


School text feedback as practice and as research object:  
interview with Eliana Donaio Ruiz /  
A correção de textos escolares como prática e como objeto de  
pesquisa: entrevista com Eliana Donaio Ruiz

*Milene Bazarim\**

Doctoral student in Science of Language at the Catholic University of Pernambuco (UNICAP), master's degree in Applied Linguistics from the State University of Campinas (UNICAMP) and Assistant Professor at the Federal University of Campina Grande (UFCG).

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1889-4386>

*Roberta Varginha Ramos Caiado\*\**

Doctor in Education and Professor of the Graduate Program in Science of Language at the Catholic University of Pernambuco (UNICAP).

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4444-774X>

**Received** in: 30 apr. 2021. **Approved** in: 15 may. 2021.

**How to cite this article:**

BAZARIM, Milene; CAIADO, Roberta Varginha Ramos. School text feedback as practice and as research object: interview with Eliana Donaio Ruiz. *Revista Letras Raras*. Campina Grande, v. 10, n. 2, p. 152-166, may. 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10120941>

Eliana Donaio Ruiz is the author of the book "How to correct essays in school: An Interactive-Textual Proposal"<sup>1</sup>, whose first edition was published in 2001. It is a pioneering book in Brazil regarding school texts feedback, being an almost mandatory reference both for researchers that approach feedback as an object of study and for teachers interested in understanding and perfecting their feedback practice.

---

\*

 [milene.bazarim@gmail.com](mailto:milene.bazarim@gmail.com)

\*\*

 [roberta.caiado@unicap.br](mailto:roberta.caiado@unicap.br)

<sup>1</sup> Own translation for: "Como corrigir redações na escola: Uma Proposta Textual-Interativa."

The author holds a Post-doctorate in Applied Linguistics, and a Doctorate and a Master's in Linguistics from the State University of Campinas - UNICAMP (SP). Ruiz has been a Portuguese Language teacher in Basic Education and, for almost two decades, has also provided advice and consultancy in writing texts and teaching languages.

Currently, Eliana Ruiz is an adjunct professor in the Department of Vernacular and Classical Languages at the State University of Londrina - SUL (PR). She works in the Portuguese and Literature Program and in the Graduate Program in Language Studies (PPGEL). Eliana Ruiz dedicates to the study of the teaching and learning process and the training of Portuguese language teachers. More recently, her research has focused on the area of Applied Linguistics and her current interests are linked to the teaching of Portuguese as a mother tongue, the teaching and learning of writing, and the relationship between digital technologies and language education.

The interview was conducted in March 2021 via email.

**Researchers:** Your thesis “How to correct essays in school” was defended in 1998, became a book in 2001, which was reissued in 2010, and became almost a mandatory reference when the topic is feedback. In the last two decades, in Brazil, it has been a lot of research on text production in school and rewriting. Can we say that, during that same period, there were few works focused specifically on the feedback practice of teachers and on the effects of feedback on the student's rewriting? Why?

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** In fact, if we look at Brazilian research in Applied Linguistics (LA) in the past two decades, we will see the emergence of other themes. But I am not surprised to see how the practice of written intervention in the school text and its implications for writing learning is still a topic that needs to be explored in academia.

It is worth remembering that, due to the pragmatic turn in linguistic studies, the research that came to the fore was centered on breaking traditional paradigms of language teaching. The criticism of the sovereignty of traditional grammar and the disembodied teaching of the socio-historical conditions of production of utterances produced an endless number of works that stole the academic scene. Perhaps because it demanded researchers' time to defend the place of text

and discourse genre in reading, textual production, and linguistic analysis activities, the main axes of the teacher's work.

That reflected in the official teaching documents that recommend guidelines for classroom practice and, consequently, impacted the practice of the teacher, who, lacking a consensus on answers about what and how to teach, experienced a collective and individual insecurity. That is why it became more difficult for the researcher in AL to access data for a research about the teaching work of text feedback. Generally, the teacher does not expose themselves, because they are afraid that their work at school will be judged by a university researcher for minors. I myself had a lot of difficulty at the time of the thesis when I asked for writing notebooks and only received grammar exercises; this, incidentally, was the reason why I included texts from my students in the corpus. So, this ethical issue, although manageable, interferes by intimidating the motivation for choosing the textual feedback theme for academic research.

