

Arts, Linguistics, Literature and Language Research Journal

RESEARCH IN SPEECH ANALYSIS: A STRETCH FROM THE REPORTS OF THE FIRST NATIONAL MEETING REGARDING SPEECH, IDENTITY AND SUBJECTIVITY (I ENDIS) - UFPI - NEPAD/NEPEC - 2016

Osalda Maria Pessoa

UNINI – Mexico

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/9749900897172789>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8639-orcid4650>

Ana La Bella Carapinheiro

Universidad de Santiago de Compostela
(Spain)

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: This work is justified not only by the brief overview of the growing academic production in Discourse Analysis at the Center for Human Sciences and Letters and at the Center for Education Sciences of the Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), together with the Center for Studies and Research in Analysis of the Discourse and the Center for Studies and Research in Communication Strategies (NEPAD/NEPEC, respectively), but also has the general objective of enabling a better understanding of the themes, mobilized theories and methodologies/techniques used in this Higher Education Institution - IES, within their programs, as well as in other postgraduate programs in Brazil, which address studies related to Discourse Analysis, its paths, aspects and new horizons. A quantitative-qualitative-descriptive methodology was used, based on a corpus of 100 (one hundred) abstracts of the Annals of the I National Meeting on Discourse, Identity and Subjectivity - I ENDIS (2016) of the UFPI/NEPAD/NEPEC, with content analysis being applied by Laurence Bardin (2011) based on the categories: themes, mobilized theorists and methodologies/techniques found in the works presented within the aforementioned time frame. The contributions point to the search for a brief overview of research in Discourse Analysis in Brazil, mainly in the Northeast Region, which presented a considerable production at the UFPI through its Research Centers, promoting a new point of view for the studies of Language and of Discourse, approaching language as a social practice.

Keywords: Speech analysis, Anais do I ENDIS 2016, UFPI - NEPAD/NEPEC.

INTRODUCTION

This article, *Research in Discourse Analysis: an excerpt from the reports of the First National Meeting on Discourse, Identity and Subjectivity (I ENDIS) UFPI - NEPAD/*

NEPEC - 2016, intends to approach studies related to Discourse Analysis, its paths, aspects and new horizons, based on the work of the Center for Studies and Research in Discourse Analysis (NEPAD), linked to the Graduate Program in Letters (PPGEL/UFPI) and the Center for Studies and Research in Communication Strategies (NEPEC/UFPI), linked to the Graduate Program in Communication (PPGCOM), as well as other graduate programs in Brazil, as a result of the Symposium 47 held at the III National Meeting of Linguistic and Literary Studies - III ENAELL, held by the State University of Maranhão - in Caxias, Brazil, between the 25th and 27/05/2021.

Its specific objectives are: i) to analyze 100 (one hundred) academic abstracts presented at the I ENDIS 2016 (among monographs, theses and dissertations) in Discourse Analysis produced in postgraduate studies at UFPI and in postgraduate studies at other Higher Education Institutions - IES of the several regions of Brazil; ii) to identify the themes addressed, the theoretical mobilized and the methodologies/techniques used in Discourse Analysis through the summaries of the I ENDIS 2016 carried out by UFPI.

The study is organized as follows: topics 01 and 02, they include a brief history of French Discourse Analysis and English Critical Discourse Analysis, making considerations about these two fields of knowledge, in order to understand the approximations of these aspects. To this end, we mobilized some authors, such as: Pêcheux (1973), Fairclough (2001), Foucault (1970), Althusser (2001), Orlandi (2010), among others.

In topic 03, the quantitative-qualitative-descriptive methodology and content analysis are presented, while in topic 04 the discussions and results about the academic productions of the I ENDIS 2016 abstracts and their categories of analysis are presented (themes, authors

mobilized and methodologies/techniques used) according to Bardin (2011), in order to obtain a brief overview of the growing academic production in Discourse Analysis in postgraduate courses at the Federal University of Piau , as well as in other postgraduate programs. graduation in Brazil, which involve the strands of discourse, new perspectives and horizons, giving visibility to the production of these lines of research, mainly in the Brazilian northeast.

