

# Arts, Linguistics, Literature and Language Research Journal

## CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE AND INTERCULTURAL HUMAN RIGHTS: CONTRIBUTIVE DIALOGUE FOR THE FORMAL EDUCATION OF DEAF BRAZILIANS<sup>1</sup>

---

*Cleide Emilia Faye Pedrosa*

Post-Doctorate in Linguistics (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Brazil); teacher Dr. in the Postgraduate Program in Languages and in the Department of Sign Language at the Federal University of Sergipe; Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil

*Alzenira Aquino de Oliveira*

Master in Languages, doctoral student in Languages, and professor at the Department of Sign Languages at the Federal University of Sergipe; Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil

*Juliana Barbosa Alves*

Master's student in Languages and graduation in Sign Languages; Federal University of Sergipe; Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil

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).



---

<sup>1</sup> Role presented at the III International Online Congress of Studies on Cultures, in the online modality, Foz de Iguaçu, PR, Brazil 2021, published, in Portuguese, with changes as a book chapter: Intercultural human rights and education of the deaf: a reading under the lens of critical discourse analysis. In: BATISTA, Fabiano Eloy Atilio. Art: multiculturalism and cultural diversity 2. Ponta Grossa, PR: Atena, 2021. p. 65-79. ISBN: 978-65-5983-531-7. Introduced in this article, with changes and significant theoretical additions.

***Joao Paulo Lima Cunha***

PhD in Languages from the Federal University of Sergipe, professor at the Federal Institute of Ceará - Brazil

***Taysa Mercia dos Santos Souza Damaceno***

PhD in Applied Linguistics from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte; Professor at the Postgraduate Program in Languages, Federal University of Sergipe; Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil

***Paulo Sergio da Silva Santos***

PhD in Applied Linguistics from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte; professor at the Federal University of Sergipe; Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil

***Leoni Ramos Souza Nascimento***

Doctoral student in Languages at the Federal University of Sergipe; Professor in Brazilian Sign Language at the Federal University of Rondônia, Brazil

***Neemias Gomes Santana***

Master's student at the Federal University of Sergipe, professor of Brazilian Sign Language at the University of Brasília, Brazil

**Abstract:** This work is part of the Research Project - Citizen learning in the context of citizenship-humanization: the role of critical discourse analysis in favor of vulnerable groups (PVD7353-2019)<sup>2</sup>- which works with vulnerable groups, in our case, the deaf community. We know that the Deaf People have in their history the denial of rights that, over the years, has become a mark of the deaf community's struggle for recognition of their identity and culture, as well as for a formal bilingual education. We seek support in Critical Discourse Analysis, ACD, which focuses on its goals the denunciation of oppressive relationships. Anchored in the transdisciplinary character of ACD, we dialogue with Deaf Studies and Intercultural Human Rights Studies, from a decolonial perspective. With this, the goal is to analyze linguistic and socio discursively demanding speeches of deaf regarding their intercultural right to a formal bilingual education. The fragments were analyzed in the light of the methodology qualitative - interpretative, because it is about a social bias survey. To meet the linguistic analyses, we use a grammar that considers the social context of language use, namely the Systemic-Functional Grammar. As a result, the demand speeches of the deaf for recognition and redistribution of bilingual education in offered conditions to reflect on the denial of rights imposed to the Deaf People and the need urgent access to intercultural human rights that recognize aspects of the identity and culture of the deaf community for an equitable education.

**Keywords:** Critical Discourse Analysis; Recognition; Redistribution, Intercultural Human Rights; Deaf People; Equitable Education.

---

<sup>2</sup> Research developed with a Scientific Initiation grant from the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Brazil.

## INTRODUCTION

A critical analysis of sociocultural contexts that pervade the (Western) world indicates how exclusionary we are. For us, scientific knowledge is currently a privileged way of knowing that it has been officially legitimized and with it comes other privileges, named by Santos (2010a) as extra-cognitive, such as the social, political, cultural, etc. In the culture of a listening society, the deaf culture, most of the time, is denied or made invisible. Having these aspects on the agenda, the goal of this article is to analyze linguistic and socio-discursively demanding speeches of the deaf regarding their intercultural right to have a formal bilingual education.