In addition, it is necessary to consider that rewriting, as part of the teaching and learning process, is also not a consensus among language teachers, since many see it as more than an extra workload. Anyone who deals with text production at school knows how arduous the interventive task of text feedback is, especially when multiplied by the number of text versions produced. From my personal experience, and from what I have heard from my student teachers in Basic Education, as a survival strategy for many, either the students' own productions are minimized, writing less than they should, and/or rewriting is not incorporated in the process. Without the guarantee of a reality in which there is an abundant textual production and a representative continuum of mediated writing and rewriting, the investigation of the AL researcher interested in teaching intervention is difficult to be carried out satisfactorily, even though there is goodwill and adhesion by the school actors to scientific research at the university.

**Researchers:** Feedback practice is part of the daily of Basic Education teachers, especially when the production of texts has already been incorporated into the process of teaching and learning the Portuguese language. How was the process to transform school text feedback into an object of research?

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** When I worked in Basic Education, I had many doubts about the best method to use in my classes. There were various axes of language teaching, and I was interested in all of them, and the answers were still being constructed by the academy and teaching practice. We did not have expressive official guidance documents as we have today, they were just a few subsidies, which came to us with little incisiveness. And the communication channels, obviously, did not bring us as close together as technology can do today. Many of these questions will still continue to populate our *métier*, certainly, because the reality is constantly changing, always creating new challenges, demanding searches.

The teaching of writing, in particular, was, however, the universe in which I realized more clearly how my mediation as a teacher made the difference in the learning process of my students. But that was just a hunch, a personal observation, that prompted me to find more relevant answers in the academy that would guide my teaching practice. How I imagined that my doubt about how to correct writing (which was even the title of my thesis work, which became a book later) was probably not mine alone. Since this was a problem for the Portuguese teacher, I ended up touching a sensitive point in the teaching methodology. During my doctorate studies, I decided to combine business with pleasure, and I transformed, again, my personal questions into research questions, as every researcher who is a teacher, in my opinion, should ask. I had already done concerning the textbook, object of study of my master's research, and then just repeated the dose. And I created my hypothesis, which was confirmed later, with the development of the thesis that has this authorship in the concept of interactive-textual feedback.

**Researchers:** Considering that you worked as a teacher in Basic Education, we imagine that you have already corrected texts by students in this segment. From the book, we have access to your reflections about the feedback. We would like you to talk a little about how Professor Eliana Ruiz corrected the texts of her students in Basic Education.

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** I corrected it as I do today, with great effort and art, modesty aside, because this co-authored mediation work has always been pleasurable. It turns out that the commitment is the same, because of the same idealistic person. Despite the time gap and context idiosyncrasies (today I work in university), the art is slightly different. I can say that now it comes,

without a doubt, mediated by the technique, or better, by a more refined technique, developed over all these years of profession and observation and study. That, however, does not mean that I am an expert and that I know everything about the subject. On the contrary, I always get more curious and careful how I intervene, especially interactive-textually: today, my comments and notes are more reflected and controlled, because I request a lot from myself. But I always think that there are things to be investigated, I ask myself new questions which demand new answers.

At the time of my classes in Basic Education, although full of doubts, I intuitively developed strategies to speak with my students through writing about their texts, as I explain in the book. Then, I came to know, both from the data of my colleagues who were subjects of my doctoral research and from the literature review I did for the thesis, that they were types or methods of feedback used by Brazilian and foreign professors. But I imagine that it is something universal, due to the configuration of this discursive genre, the textual feedback written by the teacher.

**Researchers:** In a school context, text feedback has been understood as a “mistake-hunting” activity from which the student is punished by decreasing the grade. In your opinion, how should the school text feedback be understood?

**Eliana Donato Ruiz:** In my doctoral research, the first finding of the analysis was that the work of feedback seemed to be a task of “mistake-hunting”. In general, the teacher feels that they have to point out what is bad, wrong or problematic in the text, not what is good. Whether in the case of a single version or a rewriting, the most common idea is to focus on what cannot remain the way it is, you rarely recognize what is praiseworthy. And this validation, for those who learn, is essential.

It seems to me that this culture is old and is forged in a belief that still lingers between teachers: that the student's written production is not to be read, as it is done with other texts, because, assumedly, it is not yet a text, but a mere “school essay”, since the student is only an apprentice. It is, rather, an instrument that serves for the teacher to diagnose language problems, not a place for interlocution. Hence, the teacher places themselves before the student's text as an examiner and sees the intervention task not as a part of an ongoing process, which they can

mediate, but as a certificate of (in)competence in written language. The feedback points to what can justify the note, not what pleases or delights.