THE FIRST HORIZON: A BRIEF HISTORY OF FRENCH DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The French Discourse Analysis (AD) emerged from the transphrastic analysis of the language addressed in the studies of the American Harris in the article "Discourse Analysis (1969). In addition to Harris,  mile Benveniste with the Theory of Enunciation (2005) emphasized a change in linguistic studies, bringing the subject of enunciation into the interior of linguistic analyses. These studies delimit the boundary between European and American AD.

These two currents will mark different ways of thinking about discourse theory: one understands it as an extension of Linguistics (which would correspond to the American perspective) and the other embarks on a new strand of discourse as an internal crisis of Linguistics, in the area of Semantics. This (European) tendency, based on a necessary relationship between the saying and the conditions of production of that saying, "places exteriority as a fundamental mark and requires a theoretical displacement, of a conflicting character, which will resort to concepts external to the domain of an immanent linguistics" (p. to account for the analysis of more complex units of language. (ORLANDI, 1996, p. 16).

For Maldidier (2003, p. 16-17), "French AD

has a dual foundation among its exponents: the lexicologist Jean Dubois and the French philosopher Michel P cheux" in the 1960s-70s. Jean Dubois as a linguist participates in all the endeavors to conquer linguistics: from the creation of dictionaries to the creation of magazines (just as *Langages* was created in March 1966). Michel P cheux, in turn, is involved in theoretical debates around Marxism, psychoanalysis and epistemology.

It was in this context, through differences in language practices, that a transdisciplinary relationship with Linguistics, History and Psychoanalysis was established, producing at the time several shifts that were outlined in the history of French AD. P cheux (1973, p. 17) brought with this discourse study "the displacement and transformation of man through a socio-historical and ideological process, thus determining his position as a subject. It is then considered that the subject is not the owner of his discourse.

Althusser, in the book: *"Ideologia e Aparelhos Ideol gicos do Estado"* (*Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* - 2001), highlighted that individuals when exercising their social practices are manipulated by ideological interests in any social relationship. Expanding his own concept to materialism, the theorist states that the structure through which "ideology leads the social agent to recognize his place is the mechanism of social subjection: the agent recognizes himself as a subject and subjects himself to an absolute subject" (p." (ALTHUSSER, 2001, p. 8).

Conceived this way, the subject is taken by an ideological conjuncture that constitutes him/her through/within the social spheres, including the family, the religious, the legal, the political, which are part of the institutions. It is from this ideological process that we are questioned and constituted as a subject occupying different discursive positions and we are not the owners of our saying. We are

the fruits of a given conjuncture. Thus, at the origin of the reflection on the subject we have the affiliation of the French AD to the studies of Althusser.

It was based on Althusser (2001) that Pêcheux (1973) started from the assumption that the subject is constituted in his relationship with the other, in a tension that structures and constitutes him in and through language. Given this, the meaning of a word, “is determined by the ideological positions that are at stake in the socio-historical process” (Pêcheux, 1997, p.160). Thus, it circulates, incorporating the materialities that transit in society in general and establish an interdiscursive network.

This way, when displacing words or expressions as being transparent, their meanings change according to the positions that the subject occupies, with the meanings attributed/produced “in reference to the ideological formations, in which these positions are inscribed” (Pêcheux, 1997), p.160). It can be concluded that the subject for French AD is decentralized, since he is not fully aware of what he thinks and what he says, as it derives from ideological relationships.

THE SECOND HORIZON: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (ADC)

The exposition about the theoretical-methodological framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will be taken from Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) and resumed in Fairclough (2001). This field of knowledge analyzes various social practices, having as the axis the centrality of discourse, the relationship between the study of the text and the concepts of power and ideology, “which gave rise to Critical Linguistics, of which the current ADC can be considered heir” (GOUVEIA, 2002, p.335).