In order to develop this text, we will establish a theoretical dialogue between Critical Discourse Analysis, Deaf Studies and Intercultural Rights. And we will follow a qualitative-interpretative methodology, while the corpus of analysis will be based on fragments extracted from textual productions of deaf candidates to the special entrance exam of sign language of UFS, in the year 2020 with the theme Bilingual School for the Deaf.

Thus, to meet the formation of this material, it will be presented, first through this introduction, and then we will develop two theoretical topics, one based on Critical Discourse Analysis (ACD) and another, in which we combine Deaf Studies and Human Rights. Intercultural Humans. Then, we will expose the research methodology in order to support the results and discussions. Finally, we will draw some conclusions.

## NOTES FOR CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

It was in the 1980s, with the publication of

3 January 1991 was an important month for the development of a new perspective on language, against the background of a small symposium in Amsterdam. Several names, today relevant in ACD, met for two days: Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunter Kress, Theo van Leeuwen and Ruth Wodak. These authors presented different approaches to studies on language, and, thus, CDA emerges as a type of analysis of a heterogeneous group, however, interrelated. The bases: study of language and the crucial role of context (PEDROSA, 2008).

Language and Control, that Gunther Kress and Roger Fowler raised central questions about critical discourse theory as an instrument of social change, privileging texts as the materialization of these discourses within a postmodernist position. -structuralist, bringing as evidence the correlations between linguistic structure and social structure, since social relations influence the linguistic and non-linguistic practices of the subjects. The new theory cited:

[...] a linguistics focused on practical issues. It is not the simple application of theory for practical purposes, but thinking about the theory itself differently, never losing sight of the fact that our work has to have some relevance. Relevance to our lives, to society at large (RAJAGOPALAN, 2003, p.12).

This model of Linguistics started to defend the thesis that social meanings and their realizations in texts must be represented by the linguistic analysis model to understand ideological processes. It meant theorizing language as a social practice, as an intervention in the social, economic and ideological reproduction that permeates the central framework of a Critical Linguistics (CL). It tried to postulate different indices of Functional Linguistics, which understands language through its different functions and ways of performing, not covering the entire context of the possibilities of “equipping readers to make demystifying readings of ideologically marked texts” (FOWLER, 2004, p.211).

In the 1990s, after the Amsterdam Congress<sup>3</sup>, other critical linguists believed that the relations between language and society are so complex and multifaceted that they adopted an interdisciplinary research focus: the development of a critical

tradition in discourse analysis, from the dialogue of Hallidayan linguistics, Bernstein's sociolinguistics and also the work of literary critics and philosophers such as Pêcheux, Foucault, Habermas, Bakhtin and Voloshinov (WODAK, 2003).

Scholars who began to dedicate themselves to linguistic, semiotic and discursive analysis, from different academic fields, shared a particular perspective, within which the concepts of power, ideology and history and context were central. Hence, understanding that the project of a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is already born within the common clashes in the relations established by the duet of language and ideology.

In that context, the Text and Discourse concepts are central for us to be able to articulate the generated data with the chosen theoretical dialogues and establish, from there, valid relationships for our goals. This way, let us see from what place we approach and assume these concepts.

Discourse is understood here as the use of language as a form of social practice and not as a purely individual activity or a reflection of situational varieties. Thus, we say that discourse is a mode of action, a way in which people can act on the world and, especially, on others, as well as a mode of representation. It is still an ideological and political practice that helps in the establishment, maintenance and transformation of power relations, as well as the collective entities in which such relations exist (FAIRCLOUGH, 2001). The materialization of the Discourse takes place through the Text, through linguistic achievements. "Text is considered here as a dimension of discourse: the written or spoken 'product' of the textual production process" (FAIRCLOUGH, 2001, p. 21).