The evaluation, in this case, plays a selective and classificatory function, as it is understood according to an outdated conception of education, as a quantitative measure of what the student demonstrates to master in terms of written production, including the content taught by the teacher. Well, that seems to me to be in direct relation to what Luckesi calls “exam pedagogy”, which, although not restricted to the field of teaching writing, has also contaminated us for decades. We, writing teachers, in general, are not sufficiently crossed by a pedagogy of teaching and learning of writing, founded on the real reader-teacher-student dialogue that aims at social action through language, in and outside school. Unfortunately, what still shapes our teaching behavior is the student’s success in school evaluations and beyond school walls. So, it is about time that we reflect on a new educational paradigm.

**Researchers:** Since the feedback is often confused with the cleaning of the text, it seems to us that, in an academic context, to move away from this meaning, some researchers have avoided the use of the word correction, preferring terms such as review or evaluation. In your conception, correction, revision, and evaluation are terms that can be considered equivalent?

**Eliana Donoio Ruiz:** Absolutely not. “Correction”, “revision” and “evaluation”, although they are terms that have a close correlation between them, are not the same thing.

Without forgetting all the work that the teacher does in the classroom. Including orally and collectively, to mediate the learning of textual production. I have used the term “feedback” to refer to the intervention work, in writing and generally at a distance, that the teacher - more specifically the language teacher - overlays the student's text, in the role of someone more experienced in the practice of reading and writing, aiming to establish a dialogue with the student about the text, allowing them to revise, in general, in the form of rewriting. I like the idea of the Vygotskian scaffolding – it is through this intervention text that students can support themselves to review their writing and propose a new configuration.

As a mediator, the teacher has the freedom and, more than that, the duty to express their impressions about aspects such as the management of the issue in question. The macrostructure of the text according to the objectives and the use of language. We are, of course, within the scope of the Bakhtinian discourse genre concept, since the student's text is always an example in this sense and the teacher, the other to whom the student's word is addressed in the hope of a counter word, the feedback.

The problem is when this counterword is restricted to focusing merely on the problems of the text, taking on an examining tone, which I believe is very common to occur. Then the feedback starts to be conceptually confused with "evaluation". Text feedback may have to do with evaluation, undoubtedly, but if, and only if, what is aimed is the attribution of a grade or concept, since, in an evaluation, the teacher may (or may not) use written intervention strategies to make the grade more intelligible to the one being evaluated, about the reasons for the possible low grade, for instance, to justify a grade, I can mark something in the text and/or comment on it. But I can also evaluate a text with a grade without providing feedback. By the way, is that done in the university exams? So, feedback is not necessarily evaluation, although the evaluation of a text can use feedback, as a strategy, to be based. Perhaps, since the feedback practice has been used many times for evaluative purposes, aiming to point out only the "errors" of production, these operations ended up being confused in common sense.

The term "revision" seems appropriate to refer to the work of the author of returning to their text, in this case, the student, aiming at a rewriting. Geraldi, in the 1980s, already spoke of "textual restructuring" to, in a way, refer to this work, when he foresaw a collective exercise. In which the teacher returns to a text produced in the classroom and rewrites it with the class. But the revision has also been understood as feedback, at school, when, about the rewriting, the student says, for example, "I have already corrected my text", most likely as a reflection of the rancidity of the school culture immanent from emphasizing only the grammatical aspects, either in the evaluation or in the mediating intervention. There is no doubt that this attitude ends up greatly influencing the image that the student builds, that to revise is to correct, and to rewrite is to grammatically clean the text.

The expression "revision" has been used in other contexts, too, apart from the pedagogical, such as the editorial and the professional, about the work of the person who "corrects" the text,

offering alternatives, in relation to writing conventions, grammar norms, or ABNT<sup>2</sup>, considering publication, for example.

**Researchers:** In recent years, probably due to the popularization of the Portuguese Language Olympics Writing the Future <sup>3</sup>and the essay of the National High School Exam (ENEM); The Basic Education teachers have gained more access to grids, worksheets, or feedback tables. What do you have to say about using these rubrics to give feedback to school texts? What feedback criteria are necessarily included in these instruments?

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** In fact, the Portuguese Language Olympics Writing the Future and the ENEM essay popularized the so-called grids, spreadsheets, or feedback tables for school texts, in a clear retroactive effect, quite positive, in my view. In the case of ENEM, because it is an exam, more properly and, in the case of the Olympics, a competition.