ADC is a discipline with a theoretical-

methodological approach, whose object of analysis occurs between the linguistic and the social, which considers language a social practice. He works in the investigation of the structural and social relations of power and control, which are manifested in the processes of articulation of the subject in the use of language, through oral, written and verbal-audio-visual texts. ADC is understood as both theory and method: as a method of analysis of social practices with a specific interest “in the discursive moments that unite theoretical and practical concerns with the public spheres, in which the forms of analysis “operate” – become practices and contribute to the development and elaboration of these theories” (CHOULIARAKI & FAIRCLOUGH, 1999).

The term ‘discourse analysis’ was coined by theorist Norman Fairclough, in his article “Critical and Descriptive goals is Discourse Analysis” published in the *Journal of Pragmatics* in 1985. In this article, according to Tílio (2010), the influence of French by Althusser (2001), Foucault (1970) and Pêcheux (1973), with regard to ideological processes. According to Tílio (2010), the Faircloughian works *Language and Power* (1989), *Discourse and Social Change* (1992) and *Analysing Discourse* (2003) are considered fundamental for the theoretical-methodological framework of ADC.

In addition to these authors, there are the works of Teun van Dijk (2021), Ruth Wodak (2005) and Teo van Leeuwen (2008) which, despite their theoretical differences, bring important reflections on the use of language, for the expansion of this field of study. This way, an important field of knowledge is born that sees the text (discourse) as a discursive practice and a social practice. There is not only a linguistic analysis, but also “social criticism and its socio-historical moment in contemporary times” (TÍLIO, 2010, p.

87). Mainly, the use of language, the social reality, the context of its production and how asymmetrical power relations in social processes are carried out are highlighted.

There is an ideological articulation of the subject. The subject can be transformed, restructured or destroyed, when exposed to a certain social practice. ADC as a social practice opens the way by taking discourse as a mode of action for issues related to “racism, sexual discrimination, institutional control and manipulation, violence, national identity, self-identity and gender identity, to social exclusion” (FAIRCLOUGH 2001 apud TÍLIO, 2010, p.87).

ADC’s objective is not only to analyze texts to investigate power relations, but also to find ways to rework inequality.

It is not only a descriptive and analytical analysis, it is also a social and political analysis. This means that as researchers we have an important task with society: elucidate, understand its problems, and the A.C.D. (Critical Discourse Analysis) deals more with problems than with particular theories.” (van DIJK, 2021, p. 01).

ADC is critical, first, in the sense that it seeks to discern connections between language and other elements of social life that are normally hidden, such as: language and relations of power and domination; how language operates ideologically; the negotiation of personal and social identities (continuously problematized through changes in social life) in its linguistic and semiotic aspects. Second, it is critical in the sense that it is committed to ongoing social change.” (FAIRCLOUGH, 2001, p. 230).

ADC’s transdisciplinary work aims to dialogue with different theoretical knowledge and to effect a better reflection on a social problem. It can be seen that ADC dialogues with several theories, especially social theories, on the one hand, and linguistic theories, on the other, so that ADC theory is a mutant synthesis of other theories; what she herself

theorizes, in particular, is the mediation between the social and the linguistic – “the order of discourse, the social structuring of semiotic hybridism – interdiscursivity.” (CHOULIARAKI & FAIRCLOUGH, 1999, p. 16).

The subject, for ADC, acts discursively and also discursively represents the social environment around him. In this context, there is a need to study the relationship between language, subject and society to verify the incidence of one to the other. In the same way, in order to study discourse, it is important to have its conception its three-dimensionality proposed by Fairclough (2001, p. 101) “which encompasses the analysis of text, discourse and social practice”. It is from this three-dimensional conception of discourse that ADC involves, in addition to textual analysis, discursive and social analyses, to verify ideological aspects in language, thus configuring power relations depending on the social context.

