance of the doctoral student's offer.

In the following section we have access to the development of the proofreading from an excerpt of the thesis during the proofreading process.

2.2 Analyzing Discursive Excerpts of a Proofread Thesis: My Words and the Other's Words on the Web of Meanings

In order to provide a simple way of visualizing the interaction between proofreader and the doctoral student in the course of proofreading, an excerpt of the thesis, we present the following chart organized according to the following: in the first column, there are two paragraphs of the text as received by the proofreader, i.e., the first version written by the doctoral student. In the second column, we have the proofreader's comments in each one of the paragraphs (the first numbered 1, and the second, 2) together with the suggestions for rewriting and modifications to the text, marked in red. In the third column, there is the doctoral student's reply to the proofreader's comments.

The chart is followed by the analysis of the dialogues developed in this context.

Passage with the original text sent by the doctoral student	Comments by the proofreader in the passage in question	Answer of the doctoral student	Final version
Paragraph 1) When one thinks about research, one associates it to a possible search for answers, solution to problems, production of knowledge. Knowledge is related to research, which means search and discovery, since this is an activity or process that requires work (mental, manual or both) to be reached; this is one of the reasons for knowledge not being confused with information, which is the already ready result of a process (Author, Year). This study understands research according to Authors' perspective (Year) which involves the process to explain the explanation.	[Name], I loved your idea of starting the writing of the methodology with a reflexive text. Very good indeed! But I think it needs a little more contextualization to prevent a feeling of strangeness or a break in the reader's expectations. Therefore, I make the following suggestion for rewriting: When one thinks about research, it is common to associate such a thought to a search for answers, a solution to problems, a production of knowledge. In this sense, knowledge is intimately connected to research, seen in this work as search and discovery, an activity or a process that needs work (mental, manual or both) to be achieved. This is indeed one of the reasons for knowledge not to be confused with information, which refers to the already ready result of a process (Author, Year). This study understands research according to Authors' perspective (Year), and it considers the process by means of which it is produced. These reflections are relevant for us to be able to explain that this study understands research in the perspective of Authors (Names, Year), which involves the process **to explain the explanation.**" What do you think [Name]? I also suggest proofreading this "to explain the explanation," because it is very redundant, isn't it? What about saying this in another way? 2) Another thing: I suggest that you delete the whole sentence with which you begin the next paragraph, since you had already given this information (that research has intimate relationship with knowledge production), using other words, before, don't you agree? Therefore, I suggest that you also begin the next paragraph the following way: "Based on this understanding, we emphasize the importance of calling knowledge into question, according to Author [...]." What do you think?	Dear, your comments were the best, we may keep it as you suggested. The segment about explaining the explanation is not redundant, but rather a part of my theoretical foundation, something philosophical and deep, hehehe. You may leave it such as it is, ok? The following paragraph may also begin as you said. It is getting really good, thank you!	*Paragraph 1)* When one thinks about research, it is common to associate such a thought to a search for answers, a solution to problems, a production of knowledge. In this sense, knowledge is intimately connected to research, seen in this work as search and discovery, an activity or a process that needs work (mental, manual or both) to be achieved. This is indeed, one of the reasons not to confuse knowledge with information, which refers to the already existent result of a process (Author, Year). This study understands research according to Author (Year), and it considers the process by means of which it is produced. These reflections are relevant for us to be able to explain that this study understands research in the perspective of Authors (Names, Year), which involves the process to explain the explanation."

Paragraph 2) Based on this understanding, we emphasize the importance of calling knowledge into question, according to Author […] |
| *Paragraph 2)* "The research is the way of science to produce knowledge. The importance of questioning knowledge is, according to Author […]" | | | |

Table 1: Excerpt of the text in process of proofreading. Source: The author[17]

In the excerpt, the proofreader's suggested changes to the text, marked in red, and accepted by the doctoral student as the final version of the text. These changes not only make the first paragraph significantly longer (from 88 to 122 words) but they contribute

---

[17] The original is in the Appendix after the References.

to the better development of the author's ideas than the first version by the doctoral student. The proofreader's interventions allow us to contemplate the unidirectional double-voiced discourse that organizes the final production of the writing, considering the imbrication of the proofreader's and the doctoral student's words. This is only possible by making the paragraph longer and by the almost complete assimilation of the expert's rewriting suggestions into the doctoral student's text. In other words, there is the integration of the proofreader's voice in the final writing.

