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ABSTRACT. We first dedicated ourselves to an extensive research, on the work of Jacques Lacan, of elements that could help us to throw light on the complex task of advising a career of researcher training. We then are willing, in this text, to formalize eight guidelines to psychoanalysis that could guide the supervision of post-graduation students. They are: 1) There are differences between the organism and the erogenous body; 2) There is a gap between the human being and his sexuality; 3) The instance that bonds language and the body is the Real; 4) Teaching and transmitting are two different things; 5) It is possible to transmit someone the love for knowledge by the management of the Real; 6) Advising makes more effect from what the advisor does than from what he says; 7) The evaluation of what is said must be done from the consequences of saying; e 8) Writing can be an resource to help someone in the creation of his own self. Taking them as a support to analyse the manuscripts of the corpus, we realised that they are an important tool to show what happens in the process of the academic text writing, leading to the comprehension of the ways followed by each researcher regarding the instructions given by the theses advisor.
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DIRETRIZES PSICANÁLITICAS PARA A ORIENTAÇÃO DE PÓS-GRADUANDOS

RESUMO. Após termos nos dedicado a uma extensiva pesquisa, na obra de Jacques Lacan, de elementos que nos permitissem lançar luz a respeito da complexa tarefa de orientar um percurso de formação de pesquisador, neste texto nos propomos a formalizar oito princípios da psicanálise que poderiam nortear a ação de quem se dedica à formação do pesquisador. Eles são: 1) existem diferenças entre corpo biológico e o corpo erógeno; 2) existe uma lacuna entre o ser humano e sua sexualidade; 3) a instância que une corpo e linguagem é o Real; 4) ensino e transmissão são duas coisas diferentes; 5) é possível transmitir o amor a um saber pelo agenciamento do Real; 6) a orientação funciona mais pelo que se faz do que pelo que se fala; 7) o julgamento do dito é feito pelas consequências dadas a ele; e 8) a escrita pode ser uma instância para levar o sujeito a criar um “si”. Esses princípios foram tomados como aporte metodológico para analisar os manuscritos do corpus. Por meio desta análise, percebemos que são ferramentas importantes para mostrar o que se passa no processo de escrita do texto acadêmico, apontando para os modos como cada pesquisadora deu consequência às diretrizes fornecidas pela orientadora de tese.

Palavras-chave: Psicanálise; escrita; transmissão (psicanálise).

DIRECTRICES PSICOANALÍTICAS PARA LA FORMACIÓN DE INVESTIGADORES

RESUMEN. Después de una amplia investigación, hecha en la obra de Jacques Lacan, de elementos que nos permitiesen encontrar directrices para la compleja tarea de dirigir la trayectoria de formación de investigadores, en este texto nos proponemos a formalizar los ocho principios del psicoanálisis que podrían orientar la acción de quien se dedica a la formación del investigador. Los principios son: 1) Hay diferencias entre el cuerpo biológico y el cuerpo erógeno; 2) Existe una brecha entre el ser humano y su sexualidad; 3) La instancia que une el cuerpo y el lenguaje es Real; 4) Enseñanza y transmisión son dos cosas diferentes; 5) Es posible transmitir el amor a un saber por el tramado hecho por el Real; 6) La dirección académica funciona más por lo que se hace que por lo que se dice; 7) El juicio es hecho por las consecuencias dadas a él; y 8) La escritura puede ser una instancia que lleva el sujeto a crear un “si”.
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Introduction

In previous research (Riolfi & Andrade, 2009) we have analyzed a corpus formed of 1040 versions of texts related to the formation of academic writing of four MA female students in the area of human sciences. The manuscripts analyzed were part of the elaboration process of the four students’ – namely, Bridget Jones, Cândida, Louise, and Pietra – theses in a public university in São Paulo (Brazil). All four theses were advised by the same professor, whom we named Jacqueline. In that research, we have identified moments in which the student-researchers were not successful in accomplishing tasks that were apparently easy to them.