For Foucault (1970), discourses are systems of knowledge that embody power. This way, every discourse is impregnated with power, to a greater or lesser degree, and can serve to regulate society, as they regulate available knowledge. It is from this theoretical context that ADC describes, interprets and explains the socio-historical processes by which subjects are mobilized by discourse in the social environment.

QUANTITATIVE-QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY: CONTENT ANALYSIS AND CONTROLLED INFERENCE

According to Bardin (2011, p. 29) “content analysis can be considered as a set of communication techniques”. His book aims to explain what content analysis is today and its usefulness in the human, social and applied sciences. As a technique, in its organization

process, it follows three phases: *the pre-analysis, material exploration and treatment of results*.

- ✓ *Pre-analysis*: after the data have been collected, coding is carried out. Before starting the analysis, it will be necessary to organize the materials. At this stage, it is possible to assess what makes sense and what still needs to be collected. For Bardin (2011), at this stage, we must do: a floating reading of the material, to see what it is about; choose the documents that will be analyzed a priori or a posteriori; constitute the *corpus* with basis in *completeness, representativeness, homogeneity and pertinence*; to formulate hypotheses and objectives and prepare the material.
- ✓ *Material exploration*: at this stage, there are the steps of *encoding* and *categorizing* the material. In encoding, the recording and context units must be cut out. The *registration units* can be the word, the theme, the object or referent, the character, the event or the document. To select *context units*, cost and relevance must be taken into account. The *enumeration* must also be done according to the established criteria. It can be done through presence (or absence), frequency, weighted frequency, intensity, direction, order and co-occurrence (contingency analysis). After *coding*, *categorization* must be done., that will follow any of the following criteria: semantic, syntactic, lexical or expressive.
- ✓ *Treatment of the results obtained and interpretation*: The interpretation of the results obtained can be done through *inference*, which is a type of controlled interpretation. For Bardin (2011, p. 133), the inference may “be supported by the constitutive elements of the classic

communication mechanism: on the one hand, the message (meaning and code) and its support or channel; on the other hand, the sender and receiver”.

REGARDING THE RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The First National Meeting of Discourse, Identity and Subjectivity (ENDIS) was promoted by the Federal University of Piau  (UFPI) from April 27 to 29, 2016. The full corpus of abstracts and full articles corresponds to 132 works presented at the I ENDIS/UFPI/ 2016, of which only 100 abstracts were analyzed, making it possible to survey the number of graduate researchers who participated in this event, coming from different regions, Institutions and Research Centers in AD from all over Brazil.

Regarding the Northeast Region, Piau  was responsible for 65% of the abstracts analyzed (100 abstracts), followed by the North Region with 10% of the abstracts proposed for the event. The Southeast as the radiating center of the French AD participated with 8% of the abstracts presented, while the Midwest as a precursor of the ADC, at the University of Bras lia, through Professor Izabel Magalh es contributed with 10%, since the South proposed 7%. It is noticed that the research in Discourse Analysis at the Federal University of Piau  is presented in a consolidated way through the Postgraduate Program in Linguistic Studies - PPGEL and the Postgraduate Program in Communication -PPGCOM.

The analyzed data were divided into units and regrouped into *categories* according to this academic genre, which accounts for the *registration*. Regarding the *enumeration* phase, concerns the presence or absence of elements in the text that may be significant and its frequency is measured as it appears in the recording unit. In the case of 100 abstracts, *the*

themes, authors and methodologies/techniques are recurrent and present in this genre of discourse that make up the categories that were regrouped.

In order to classify the frequency of *authors, themes and methods/techniques*, a quantitative, descriptive approach was made about the data and a qualitative, interpretative approach based on the literature review on the aspects of AD. The relationship between the data obtained and the theoretical foundation is what will give meaning to the interpretation. Controlled inferences will always be a resource, in the sense of seeking what is hidden under the apparent reality, what the enunciated discourse truly means.