In both situations, what is sought is the result presented by the writing subject, the text as a product, as a certificate of a learning stage, that is why the texts are judged and receive a grade. Therefore, what is popularly called, in these cases, the “feedback grid” is, in fact, an evaluation grid, an instrument for judgment of value, since these rubrics carry scores, reinforcing the idea contained in the very expression “to correct it is to evaluate”. Evidently, the degree of subjectivity inherent in any textual evaluation process must be minimized, as far as possible, with the fair establishment of criteria intelligible by any teacher in the field, which provide a measure of objectivity.

But what seems positive to emphasize, in this process of creating grids, is the fact that precisely because of the establishment of these criteria and descriptors, on the part of both the Olympics and ENEM. The teachers are led to realize the need for precision during the interventive or evaluative reading, and depending on the discursive genre in question, there are specific aspects to be considered. And students are encouraged to create a mentality that the text needs to be following certain standards that are independent of the subjective will of the teacher - in fact, just

---

<sup>2</sup> Brazilian Association for Technical Standards.

<sup>3</sup> *Escrevendo o Futuro*.



like everything in the life of the citizen subject who needs to act socially within certain parameters that are beyond their control. And most importantly: rubrics are not only used to evaluate, but can, and should, be used to guide the mediation work by the teacher in a transparent way, and the review by the student when the rewriting it is incorporated into the teaching and learning process.

About exactly what to contemplate in a text feedback grid, I think that the Bakhtinian tripartite idea that exists in the concept the discursive genre can offer us a safe parameter concerning to the fundamental aspects to be considered: theme, compositional structure, and style. How these general elements will be specifically enunciated in the rubrics, in terms of criteria and descriptors, is a complex issue, which requires theoretical and methodological knowledge and editorial ability. It seems that it depends on the teachers' ability who creates the grade to have clear, for themselves and for other. What adjustments should be aimed in that specific context of production, guarantee not only the effectiveness of the instrument but also its intelligibility on the part of the student producer about what is being demanded. This is both before and after the text is produced.

**Researchers:** The training of Portuguese language teachers should include a diversity of knowledge, not only, but mainly, about the language and its teaching and learning process. Thus, what would be the role of the undergraduation in Language and Literature in the formation of the teacher to act appropriately in giving text feedback to students?

**Eliana Donoio Ruiz:** Exactly because it contemplates a diversity of knowledge, mainly about the language and its teaching and learning process, the role of the undergraduation in Language and Literature, in my view, is to serve as an example. We know from experience that it is not just discourse that teaches; much more than with words, it is with the experience guided by the attitudes of those who preceded us in the journey we learned. Teachers, those who teach, should have a clearer and more refined awareness of this. There is no point in my speech being one and my behavior being another, I preach a theoretical conception X and exercise a practice Y through my classes, activities, and exercises and through the way I intervene and evaluate the learning process. In the end, what my student is going to retain and repeat, unfortunately, and confusingly, is Y.

Therefore, I see no sense in a university professor who teaches text production to think that they can stay in theory and put practice aside. As I see no sense in not incorporating literacy issues in their work methodology, making the undergraduate student, the future language teacher, write in a non-situated way. I also do not see productivity in not taking the practice of rewriting as fundamental in the teaching and learning process of the written modality of the language. And I think it is a disservice to privilege, in-text feedback for students of Language and Literature, formal normative or linguistic aspects, in detriment of the textual-discursive ones, the most significant for a producer who is in the subject-position of a teacher in training. Talking to our students about their writing, in any way, is essential. I would say that it is our ethical duty, especially as trainers in an undergraduation in Language and Literature.

Many of my students have already told me things like: “teacher, you are the only one who gives feedback to our work like that, everyone writes the grade and that’s it”, which makes me, sadly, realize that everything is as it always was. It is idealism, without a doubt, to think that there can be an absolute cohesion, between the Language courses in the country or within a specific Language course, with regard to theoretical and methodological conceptions, including those related to the ways teachers deal with school texts. Diversity is important and must be respected. However, I get surprised, at times, when I realize that, despite all the theoretical and methodological advances in Applied Linguistics in recent years, some still act as if they were incarnated in the times of the Linguistics of the last century. If so, how can we ensure that, very shortly, our students will act appropriately and productively in giving feedback to their own students' texts?

**Researchers:** If training teachers in Brazil is a challenge, acting as a teacher of Portuguese the Language in Brazilian schools currently has been an even greater challenge. Could the real working conditions of the Basic Education teacher in Brazil be considered an ally or an enemy of the practice of feedback?