In various moments, the young students demonstrated having all necessary empirical conditions to obtain success (library at their disposal, present advisor, TI labs, etc.), but, appearing to be consumed by an “intellectual morbidity”, they did not use the resources available to them. Consequently, they were not even able to carefully do the required readings, let alone reflect upon their own writing, correcting it.

Taking into consideration the fact that psychoanalysis could shed light into the task performed by who is willing to advise those undergoing such type of difficulty, we have dedicated ourselves to an extensive documental research in the works of Jacques Lacan. The investigation is justified considering the fact that it is necessary to evade the logic of “cause and effect”, or “stimuli and response” in favor of a perspective of formations of researchers that include: 1) the specificities of human sexuality; 2) the existence of unconscious knowledge; 3) the existence of a beyond the actions used to deliberately teach someone; and 4) the possibility of a writing process that enables great subjective dislocations.

The following question guided our reading investigation: ‘What are the guiding principles of psychoanalysis that can preside the action of those who dedicate themselves to the formation of researches?”

Taking the word “principle” as an indicator of elementary propositions that serve as the basis for an order of knowledge (Houaiss, 2001), in the following we first present some of our results, and, then, some practical applications.

There are differences between the biological body and the erogenous body

In order for one to establish a transforming relation with the knowledge, the body, and the language, these need to be united. Since “none of us have a consistent relationship with our own body” (Riolfi, 2015, p. 46-7), every person “needs an intermediary instance between her and their body that validates it, without fearing its loss”.

Freud was aware of the discomfort of the human body whose source transcends the organic. In analyzing hysterical symptoms, such as coughs, paralysis, aphony, headaches, etc., he found out that there is no conscience between the organism and the body apprehended by psychism. Curious after the fact regarding this mismatch, Freud arrived in 1915 to the elaboration of the concept of drive (Trieb): a force that exerts constant and excessive pressure in the direction of the attainment of the impossible, that is the reason why a person is never happy with their own body.

From this we see that both Freud and Lacan gave special importance to the difference between biological body, which is common to both humans and animals, and erogenous body, which is exclusive to human kind. Erogenous body corresponds to the biological one under the effects of drive.

Lacan (1964/2011) used the concept of drive as the basis upon which he built a way of interpreting different imperatives that would be on the origin of subjects’ acephalous behavior. According to him, when a person is not found actively in a way to experience their drives, they could be victims of a turnaround that would make victims of a marked card deck game, in which the only thing to do is to
become the object of the other. In this configuration, a subjective position (e.g., being seen, being heard, being sucked, being defected, and being destroyed) would correspond to each of the drives (e.g., in their vision, scopic; summoning; oral; anal; and of death).

Having said that, it should be recalled that, during the path of research, it is of paramount importance to manage the driving pressure and take commitments to its end. Only those who were able to articulate their bodily dimension to that of language are able to attain so. If such an articulation is not made, the person will be a victim of what Riolfi (2015) has labeled spread-out language, that way in which Portuguese language has been seen in different educational levels: unarticulated. Riolfi (2015) has argued that spread-out language is present in the productions of people who are impotent with respect to the willingness of saying something. They wish to speak, to read, to write, but, in trying to do so, they have no means to perform the discursive operations with the language. The result is shredded texts, with no anchor in their own body.

There is a gap between human being and sexuality

From the difference between the biological and the erogenous body results the fact that the sexuality is installed in each of us through the speech, through the derangement (Lacan, 1964/2011). Since the beginning of his research, Sigmund Freud has taught us this lesson. Freud dedicated his life to describing the ways in which the human being relates to sexuality.

In this direction, one of Freud's first texts (Freud, 1895/1996a), he already distinguished between empirical and psychic reality; the former had to do with real facts that happened in one's life, and the latter with the interpretation that one makes of the facts. Using the example of breast-feeding, process through which the baby needs to count on the acquiescence of someone who is willing to feed it, Freud postulated that the desire of the other introduces the desire to live in the baby.