Next, the analysis of the *categories*, which are seen as rubrics or classes that group certain elements together with common characteristics. From the categorization process, it is possible to join a significant number of information organized in two stages: *inventory* (common elements are isolated) and *classification* (the elements are divided and the organization is imposed).

Table 1 demonstrates the significant presence of the *themes addressed* in the Discourse Analysis research carried out at

UFPI and in other graduate programs of the various HEIs in Brazil that participated in the I ENDIS/2016.

Emerging social themes, coming from different fields of knowledge, were approached in a transdisciplinary way, based on the main theme: *Contemporary Discourse and Narratives*, through 06 Working Groups “ to stimulate debate among students, professors and professionals in the areas of Communication, Language and Literature, Philosophy, History, Anthropology, Sociology and related areas, with an emphasis on studies on discourse, identity and subjectivity and their interconnections and interfaces” (I ENDIS/UFPI Introduction, p. 01, 2016). This way, the event provided an exchange between the NEPEC/NEPAD/UFPI research groups and researchers from other national higher education institutions. The meeting also functioned as a space for inducing publications and sharing experiences.

The participating postgraduate researchers in Education, Social Communication, Letters and other degrees such as History, Philosophy, Sociology, Art, Biology, as well as a bachelor’s degree in Law, Administration, Medicine, Psychology, etc., as specified in

Category - Themes		%
GT1- Language, Culture and Identity	Readings, social resistance and cultural identities from literary works	30%
GT2 – Media and Corporeality	Gender, sexuality and body	20%
GT3 – Discourse and Ideology	Ethnic-racial relations	5%
GT4 – Gender and Subjectivity	The social condition of women (work, prostitution, rape, abuse.	25%
GT5 – Speech and Education	Art, education and language	5%
GT6 – Speech and Digital Culture	Guidelines for print and digital media	15%

Table 01: Research in Discourse Analysis in Brazil - Themes.

Source: 100 Abstracts of the I ENDIS 2016 - UFPI - NEPAD/NEPAC.

the abstracts of the programs' work to which they belonged, explored the different types of discourses, such as: political, historical, scientific, pedagogical, literary, formal aspects of language, art and education, language and ideology and the discourses of print and digital media, of the economy, of the world of work and social relations, focusing on: French AD, the Critical Discourse Analysis, sometimes Semi linguistics, in addition to various discourses arising from the analysis of literary works.

It was observed that the preponderant *themes* concern the media guidelines (Media and Corporeity 20% and Speech and Digital Culture 15%), which covers the most different current issues carried out by postgraduate students of Social Communication. In the second position is the theme on Language, Culture and Identity (30%) based on readings of social resistance and cultural identities resulting from the analysis of literary works, followed by Gender and Subjectivity on the social condition of women (25%) from the current of the feminist curriculum, experienced since 1980, coming from Sociology and Philosophy, Literature, Biology, Medicine and Psychology. In the

fourth position are the themes Discourse and ideology and Discourse and Education with 5% each.

In Table 02, the recurring *authors* in the 100 abstracts of the I ENDIS -2016, now coming from the theories of French AD, of ADC and Semi linguistics or from different areas, as the study of discourse will always take place in a transdisciplinary way.

In this category, *authors* from print and digital media, literary works and discourse theories (French AD, ADC and Semi linguistics) were taken into account, as well as the abstracts without authors, to facilitate classification and aggregation. Regarding the *discourses of print and digital media*, 40% pointed to different authors in the field of Communication and, at times, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) were cited to support the analysis of discourses, being exponents of language as a social practice in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis. At the beginning of this century, with access to the internet, language was focused as a social practice, with emphasis on *digital media* that favor the practices of multimodal genres.