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** In the public Brazilian Basic Education, in general, the working conditions of the teacher seem to me to be enemies of the feedback practice, unfortunately. I have students who are teachers and who tell me that there is seldom enough time to teach writing classes, let alone giving text feedback, and that they have a lot of content to teach besides text

production, since there are several fronts or axes of action, and that there are other bureaucratic tasks being demanded - this even before the pandemic, which added the challenge of remote education.

It is optional to participate in the Portuguese Language Olympics, for example, so it does not mobilize all teachers, heterogeneously impacting the indirect work of continuing training in the field of text production in Brazilian schools. And, in the case of the state of the federation whose reality I follow more closely, there is a specificity that practically precludes the work of text production at school currently: the Paraná Test<sup>4</sup>. It is a diagnostic evaluation of the learning of Basic Education students from the public network that proposes to collect subsidies for pedagogical supporting actions. The project is so incisive that it includes a website about the test, with guidelines, web-conferences and supporting materials to be used in class, as well as decentralized planning meetings in schools. The problem is that the instrument used in the evaluation does not include the production of texts, only objective reading questions. And its retroactive effect on teaching has led teachers to return their practice, primarily, to textual interpretation, leaving the teaching of writing, and therefore text feedback, completely aside.

The Achilles' heel of text production, when dealt with a procedural way in class, is the manpower that it requires from the teacher who, let's face it, has an overload of work precisely with feedback, a practice that demands time of dedication, for it is a production of language necessarily connected, linked to another, and for there are many texts to be corrected. This task should be institutionally recognized as extra work and the teacher should be paid for it, as is already the case in some private schools. In the meantime, it all becomes a matter of personal choice and time management.

As a result, the language teacher ends up having to make a conscious option - and, I think, socially (un)committed - in relation to their teaching practice, which involves asking: is there space for me to promote text production in my classes? Or for me to intervene, through written feedback, in my students' learning process? What is it possible to do? Is it worth giving feedback by sampling? Or through general comments? Where do I want and where can I go in the teaching and learning conditions that my students and I have? What is my role in this story? For what, after all, students

---

<sup>4</sup> *Prova Paraná*

write at school? This for what, as Geraldi used to say, must always enlighten what to teach and how to teach. Those are our political choices.

**Researchers:** We know that the incorporation of a new technology can trigger changes in the ways of thinking and acting. So, to what extent can the use of digital information and communication technologies (DICT) tools optimize the practice of school text feedback?

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** DICTs were already incorporated into our everyday language practices, even before the pandemic. Emergency remote education has only significantly increased this reality and the demand for the insertion of technology in the teaching and learning process, in general, and in writing, in particular.

But, in this context, not everything favors the work of text feedback, because just as there are those who have done well with the available resources, many teachers are experiencing great difficulty in the use of technology. Most, including students, do not have a good level of digital literacy to benefit from technological tools. And as the problems are innumerable, the focus becomes a personal dealing with DICT or tutoring with students, which leads many to overlook the concern with other aspects, including how to work, correct or evaluate text production. There are people, for example, who, due to lack of knowledge or choice, print the students' texts, give the feedback by hand, take a photo and send the material in return, as they find it more practical. There are people who simply transfer to the virtual what they did in person.

As the conditions of teaching work in Brazilian Basic Education are heterogeneous in terms of the state and municipal public network, if, on the one hand, not everything is blooming with the explosion of remote education, on the other, many of us, teachers, searched new ways of acting, starting to validate technological tools that we already knew or to experience others. And we faced an immense universe of possibilities, which only tends to expand in the near future, since the whole world demands innovations of this nature.

We found out, for example, that the “comment” tool in texts from Word or Google Docs can be of great value for feedback, as it allows us to talk to our students about specific words, expressions, or excerpts of the text. In other words, it is the interactive-textual feedback having

space to happen in a less generalized way, in all textual extensions, not only in the “post-text”, as it is the tendency in the manuscript sheet. And this enhances the anchoring for the student's review work. Furthermore, it allows, more specifically in the case of Google documents, that the orientation for writing is done during the entire production process and not focused only on the final text product.

Another tool that I find interesting using in-text feedback is the “rubric” available on educational platforms such as Google Classroom and Moodle. Although it was designed for evaluation to make the process more objective and transparent That allows the teacher to create personalized and categorized grids with multicriteria, which allow them to give standardized feedbacks on text productions, without assigning a grade and without necessarily marking the text or making specific comments. Using the “private comment” tool available in the rubrics, the feedback can be individualized, with a more general interactive-textual intervention, which provides a more autonomous review by the student.