The psychoanalyst could identify two instances related to the satisfaction of the baby: the satisfaction of its basic needs, and the added pleasure whose nature can be taken as sexual, since it is not about physically satisfying the hunger for milk, but, mainly, about stimulating the nasal mucus, the creation of a secondary pleasure, beyond pure physiological need. The consequence is that, different from what happens in other animals, whose basic rule is biological development; human sexuality is the added level.

Thus, in very human being there exists a sexual instance that is not related to genital organs, let alone to procreation, but it is related to a satisfaction (Freud, 1915/1996e) that, as we have showed, will always be in mismatch. The count never closes because there is no fixed universal object of satisfaction. This is the reason why we can have a fair amount or parts of satisfaction that would be valid for all humanity.

Such contingency invites us to invent particular ways to deal with the most intimate aspects of our experience, and with the most empirical situations in like, which is a pre-condition to the invention of particularity.

The importance of reflection with respect to the mismatch in human sexuality becomes clearer if we explicate that human sexual behavior constantly constitutes the prototype of other reactions toward life (Freud, 1908/1996d). The way someone deals with their sexuality interferes in all other actions and in the way this person relates to their environment. In this sense, it also interferes in the way someone's disposition to write an academic paper.

In the same way that there is impossibility between a man and a pretense ideal object of satisfaction, there also is a gap between what is taught and what is learnt. There is no one-to-one correspondence between learning and teaching. Even though we know out teaching may not be effective, we can always have serenity when we need to try again.

Another point to be considered is the variability of the libido. According to the psychoanalysis dictionary organized by Roland Chemama (1995, p. 126), “libido is the psychic energy of sexual drives, which find their regimen in terms of desire, of love aspirations, what, in Freud’s view, explains the presence and the manifestation of the sexual in psychic life”. Lacan proposed to understand the libido “not so much as a field of energy, but as an non-real organ that bear relation with the part of the self that the living sexual being loses, in sexuality”.

In the direction of trying to understand this variability, Freud (1931/1996f) proposes the path or the vicissitudes of the libido that someone form the female sex may choose from. The first is general revulsion, moment in which the person, horrified before their corporal contingencies, abandons sexuality, becoming frigid, sand, and less intelligent. The second is self-affirmation and excess of libido, when a person, incapable of giving up hope of someday attaining the male sexual organ, ignores the alleged fragilities of her sex. And the last is the meeting with the “father” as object, when the persons reacts to her bodily contingencies hoping to find, in the opposite sex, a complement to the absence of the male organ, in the form of a love partner, and, later, in the form of a son.

Taking into consideration the vicissitudes of the libido is to recognize the various paths through which a human being may deal with bodily contingencies and with reality. Consequently, various are the ways in which the researcher will learn how to deal with specific procedures that involve academic research.

The instance that unites body and language is the Real

In order to address everything that may be covered by images and words, the Lacanian Real is the instance whose irruption leads the researcher to deconstruct identifications, which supported their relation with knowledge. This is an instance that vivifies the body, that makes not to live in and erratic and automatized manner.

The effect of the irruption of the Real is that of displacing the subject from their place of comfort, in which the senses, allegedly, complete the subject’s existence, because this is the register that resounds directly into the body of the interlocutor when he listens or reads something that moves him, may promote and agreement between body and language (Riolfi, 2015, p. 47).

In one of the first times he tried to formulate this concept, Lacan asserted that he intended it to refer to what always returns to its place, since it cannot be symbolized (Lacan, 1964/2011). Later, he was emphatic in asserting that: “Far from the body, there exists the possibility of what I have named the last time of resonance, or consonance. It is on the level of the real that this consonance may be found. With respect to the poles that the body and language constitute, the real is responsible for making the agreement” (Lacan, 1975-76/2007, p. 40).