The texts are, therefore, the empirical material for the critique of social processes of change or maintenance of social practices,

since language constitutes and is constituted by society. According to Fairclough (2006), social life is increasingly mediated by texts in all fields of human activity. In times of late modernity, of planetary capitalism, globalization and its processes of intervention in people's daily lives are inexorable.

## **DEAF STUDIES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INTERCULTURAL HUMAN RIGHTS**

Socially, knowledge is not equitably distributed. It is easily identified that epistemological and/or sociological privileges stand out in our society as unequal. In fact, one type always refers to the other; for this reason, it is convenient to consider these issues from the perspective of Intercultural Human Rights (SANTOS, 2010a). There needs to be a reformist policy of abstract Human Rights, as they are not universally applied, for a more intercultural reading of these rights. The epistemological voices of the South need to echo socially in order to answer the question "how can human rights be a simultaneously cultural and global politics?" (SANTOS, 2010a, p. 437). According to the sociologist, we must emphasize that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 was prepared with representation of the minority of peoples. In these terms, we are led to what the perspective of "coloniality" makes us understand that deaf people also correspond to what Walsh (2009, p. 3) calls "oppressed" and "condemned". Thus, these two premises brought by Walsh (2009) and Santos (2010) underlie the situation of the deaf in Brazil. A country so rich and unequal at the same time, that they do not recognize in "minorized" groups the potency of knowledge that springs from these communities.

Stereotyped, the deaf in Brazil carry a derogatory reputation that persists in classifying and degrading them to a lower

level than people who can hear. Their bodies are “condemned” to a pathological and unjust vision, plastered in what Walsh (2009) calls an instrument of classification and social control, resulting in excluding educational practices that do not contribute to the construction of the deaf person’s subjectivity. Still, regarding this maneuver, Fernandes (2015, p. 43), when citing Foucault (1997), reveals how this “disciplinary procedure” combines domains and controls, materialized in a “practice of control established not over, but in the social body itself”.

The lower level that persists in categorizing deaf people in Brazil and in the world, categorizing from the perspective of knowledge and knowledge of the world that these communities preserve, all this comes from political and ideological clashes related to the physiology of deafness. Globally speaking, the issue of deafness had great repercussion in the 19th century, in which the Italian city of Milan gathered hundreds of people to discuss how deaf people must be seen, taught and included in society. The Milan International Congress, in 1880, defended the “Oral Method” as the appropriate didactic-methodological approach for the resignification of the deaf person, completely abstaining from the use and dissemination of signed language (ROCHELLE, 1880).

For this and other factors, we believe that the stereotypes that marginalize deaf people, in this decolonial context, promote a clarification of ideas, leading us to the understanding that the CDA also “encompasses” Deaf Studies in its repertoire in favor of a deconstruction ideological, revealing asymmetric relationships between deaf and non-deaf people in all social contexts.

Given the facts, Severo (2013) suggests that public policies and local practices must be brought together, directing us to issues that deal with language management. Since

Sign language is recognized as a language by Law 10,436, of April 24, 2002 (BRASIL, 2002), there is an explicit policy in favor of the rights that native speakers of this language have. However, the borders that the intercultural relationship between hearing people, deaf people and people with hearing impairment, especially between sign language (Sign language) and oral language (LP), make cultural issues increasingly distance, creating a fine line for those who want to live and express themselves freely in their language.

In order to highlight the proposal of the DHI (Intercultural Human Rights), we have 5 premises (SANTOS, 2010a, p. 445-447): overcoming universalism and cultural relativism; “all cultures have conceptions of human dignity, but not all of them conceive in terms of human rights”; “all cultures are incomplete and problematic in their conceptions of human dignity”; cultures are not monolithic; “all cultures tend to distribute people and social groups between two competing principles of belonging (...) that of equality (...) and (...) that of difference”. In this same line of reasoning, we come to the understanding that identities are built through the relationship with the other, otherness, is built by differences and social experiences. As with all cultures, deafness is the behavior shared by deaf people in the experience exchanged with their peers, whether in institutionalized places (schools, associations, churches) or in informal meetings. Which in turn brings the identification of belonging to a distinct people.