Hence, the expansion of the concept of language/discourse as a social practice, in

Categories - Authors		%
1	Authors of print and digital media	40%
2	Authors of literary works	30%
3	Authors of the strand: French AD	10%
4	Authors of Critical Discourse Analysis	8%
5	Authors from the branch of Semi linguistics	6%
6	Abstract without citing authors	6%

Table 02: Research in Discourse Analysis - Authors.

Source: 100 Abstracts of the I ENDIS 2026 - UFPI - NEPAD/NEPEC.

Fairclough (2001), with the emergence of verbal-audio-visual genres/discourses, the grammar of visual design and systemic-functional linguistics, the reinterpretation of acts of speech, &c. There is an intersection of languages coming from cinema, radio, TV, music, paintings, cinema, theater and the arts in general. Included in this effervescence of genres and discourses are the journalistic-media fields, research, the public sphere and everyday life, starting from approaches to social issues related to violence, gender identity, social inequalities, inclusion/exclusion, relationships anti-racial, environment, etc.

As for the *literary discourse*, around 30% of the 100 analyzed abstracts cited authors with exploration of literary works, including discourses from different textual genres, such as: poetry, short stories, chronicles, novels, etc. pointing to the various discursive formations that question subjects arising from political, legal, pedagogical, religious, economic, world of work and everyday speeches.

Theorists mobilized in the light of the *Frenhc AD were defined* around 10%, as examples are Foucault (1970) for whom the subject is a social function and Pêcheux (1973, p. 160) for whom the subject is subject, since the meaning of a word, “is determined by the ideological positions that are at stake in the socio-historical process”. Work appeared in Brazil in the 2020s (from 1980) and nowadays, anchored in history, psychoanalysis and dialectical materialism pointed out by Pêcheux (1973). For Althusser (2001) the subject and the discourse are the result of a given ideological conjuncture that constitutes it within the social spheres.

With regard to ADC, only 8% reported to the authors in abstracts and sometimes in print and digital media discourses, with ADC “understood as a form of analysis that connects textual analysis to broader social

and interactional contexts”, with the objective of showing how language participates in the construction of social processes” (FAIRCLOUGH, 2001, p. 229 apud TÍLIO, 2010, p. 87) opening paths for discourse as “modes of action”, observing the relationships intertextual and interdiscourses.

As for the works analyzed in the light of *Semiolinguistics* based on Charaudeau (2016), around 6% were identified, since 6% of the 100 abstracts did not indicate authors. Regarding the semiolinguistic field of discourse, two distinct types of approach to language are defined: - one that is characterized by language as a transparent object having abstraction as its method of activity and is interested in *what language* tells us as an individual act and, another, which is characterized by the conception of language as a non-transparent object for its method of elucidation, who is interested in *how* language speaks to us based on collective acts for this author

the language act cannot be conceived otherwise than as a set of signifying acts that we *speak* of the world through the conditions of the very instance of their transmission. Whence it follows that the object of knowledge is *about* the language speaks through *how* to speak language, *one constituting the other* (and not one *after* another). The world is not given at first. It *is done* through the human strategy of signification. (CHARAUDEAU, 2016, p. 20)

The method followed must therefore be twofold: elucidating from the point of view of *how* and abstracting from the point of view of the *reason*. It is a Semiotic analysis due to the fact that it is interested in an object that is only constituted in an intertextuality and in a Linguistic due to the fact that the instrument it uses to interrogate this object is built at the end of a work of structural conceptualization of linguistic facts.

The table 03 will address the category of *methods/techniques* presented in the

100 abstracts analyzed, which include *the document analysis, studies, bibliography and the content analysis technique*, in addition to the percentages of abstracts that did not present methodology. It is worth remembering that in Brazil, bibliographic studies (type of research regarding the object) according to Prestes (2002, p. 30) and documental analyzes in Marconi & Kakatos (2012) are sometimes confused as research methods.