In the conference entitled The third (Lacan, 1975/2002, p. 3) we find two meanings of Real: 1) “what does not move, …a stone in the way,… what does not cease to repeat”; 2) the “impossible of a logic modality”. In this occasion, the psychoanalyst made an effort to clarify that: a) there is no hope in trying to attain the real through representation, and b) the real is not universal. Then, each of the elements is identical to itself.

From this principle an important guideline is implicated to the advisory of research-students. The interventions that go beyond logical exposition (e.g., those anchored in the surprise, in the humor, in the unexpected) may allow the junction of the body with the language, lowering anguishes and the separation that the student experiences in performing tasks that, in a certain point of the progress, are above their level of capacities. In other words, when the advisor’s interventions cause the senses to be unstable, allowing for a breach of the real, the researcher in formation has the opportunity to invent formulations in writing that better suit their particularities.

Teaching and transmission are two different things

To form researches is an activity that goes beyond mere teaching. The notion of “teaching” may be correlated to what happened between an “I” and a “you”, to whom a “message” is conveyed with respect to a content to be apprehended (Jakobson, 1970). In this schema, for communication to be effective, speaker and addressee need to recognize situational referents, to use the same code, and to establish contact via a channel of communication. In including the dimension of the unconscious, the concept of transmission points to what exceeds to what is passed in this level.

In the teaching that transmits, since what is transmitted Is the lack of that which teaches, we refer to something that is invisible. We can only know the effects of transmission, for example, through the
development of a particular viewpoint. This accomplishment points to an implicated way of conducting research.

The desire is the sine qua non condition for the transmission to happen, given that it is the desire itself that is transmitted. Anguish is included, which works the fuel that feeds the desire to knowledge. The advisor’s decision to teach does not need to be declared. Such a declaration is irrelevant in the sense that it is shown in the advisor’s enunciative positioning. The advisor might even assert he does not wish to dispense more time to a troublesome student, as long as he continues to dispense his time with this student. The advisor supports the desire to teach and always finds his expression the models that are more convenient to him. In being hooked by something estranged to him, the student is lead to reformulate what was transmitted and to found an enunciative place.

Thus the teaching that transmits is the accomplishment of what Lacan (1954-55/1985, p. 280) has called “genuine teaching”: “the type of teaching that is capable of awakening in those who listen an inconsistency”. Lacan further characterizes this as the type of teaching that teaches the subject to “name, argue, bring to existence, this desire that is literally beyond existence, and, thus, inexists” (Lacan, 1954-55/1985, p. 309).

In the words of Lacan, “the only genuine teaching is one which succeeds in awakening an insistence in those who are listening, this desire to know whidl can only emerge when they themselves have taken the measure of ignorance as such - in so far as it is, as such, fruitful - and no less so on the part of the one' who teaches” (Lacan, 1954-55/1985, p. 260).

We can draw consequences from the assertions made by Lacan. If a professor, in his action, testifies to his curiosity and enthusiasm towards the subject he is teaching, allowing, not deliberately, that the student beholds the presence of his unconscious, the consequences of this work will always be of the order of the unpredictable, exceeding the teacher’s expectations.

It is possible to transmit love to knowledge through the management of the Real

To love the real is to love what is impossible to be apprehended through the words. Whoever loves the real is able to transmute the “adrenaline” coopted by anguish in energy to make headway on the project of “putting oneself” in academic works. This loves makes one not to get tired doing the work and it upholds an unquenchable curiosity about the new possibilities of work.

Since the Real is par excellence what is constantly inscribing itself, it creates a hole that is impossible to be fulfilled. For this reason, harassed by the Real, but without being frightened by its effects, the person will never reproduce of has been done already. Dissatisfied with what has been accomplished so far, the person will seek through different ways to find an elaboration hat, in that given moment, is capable of expressing an idea.