Furthermore, the way the proofreader's discourse is organized to start her dialog showing appreciation for the doctoral student's originality in starting her methodology with a reflection:

> [Name], I loved your idea of beginning the writing of the methodology with a reflexive text. Very good indeed! But I think it needs a little more contextualization to prevent a feeling of strangeness or a break in the reader's expectations. Therefore, I make the following suggestion for rewriting: [Proofreader]

This friendly way of approaching the interlocutor, by praising before pointing out gaps in the text that may impair the reader's understanding then suggesting rewriting alternatives, is the proofreader's probable discursive strategy to reach her goal (to develop her work in partnership with the thesis author) and to positively influence the type of relationship established between the protagonists of the dialogue.

So, instead of rewriting the text or concentrating her comments on the aspects that must be corrected by the researcher, the proofreader emphasizes positive aspects of the work, thus creating a discursive effect (mainly by the ideological sign "a little more"). Emphasizing the originality of the doctoral student's choice in the beginning of her writing facilitates the exposition of the gaps in the text. Consequently, the same friendly and gentle tone is used by the author in her answer, which guarantees the continuity of the interaction between them, as the utterance shows: "Dear, your comments were the best, we may keep it as you suggested." (Doctoral student). In addition, the use of the sign "we may" in this utterance also shows the constitutive double-voicedness of the work done. This means that the final version is co-produced, entailing a *we*-responsibility in the development of a shared and dialogued writing.

It is noteworthy that this is a professional activity performed after hiring the service provider, so it implicates remuneration. Therefore, the proofreader could also be

praising the writing as a marketing strategy to maintain her client, in other words, the friendly tone could be part of a commercial strategy so that she would manage not only hold the job but carry it out in an affable way.

In addition, the collaborative production of the text shows that this process of dialogued writing, despite the disagreements (characteristic of the dialogic movement of preparation and circulation of discourses), does not create a conflict in the established relationship, as shown in the utterances: "I also suggest proofreading this "to explain the explanation", because it is very redundant, isn't it? What about saying this in another way?" (Proofreader) and "The segment about explaining the explanation is not redundant, but rather a part of my theoretical foundations, something philosophical and deep, hehehe" (Doctoral student). As we can see, the linguistic marks that indicate laughter at the end of the author's answer to the proofreader's utterance mitigates the impact of the author's refusal to accept the suggestion. Although the author contradicts the proofreader's comment by saying that what seems to be redundant and irrelevant is actually something unique from a specific philosophical-theoretical understanding in her area of research, this is done by using a very subtle and pleasant tone, creating an effect of meaning with shades of humor.

The friendly tone used to discuss the text creates the necessary set of voices to ensure the work is performed without difficulties for either subject, who feel comfortable enough to communicate their views and to discuss the best alternative to the final writing of the thesis. The same friendly tone also helps the proofreader's work move exotopically from the position of a mere text "grammar checker/evaluator" to relate empathetically to someone else's writing. These reflections ratify the discursive importance of intonation which is often responsible for the nature of the relationships between interlocutors and holds great influence on the way the dialogue and, in consequence, the work is carried out.

In the analysis of the excerpt, despite the rejection of some of the proofreader's suggestions by the author of the thesis, the latter's participation in the final writing is not reduced nor belittled. In addition, the way both interlocutors build their discourses – either to request changes to the text, in the case of the proofreader, or to refuse them, in the case of the author – is based on emotive-volitive accents which emphasize the complicity and the respect both have for the proofreading. In that particular excerpt, we verify that the

balance between suggestions and alterations in the final writing of the text seems very well managed by the proofreader and positively valued by the doctoral student. Indeed, she concludes the dialog with a positive analysis of the work, as revealed in the utterance: "It is getting really good, thank you!!" (Doctoral student).

Albeit brief, the interlocutors' considerations in the analyzed excerpt reveal important aspects of a proofreader's work, such as the nature of the emergent relationship in and about the work as well as the role the proofreader plays in the elaboration of the author's final version of text.