As for the *category of methods/techniques*, no proprietary methods were used in the French AD, ADC, of Semiolinguistics in the 100 abstracts. Documentary analysis, bibliographic studies and the technique of content analysis were cited. They confuse methods with types of research and with techniques. Documental analyzes are based on *primary* sources, explored for the first time through literary works, being used in 30% of the 100 abstracts, since 40% of the analyzes came through multimodal discourses, print and digital media of qualitative, interpretative and intersubjective basis.

Marconi and Lakatos (2012 p. 176) state that the researcher “must start his studies with a clear definition of the objectives in order to be able to judge what kind of documentation will be suitable for the

purposes of the research”. The bibliographic studies (theoretical research) proposed in the abstracts were based on books, magazines, newspapers, articles, websites, etc. According to Eco (2000 p. 42) “organizing a bibliography means looking for that whose existence is still unknown”.

Documental analyzes were used to support the content analysis technique used to analyze selected speeches from the perspective of French AD, English ADC and Semiolinguistics (French) around 24% of the 100 analyzed abstracts. For Bardin (2011, p.15), content analysis “is a set of increasingly subtle methodological tools, which apply to extremely diversified “discourses”. It is a controlled hermeneutic, based on deduction and inference. It is a result treatment technique guided by different communication poles (sender, receiver, message and channel) and considers “content analysis as a search for other realities through messages”. (BARDIN, 2011, p. 15).

It was observed, in the research proposed in the 100 abstracts, the absence of a strong base of Critical Ethnography and of other methods of the language sciences in relation to French AD, ADC and Semiolinguistics, since their main material of study are the

Categories - Methods/Techniques		%
1	Documentary analysis and bibliographic studies: discourses in print and digital media	40%
2	Document analysis and bibliographic studies: literary works	30%
3	Document analysis/content analysis (French AD, ADC English and French Semi-Oliguistics):	24%
4	Bibliographic studies - authors who touch the theme	0%
5	The methodologies were not defined	6%

Table 03: Research in Discourse Analysis.

Source: 100 Abstracts of the I ENDIS 2026 - UFPI - NEPAD/NEPEC.

verbo- audio-visual, as well as the absence of methods from education, social and applied sciences and health.

The combination of ADC and Ethnography can be useful for both. On the one hand, the experience of Critical Ethnography requires from the researcher a systematic and prolonged presence in the investigated context, offering the English-speaking ADC a knowledge that goes beyond the text, “which is the knowledge about the different moments of social practice, its material aspects, its processes and its social relations, as well as the decisions, values and desires of the participants” (CHOULIARAKI & FAIRCLOUGH, 1999, p. 62).

On the other hand, Ethnography benefits from CDA in the sense “of reflexivity, as material data must not be considered as faithful descriptions of the external world, but as discursive formations that are aggregated to construct a given perspective of the social world” (CHOULIARAKI & FAIRCLOUGH, 1999, p. 62). Furthermore, ADC, as well as Critical Ethnography, assume the impossibility of analytical neutrality, as both understand that research is a process of interpretation that must be carried out with and for the research collaborators.

CONCLUSIONS

It is concluded from the analysis of the categories (themes, *authors who were mobilized* and methodologies/techniques used) and their subcategories, which the research participants highlighted in the 100 analyzed abstracts of the I ENDIS/2016, that the guidelines (themes) of digital media guide our lives in the economic, political, cultural, identity spheres, as well as resistance readings, since from literary works we also build social relations and our cultural identities. In relation to the authors mobilized, the authors of digital media and literary works stood out

more, followed by the authors of the strands of discourses.

Texts and discourses build models, patterns of life through the action and interaction of subjects with language and the social context. More theorists from the DA strands must be approached, so that the subject and the discourse are constituted within the social spheres and there is more emphasis on discourse theories that support the analyzes of various genres, regardless of the circulation support, in order to that scientific events about discourse are no longer guided by literary discourses and printed and digital media. That, in fact, the trends and new horizons in the perspectives of French AD and ADC of English origin are more addressed and explored in postgraduate research in Discourse Analysis in Brazil, since the predominance of media and literary works prevailed.