Some people fear the Real and, in facing it, they paralyze. Other, however, learn how to love it and use it as a conductor for the construction of life. We understand that it is by loving the Real that a researcher can, facing the transformations he will undergo during the long process of formation, anchor his choices and implicate his body in an investigation that is his own. This is so because whoever decides to radically face the challenge of elaborating a research needs to detach from any imaginary with respect of the work, the world, and toward oneself. Without these constructions, once extraneous to the researcher, he will be able to find support in the Real to come up with unprecedented research.

In the psychoanalytic perspective, the love for the Real allows one to conquer a transforming relation with knowledge (Lacan,1972-73/2008, p. 130). This love keeps someone in the direction of building answers to their questions. In this sense, we consider that the Real provides the orientation, as an anchor point, and not a sense to whom is touched by it. This orientation does no include the sense because it is anchored in the body of the person who, hooked in their desire, works to build their place in the world.

Guidance better works for what is done than for what is said

Since there is a mismatch between someone’s action and words, what is the guideline to organize relations? This is one of the first questions that guided Lacan’s investigations.
Differently from those who were guided by what patients said, Lacan asserted that his choice was to think with his “feet”. In his words, “We believe to think with our brains. Me, I think with my feet, and it is there I find the hard things” (Lacan, 1975/2002, p. 6).

Despite its exotic formulations, Lacan’s proposal is coherent to Freudian thinking. According to Freud, the unconscious is not-knowing. Since his first texts, Freud (1900/1996b; 1905/1996c) puts forth the idea that psychism is not reduced to conscience – to the readily accessible and retrievable idea in our conscience – but it is formed of certain latent contents that are only consciously accessible after some resistance has been overcome.

In commenting the discovery of the unconscious and the revolution it brought to humanity, Freud (1916/1974, p. 31) asserts that the “ego” is the lord of its own house, since there will always be a part of not-knowing in all of us due to the existence of the unconscious. The unfolding of hypothesis is that of the one who speaks does not know what is spoken. In this sense, when you ask about what he wants, there is the possibility that the person is mistaken in the answer provided.

In order to confer a more rigorous character to this hypothesis, Lacan (1960/1996) considered the distinction between the utterance, the concrete representation of language, and enunciation, which is part of the meaning of the utterance, and the update of the language in discourse. This is to better understand, therefore, that there is no correlation or symmetry between that one utters and what one does. In this life, what is uttered is never one hundred per cent precise, because there always is the possibility of misunderstandings, fluidity in meaning, ambiguity.

In his text “Subversion of the subject and the dialectic of the desire in Freudian unconscious”, Lacan (1960/1996) made use of the Freudian concept “unconscious” to mark the two instances that form human psychism. On the one hand, there is an “ego”, which designates the subject’s utterances, and is responsible for planning the speech; on the other hand, the subject of the unconscious desire, the instance that does not know what it says, but meddled in the speech of the “ego”.

In our understanding, Lacan’s (1960/1996, p. 813) definition is pertinent to mark this characteristic of the unconscious of always insisting in finding ways of manifesting itself: “Since Freud the unconscious has been a chain of signifiers that somewhere (on another stage, in another scene, he wrote) is repeated, and insists on interfering in the breaks offered it by the effective discourse and the cogitation that it informs”. The psychoanalyst was explicit in his assertion that, with respect to the unconscious subject, there is not possible to provide an answer the question of “Who is speaking”, this is so because “if he does not know what he is saying, or even if he is speaking” (Lacan, 1960/1996, p. 815).

Bringing this discussion to the field of formation of researchers, we can propose that, for example, when the advisor says to his advisee something like: “you need to study a lot to write that chapter”, there are no guarantees that this utterance has a shared meaning between advisor and advisee. It is pertinent to question: what does it mean to study a lot considering the person who said this utterance? The intensity of “studying a lot” might not mean the same for two people. Parallel to this, is the advisee confirms he understood the utterance; there is no guarantee that at the level of enunciation he will display such an understanding. For this reason, there is a part of the job of advising students that flees from verbal interventions in the text they produced. An example is drawings and schemas made during the advisory process.