Final Considerations

In this paper, we examined the work of proofreading based on the dialog between a doctoral student and a hired proofreader concerning the latter's thesis. The analysis of the established discursive exchanges was conducted from the Bakhtinian perspective with a particular focus on the concepts of dialogic relationships and double-voiced discourses.

Considering the dialogic relationships resulting from the interactions between the doctoral student and the proofreader, we verify that, despite the discursive tension set up in their voices regarding the meaning of proofreading, they reflected an activity developed essentially in cooperation. That gives us reason to claim that proofreading cannot be understood as the mere execution of a technical work, i.e., centered on the proofreader's linguistics and grammatical. Proofreading requires, as we demonstrated, a continuous discursive interaction between proofreader and client, being the nature of the relationship another important element in the task completion.

In addition, the analyzed discourses revealed aspects of the complexity of a proofreader's work that allows us a better understanding of it. In addition to carrying out her activity with the text, the proofreader often needs to prove by means of arguments to the clients that this work involves more than a mere "grammar check" of a few inconsistencies. As we have seen, the proofreader had to deconstruct voices that socially disqualify her work as a linguistic "quick check." The proofreader's discursive movement demonstrates that she takes an active and responsible part in the author's writing process. The (in)tense meaning-making environment in which the work takes place reveals the heterogeneity of elements involved in her profession and allows us to better understand

it, especially by analyzing the process of proofreading itself, i.e., the exchange of e-mails between client and proofreader as well as the excerpts of texts during the proofreading.

In this (mis)matching of voices, we also verified conflicting social values in the discourse of the enunciators, albeit implicitly, revealing the dialogic way the academic text submitted to the proofreading process is constituted. In this study, by dealing with the double-voiced process of the other's words in the final version of the proofread thesis, we are able to claim that the proofread text reflects the writing shared by author and proofreader.

Thus, we point out the validity of understanding text and writing as processes that are not closed in themselves since they are amidst multiple possibilities of dialog, (re)reading and (re)writing, processes to which the proofreader significantly contributes. Indeed, the proofreader stands in-between two opposite poles, which are the protagonist role they play in the (re)organization of the final writing – as it is to be submitted/presented – and their constitutive silencing since academic genres make no room to either recognize/affirm their work.

REFERENCES

BACHTIN, M. M. *Problemi dell'opera di Dostoevski*j. Introduzione, Traduzione e comento di Margherita De Michiel. Prezentazione di Augusto Ponzio. Bari: Edizioni dal Sud, 1997. [1929]

BAKHTIN, M. M. *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. Tradução direta do russo, notas e posfácio de Paulo Bezerra. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2015. [1963]

BAKHTIN, M. M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

BARBOSA, V. F. *Uma análise dialógica da atividade de revisão linguística em EaD*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Universidade Católica de Pelotas, Pelotas, 2012.

BARBOSA, V. F. *Uma voz apagada?* Análise da atividade de revisão de textos acadêmicos sob as perspectivas bakhtiniana e ergológica. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2017.

BARBOSA, V. F. "É só uma olhadinha?": o fazer do revisor de textos acadêmicos em perspectiva dialógica e ergológica. *In*: RIBEIRO, K. R; SCHWAB, S; MARTINS, A. A. (Orgs.). *Estudos bakhtinianos em diálogo*: diferentes perspectivas. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2018. p.115-134.

BARBOSA, V. F.; DI FANTI, M. G. C. A (in)visibilidade da atividade de revisão de textos acadêmicos: um outro na teia dos sentidos. *Letrônica*, v. 11, p.s35-s53, 2018.

BEZERRA, P. Prefácio: Uma obra à prova de seu tempo. *In*: BAKHTIN, M. M. *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. Tradução, notas e prefácio de Paulo Bezerra. 5. ed. revista. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2015. p.V-XXII. [1963]

BRAIT, B. Problemas da Poética de Dostoiévski e estudos da linguagem. *In*: BRAIT, B. (Org.). *Bakhtin, dialogismo e polifonia*. São Paulo: Contexto 1.ed. 3. reimpressão, 2015. p.45-72.

FARACO, C. A. *Linguagem & diálogo*: as ideias linguísticas do Círculo de Bakhtin. São Paulo: Parábola, 2009.