Without failing to recognize the cyborgic aspect that represents having at hand a set of criteria and fixed descriptors that works equally to a whole lot of productions, so that the teacher does not have to repeat themselves with each intervention, to account for the various aspects to be considered, there is no doubt that, once ready, the tool streamlines the feedback task. It remains to be seen to what extent it anchors the review.

As with rubrics, comments digitized in “.doc” or “.docx” files also follow a standardization of their enunciative form when they allude mainly to specific and localized linguistic aspects, such as those related to the conventions of writing or the rules of the standard norm. And that would already relieve, in a way, the teaching workload in feedback since a copy and paste would be enough (Ctrl+c/Ctrl+v). But, as it does not stop there, the challenge is to find out how to make a cast about aspects related to the theme, genre, and textuality, which are not suitable for a rigid categorization. I have a hunch that an investigation in this area would point to the limits of technology concerning human feedback work. A question that intrigues me, for example, because of the technological explosion and the dedication required of the teacher for the written teaching intervention, is how to produce what could be called “wildcard comments” and how to make the digital operation of selecting those comments functional at the time of feedback - in addition, of course, on how to ensure effectiveness in these procedures, to anchoring for the review. I think that joining this type of linguistic knowledge - which involves stylistic, textual, and discursive

aspects, related both to the text under analysis and to the immediate context of interaction with this or that student - with the technical knowledge in informatics could, maybe, aware the teacher for the potential aspects to be considered in feedback, as well as making the teacher's feedback work more agile and, possibly, more effective and productive.

Even though the ideal is always the old and human dialogue between teacher and student, the practicality offered by technology is undeniable, which proves to be an excellent ally in the task of feedback, since it is guaranteed a good teacher training, unrestricted access to the internet, equipment and tools, as well as the digital literacy of the subjects involved in education. But it takes politics and time to mature.

**Reseachers:** Your post-doctorate studies focus on Discourse Analysis and, in recent years, you have been dedicated to studying the relationships between digital technologies and language education. Therefore, feedback is no longer the focus of your research. Do you believe that school text feedback is still a fruitful field for conducting research? Why?

**Eliana Donaio Ruiz:** Without a doubt, the teacher's mediation work in writing learning, especially in relation to school text feedback done remotely, asynchronously (not simultaneous/offline), and in writing, is a field to be widely explored by researchers is AL.

As I said, if we map research on the production of texts at school, we will see that a lot of things have to do with their relationship with reading, with discourse genres, with teaching and learning, or with official teaching documents. But, still, there is little research on the teaching intervention in the teaching and learning process of writing, even for the reasons already mentioned. And if in spite of what is already being produced academically on the subject, we take into account both the different contexts in which school writing happens and the technological issues that begin to involve us with more intensity, from remote teaching in these pandemic times, it is easy to see how much research is still needed.

In the distance modality, in remote or hybrid teaching, the text feedback which is understood as co-authorship seems to me to be one of the most promising ways to promote student

literacy and improve their writing, whatever is the tool used – including our graduate students who receive their work in Word

or PDF all full of notes and comments after their qualification or defense boards via Google Meet.

And collaborative writing, which starts to become relevant in teaching with wiki platforms, for example, is a highly fruitful field for scientific research in Linguistics that wants to be critical, on the sense attributed by Rajagopalan, including the teaching interventions related to the configuration of this type of authorship, whether in basic or higher education – a field which in fact has been particularly interesting to me. So that investing in this theme of the feedback is not only a possibility, but a need for research, as it will certainly shed new light on current teaching practice and on what is springing up in these new working conditions, as it tends to rethought in the future.

Anyway, to conclude, I would like to thank both Milene and Roberta immensely, for the deference, for the kind invitation, for the opportunity that was given, putting on such a relevant topic (I am a bit partial) as the school text feedback. Whatever time you write, it is always a verb that is conjugated in the present, as Menegassi said in the preface to a book that I organized on teaching (non) school writing and that will soon be published by Pontes.

And just as one rooster cannot weave a morning and it will need other roosters, which cross with it the sun thread of its cries so that the morning forms a tenuous fabric, we will always need others to weave our texts, either for affirming us, surprise us, or deny us, simply by holding hands, with their eyes and minds, in their blessed readings.

## References

RUIZ, Eliana Donaio. *Como corrigir redações na escola: uma proposta textual-interativa*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2010.