The assessment of what is said is made by the consequences it brought by

In listening to what subjects have to say, the psychoanalyst’s concern is not to analyze utterances, but to teach that what is said can be evaluated under the effects it has caused. According to Lacan (1972-1973/2008, p. 26), “it is by the consequences of what is uttered that one judges the utter”. Therefore, it is necessary for one to observe each case in order to evaluate the importance of each utterance. Not every uttered word will be heard or read by people in the same way.

The reason for having to introduce the consequences of what is said to evaluate the potential of an act of uttering is, according to Lacan, the fact that, given the opacity of language, it is impossible to calculate what a persons intents to speaks when she utters an utterance. To the author, the meaning has nothing to do with ears, but only with the reading of what is heard of significant. “The meaning is
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not what is heard. What is heard is the signified. The meaning is the effect of the signifier” (Lacan, 1972-1973/2008, p. 47).

We shall illustrate. A person may say, “I study a lot”. In an ordinary conversation, who listens to this utterance would either agree with it without reflecting upon it or question if it is true or false. The psychoanalyst, on the contrary, questions the meaning of “a lot” to the person who uttered those words. Would this person be too tired from studying too much? Out would this person be defending himself or herself from not studying at all? Only the academic situation of the person can answer this in case of doubt. In the case the situation is bad, no matter how much the persons thinks he or she is studying hard, this would be too little for their necessity.

The practical application of this principal is related to the need that the advisor to judge the efficacy of his supervisions based on the transformation that he finds in the versions of the texts his students produce, instead of blindly believing in what was previously said.

The writing can be an instance to bring the subject to create the “self”

In our understanding, writing is an action analogous to that of the goldsmith, who masterfully works, models and refines the piece he wishes to create. Writing my be configured as a powerful resource of transformation of the relation the person establishes with the word, to the condition of one who writes does not limit oneself to face the act of writing as the fulfillment of a bureaucratic task.

Lacan (1975-1976/2007) postulated the existence of two different meanings to the term “writing”. The first refers to the logic-mathematical constructions that are the basis of thought without the support of words. It refers, for example, to schemas and diagrams used to explicate the functioning of something, cause and effect relations. The second refers to the “result of what can be called a precipitation of the signified” (Lacan, 1975-1976/2007, p. 140), and it is understood to be the graphic formalizations that, in every culture, words are represented. For example, in Portuguese, the combination between letters of the alphabet that constitute our writing system.

Lacan was interested particularly in the first meaning of “writing”. In the same lesson, he asserted, “the writing in question comes from a different place than that of the signified” (1975-76/2007, p. 140). This is so because the writing connected to the support of thought is related to the level of “dit-mension” – the level of what is said. We can understand that, in this vein, there is a subject that utters, without knowing about his self.

We can conclude, then, that Lacan considers two different instances in thinking about writing. The first is that of the person who deliberately performs actions to write. The second is that of the enunciator who is spoken by it.

Because it is configured in sublimation, writing can be seen as one of the four possible destinies to let the drive flow, as described by Freud (1915/1996e). Sublimation occurs when the drive finds satisfaction in some realization is not more directly sexual, but substantive, such as writing, cooking, teaching, etc. In this perspective, sublimation is a way of satisfaction performed by who is able to negotiate with the pressure and the energy exerted by the drive.

According to Gérard Pommier (1992, p. 165)), sublimation is not the foundation of an elite artistic, but “a necessary creation to existence: drawing, singing, and dancing are inevitable activities of a body preventing itself from getting lost”. It generates a product that, in allowing the emergence of a signature, it propitiates the person who creates the piece the advent of a “self” separated from bodily surface.