SOBRAL, A.; BARBOSA, V. F.; Sobre tipos de revisão textual e suas redes enunciativas: uma proposta bakhtiniana. *In*: RODRIGUES, D. L. D. I. (Org.). *No ritmo do texto*: questões contemporâneas de preparação, edição e revisão textual. Divinópolis: Artigo A, 2019, v. 1, p.15-40.

Appendix. Original Table 1

Trecho com o texto original enviado pela doutoranda	Comentários da revisora no trecho em questão	Retorno da doutoranda	Escrita da versão final
Parágrafo 1) Quando se pensa em pesquisa associa-se uma possível busca de respostas, solução de problemas, produção de conhecimento. O conhecimento está relacionado à pesquisa, que significa busca e descoberta, uma vez que esta é uma atividade ou processo que necessita de trabalho (mental, manual ou ambos) para ser atingido; essa é uma das razões para o conhecimento não ser confundido com informação, que é o resultado já pronto de um processo (Autor, Ano). Esse estudo entende pesquisa na perspectiva de Autores (Ano) que passa pelo processo explicar a explicação.	*1)* [Nome], adorei a tua ideia de começar a escrita da metodologia por um texto reflexivo. Muito bacana mesmo! Apenas penso que faltou contextualizar um pouquinho mais essa ideia, para não causar um estranhamento ou uma quebra de expectativa em teu leitor. Por isso, sugiro-te a seguinte opção de reescrita: "Quando se pensa em pesquisa, é comum que se associe tal pensamento à busca de respostas, à solução de problemas e à produção do conhecimento. Nesse sentido, o saber está intimamente relacionado à pesquisa, vista neste trabalho enquanto busca e descoberta, uma atividade ou um processo que necessita de trabalho (mental, manual ou ambos) para ser atingido. Esse é um dos pontos inclusive para o conhecimento não ser confundido com a informação, pois ela se refere ao resultado já pronto de um processo (Autor, Ano) e ele considera o caminho percorrido para desenvolvê-la. Essas reflexões são relevantes para que se possa explicar que este estudo entende a pesquisa na perspectiva dos Autores (Nomes, Ano), o que passa pelo processo *explicar a explicação*". O que achaste, [Nome]? Sugiro-te também rever este "explicar a explicação", pois é tão redundante, não? Que tal se disséssemos de outra maneira?	Querida, ficou ótima a tua proposta, podemos deixar igual sugirisse. A parte do explicar a explicação não é redundante, é parte do meu referencial teórico, algo filosófico e profundo, hehehe. Pode deixar como tá, ok? O próximo parágrafo pode começar igual falasse também. Tá ficando muitooooo bom, obrigada!	*Parágrafo 1)* Quando se pensa em pesquisa, é comum que se associe tal pensamento à busca de respostas, à solução de problemas e à produção do conhecimento. Nesse sentido, o saber está intimamente relacionado à pesquisa, vista neste trabalho enquanto busca e descoberta, uma atividade ou um processo que necessita de trabalho (mental, manual ou ambos) para ser atingido. Esse é um dos pontos inclusive para o conhecimento não ser confundido com a informação, pois ela se refere ao resultado já pronto de um processo (Autor, Ano) e ele considera o caminho percorrido para desenvolvê-la. Essas reflexões são relevantes para que se possa explicar que este estudo entende a pesquisa na perspectiva dos Autores (Nomes, Ano), o que passa pelo processo de explicar a explicação.
Parágrafo 2) "A pesquisa é a maneira que a ciência tem para	*2)* Outra coisa: sugiro-te a supressão de toda a frase com a qual inicias o		*Parágrafo 2)* Partindo dessa compreensão,

produzir conhecimento. A importância de problematizar o conhecimento é, segundo Autor [...]"	próximo parágrafo, pois já colocaste esta informação (de que a pesquisa tem íntima relação com a produção de conhecimento) com outras palavras antes, não achas? Por isso, sugiro-te inclusive que inicies este próximo parágrafo da seguinte forma: "Partindo dessa compreensão, destaca-se a importância de problematizar o conhecimento, segundo o Autor [...]". O que achas?		destaca-se a importância de problematizar o conhecimento, segundo o Autor [...]".

Ackowledgment

Translated by Adail Sobral - adail.sobral@gmail.com;

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5532-5564