As for the *methods/techniques*, bibliographic studies predominated in print and digital media discourses and in literary discourse, followed by content analysis in approaches about French AD, ADC and Semioliinguistics. Document reviews were also triggered in all categories.

Regarding the *authors who were mobilized*, the authors of digital media from studies in the area of communication and literary works from Letters, Linguistics and Arts stood out more, followed by authors from the French AD and English ADC. Regarding the *used methods*, the absence of 100 Abstracts of Critical Ethnography aided by cartography and autobiographical narratives, essential in the processes of social interactions, was observed, as well as the absence of methods from the social, applied and health sciences.

REFERENCES

- ALTHUSSER, L. **Ideologia e Aparelhos Ideológicos do Estado**. 3.ed. Lisboa, Portugal: Editorial Presença/Martins Fontes. 2001.
- BARDIN, L. **Análise de Conteúdo**. Lisboa, Portugal: Edições 70, LDA, 2011.
- BENVENISTE, Émile. **Problemas de Linguística Geral I**. Trad. Eduardo Guimarães. São Paulo: Pontes, 2005.
- CHARAUDEAU, Patrick. **Linguagem e discurso**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2016.
- Chouliariki, J. & Fairclough. **Discourse in late modernity. Rethinking critical discourse analysis**: Edinburgh University Press. 1999;
- Eco, Humberto. **Como se faz uma tese**. 14. ed. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 2000.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1985). **Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis**. Journal of Pragmatics, 1985.
- _____. **Discurso e mudança social**. Tradução de Izabel Magalhães. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2001.
- FOUCAULT, M. **A ordem do discurso**. 7.ed. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1970.
- GOUVEIA, Carlos M. A. **Análise Crítica do Discurso: enquadramento histórico**. In: Mateus, Maria Helena e Correia, Clara Nunes. **Saberes no Tempo**. Lisboa: Colibri, 2002.
- MARCONI, M de e Lakatos. **Fundamentos da metodologia científica**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2012.
- MALDIDIER, D. **A inquietação do discurso - (Re) ler Michel Pêcheux hoje**. Tradução Eni Pulcinelli Orlandi. Campinas: Pontes, 2003.
- ORLANDI, Eni P. **Análise do Discurso: Princípios e Procedimentos**. Pontes Editores, Campinas, 2010.
- _____. **Interpretação: autoria, leitura e efeitos do trabalho simbólico**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1996.
- PÊCHEUX, Michel. **O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento**. Campinas: Pontes Editora, 1973.
- _____. **O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento**. Campinas: Pontes Editora, 1997.
- PÊCHEUX, M. **Semântica e discurso. Uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio**. Tradução Eni Pulcinelli Orlandi [et al.] Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1997.
- PRESTES, M. L de M. **A pesquisa e a construção do conhecimento científico: do planejamento aos textos, da escola à academia**. 4ª ed. São Paulo: Respel, 2012.
- TÍLIO, Rogério. Revisitando a Análise Crítica do Discurso: um instrumental teórico metodológico **In: Revista do Curso de Letras da UNIABEU** Nilópolis, v. 1, n. 2, Mai. - Ago. 2010.
- Van DIJK, T. A. Cincuenta años de estudios del discurso. **Discurso e Sociedade**. V. 9 (11)15-32. Disponível: www.dissoc.orgs. Acesso em: 06 de maio de 2021.
- Van LEEUWEN, T. **Discourse in Practice: new Tools for critical Discourse Analysis**. Nova York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- WODAK, R. **Disorders of Discourse**. Nova York: Logman, 2005.
- Universidade Federal do Piauí. **I encontro Nacional de Discurso, Identidade e Subjetividade** – Anais do I ENDIS – NEPAD/NEPAC. Disponível em: drive.google.com/d/1HSjB8X9MCjW_AWI45_5HphemBXXblaD/view. Acesso em: 30 de abril de 2021.