In this conception, subliming the drive is not a destiny to a few chosen, but to all those who are willing to keep themselves alive. In order to do so, one of the necessary prerequisites is that the person acknowledges that they have a body and that they may choose the ways in which they will preferably satisfy it. The act of writing, for those who decide to see it through, can fixate in the subject an identity and propitiate him a renown name in the academic community, as being the one who wrote the paper X, Y, Z.

Performed in an implicated fashion, the act of writing becomes the passport to the conquering of a name and of a “self”. If a person who writes does not cave in to their desire toward the irruption of the Real, this person will learn that there is more in their kinesthetic world than they can express through words. The person will realize that they are not limited to the names offered in social life. For this
reason, the person will soon conclude that there is the need to invent a “self”, a singular way of expression that is circumscribed in the world.

As we have been arguing since the beginning of this paper, writing in academic context may be configured as an act in which those who write invent a “self” and materializes it in the text. We know that not every person is willing, or have the courage and the cognitive conditions to make headway with the necessary effort to see through or to endure the time demand that is different for everyone.

In order for this intervention to take place, “those who are willing to learn how to write must go through the hell” of writing” (Riolfi, 2011, p. 26-29). As affirmed in Riolfi, the person needs to forsake the temptation of sticking to the cosmetic writing, innocuous, that causes no transformation in who writes, to experiment and surpass critical writing, which causes suffering but leads to no transformation in who writes, to open up to the settling of task of writing, which leads the person to allow themselves to suffer the effects of writing in their own body, and to the able to take responsibility for the piece and the sustenance of a name of author, being able to build their own name. Whoever arrives to this place “begins to experience the act of writing in the register of enthusiasm, of joy of being faithful to their unconscious desire, from where they will no longer forsake” (Riolfi, 2011, p. 30).

When students start the postgraduate career, they know that without writing they will not be able to finish their courses. But, what we see when we analyze the written corpus of this research is that probably none of the researchers foresaw the effects of writing for each of them. The thorough analysis of each text may be found in Andrade (2015), in which the author shows a type of writing filled with uncertainties, of anguishes, of learning, of persistence, pointing out the result of transmission of love for the Real. In other words, Andrade shows that writing is about being able to invent a “self”, a particular place of enunciation from where to utter.

**Final considerations**

In order to provide a general view of how these eighth principles outlined above operate, we have used them as the theoretical-methodological basis to select the manuscripts that form our corpus. We have privileged textual signals left by the students in their texts, these signals point to the way in which each student dealt with the guidelines provided by the thesis’ advisor.

In the following, we present two examples to illustrate how these principles may shed light in the process of the academic writing. The first, taken from the corpus of the informant Bridget, refers to the importance of what is done throughout the process of writing an academic text.

Looking at Figure 01, we can see the mismatch between what the student Bridget Jones originally planned and what she had effectively accomplished. Figure 01 reproduces the plan of activities to be developed by the student since the beginning of her master’s until the deposit of her qualifying paper at the graduate office.

The plan of activities was elaborated with the aid of the advisor. It is divided into five parts, each corresponding to a month of the year. The typographic difference in the table specified two moments of the work. In the first moment, the student made a digitalized version in which she indicated that she would start her studies in August and deposit the final version in December. In the second moment, the student
Figure 1. Schedule of Bridget Jones’ MA thesis.

Observing Figure 01, we see that activities initially planned for the month of August were pushed forward to the month of December, and so on. The activities were behind schedule with an interval of four months. In this sense, taking what was said by the student (in this case, the initial version of the activities plan) as being true would be useless to understand the process of academic writing. In order to better understand the process, it was necessary to balance the action of who wrote the plan, by considering the obliterations in the digitalized version.

The second example refers to the consequences of what was said by the informant Cândida. We have selected a version of her second chapter sent to the advisor in 03-30-2009, and returned with many observations on the following day. The version was written after the qualification of the student, about a year before the deposit of the dissertation.

Cândida wrote: “In this second excerpt, the informant keeps analyzing how children fill in the caps that would be filled by names (article, noun, and adjective), in this sense, if initially she states there were no ‘problems’, here she points out that the adjective ‘happy’ caused some difficulty (line 09), since few children knew how to use it”.

This is the first paragraph of the analysis of the second piece of data the informant chose for her thesis. Next to it, with no observations, the advisor evaluated the analysis carried out by Cândida, with the following comment: “Your analysis is overall weird. You should ask one of your colleagues to point out to you what is difficult to understand, okay?”.

In our view, in the intervention the advisor: 1) pointed out that the overall analysis was “weird”; 2) suggested the student asked another reader to find out what according to the advisor was troublesome to understand. It should be noted that there is no answer to the problem. The advisor opened up a space of doubt in order to, through her own work, the student would reformulate the chapter.

In our understanding, from the reading of the whole chapter, the main problem with Cândida’s analysis was to reproduce what she criticized in the texts of her informants. Focusing on a random signified, maybe the certainty that the informant’s text was problematic, that she forgot her initial goal, which was to show how the informant was learning to write to pursue other, showing the problems with the informant’s writing.

What was the consequence of the advisor’s intervention? In the paragraph in which the intervention was inserted, we have noticed two textual changes: the exclusion of the conjunction assim que, which was replaced by the expression ressalte-se que. However, more than the changes located in this paragraph, we have observed that the consequences of the intervention resounded on the student’s attitude toward the analysis of her data.

Our basic affirmation is based on signals the reading of the final version of her thesis: 1) change in the title of the section of analysis, previously named “imaginary of academic text”, to another title which indicated that the section would present the research data. Cândida removed the title that indicated an appreciation toward her data to another that expressed the thematic line of her research; 2)
presentation of deeper analyses. In the previous version, there were five paragraphs dedicated to the analysis of the first piece of data, in the second version there were ten paragraphs; 3) refinement and correction of the analysis, in a way that only a few aspects of the previous analysis was made use of.

No paragraph from the previous version was kept as they were. As an example, we bring paragraph 4 of the analysis section, which firstly was made out of four lines, and then was rewritten in ten lines. Following we present some excerpts of the two.

Previous version: "In this excerpt, we may notice a stance of the informant with respect to the data: the option to not inform the reader of the criterion used in the correction of the test" (emphasis added).

Reformulated version: In line 4, Maria tried to provide the reader with significant information to the understanding of the results of the test that was applied, namely, the one that referred to the use of the underline. She justified the use if the underline in line 7, however, without making it explicit the place where this device should be used. Maria left to the reader, therefore, the responsibility of inferring that in her test … In doing so, because she does not master properly the dynamics of the images necessary to write, Maria omits important information from the reader to follow the analysis carried out by the researcher, assigning to the reader the discursive and textual choices that were her responsibility".

It should be noted that in the first version Cândida presented her stance of evaluation about her informant using the verb "opt". In strongly asserting that her informant opted not to inform of a given criterion, Cândida showed that her informant should have informed but deliberately did not so.

If we look at the verbs used in the reformulated version, we see that Cândida gave more emphasis to her informant. Firstly, she asserted that her informant “tried” to provide the reader with the information; later, she informs an important action carried out by her informant, namely, to justify the use of the underlining device, and, only then, she presents the problem of not “showing” the information to the reader. Next she does something similar to what she did in the previous version, she analyzed the action of her informant. Thus the focus was no longer what the informant did or did not do, but what the informant indicated to not know in order to write in this or that fashion.

Thus, the principle of judging what is said through its consequences leads us to, in analyzing graduates’ texts, not a look toward the specific context of what the advisor said or did not say to the researcher. But to focus the analysis on the consequences of what was said by the advisor to evaluate the extent to which it had an impact both in the researcher’s text and on this relation with knowledge.
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