Deaf culture as a difference constitutes a creative activity. Symbols and practices never achieved, never approached the listening culture. It is disciplined by a form of visual action and performance. I have already stated that to be deaf is to belong to a world of visual rather than auditory experience. I suggest the positive statement that deaf culture does not mix with hearing.



This breaks the old social status represented for the deaf: the deaf has to be a listener, an affirmation that is growing, but socially hidden. It also breaks the claim that the deaf is a user of the hearing culture (PERLIN, 2016, p. 56-57).

According to the deaf researcher Perlin (2016), the deaf identity is built within a visual culture and this difference needs to be understood not as an isolated construction, but as a multicultural construction. It is also worth mentioning two important concepts postulated by Karin Strobel (2016), widely used to talk about deaf culture, first the deaf people are considered the group of individuals who share the same language, histories, customs, traditions and similar interests, in short, a common origin, a visual ethical code and the lack of hearing.

The second concept, no less important, is the deaf community being composed not only of deaf subjects, but any family member, interpreters, teachers, friends and others who are interested in and fight for the appreciation of deafness and support for deaf individuals of different ways, being carried out in a certain meeting location, where there is a mutual exchange of knowledge, where everyone learns together in the same space (STROBEL, 2016).

Walsh (2009) discusses linguistic-cultural interculturality and opposes the term “bicultural”. We agree with the author, in the sense that we will never be bicultural due to the “global and integrative nature of culture”, always adding new formulations as new living conditions and needs arise (WALSH, 2009, p. 5). These premises refer us to the differences between deaf cultures and hearing cultures; but they can also lead us to a desired intercultural dialogue through the recognition of the incompleteness of each culture. This way, we will seek a new redistribution of material and immaterial goods, such as education, for example. With this stance, we will have the

possibility of breaking the hegemony of the listener’s cultural imperialism, established by the fact that the deaf population in the world is a minority, peripheral.

## METHODOLOGY

Critical Discourse Analysis embraces, in its academic and social research, the causes of wronged groups (MELO, 2018; PEDROSA; CUNHA; BRITO, 2020). Critical discourse analysts seek to understand and shed light on inequalities by taking a position of engagement in favor of minority groups (MELO, 2018), for that, “to provide reflections, awareness, concerns and various provocations, so that the reader always takes a position in favor of the vulnerable” (PEDROSA; CUNHA; BRITO, 2020, p. 52). Its methodology places the researcher as an observer and critical reader of the world, because it works with the interpretation of social and discursive events recorded in texts. (PARDO, 2015).

Due to the fact that CDA is a transdisciplinary approach, the present article transits between some theories and interface areas that complement each other, thus following the Brazilian current of interdisciplinary nature proposed by Pedrosa (2012), the Sociological and Communicational Approach to Discourse in dialogue with Deaf Studies.

The texts were linguistically analyzed under the lens of a grammar of use, the Systemic-Functional Grammar - GSF, proposed by Michael Halliday in 1994 (FUZER, 2014), which considers the semantics of the language (systemic basis) allied to its functionality produced in the (functional) language sentences, thus allowing us to analyze textual productions as flows of meanings and intentions that mediate personal relationships, considering their production contexts and the choices made by their (deaf) authors to construct their meanings, at the same time in

which they represent their understanding of reality in the world.

One of the common characteristics between Systemic-Functional Grammar and Critical Discourse Analysis is the ability to establish interdisciplinary relationships. The possible connections established between the social sciences, through the GSF and the ACD, seek to reflect on language and society, not perceiving them as a dichotomy, in which the idea of superposition persists, but as inseparable elements that sew the performances. language cultures.

This social character of the GSF justifies its use in the Sociological and Communicational Approach to Discourse, by Pedrosa (2012), and for both, the function of language is more important than form. This is how Halliday proposed three metafunctions that meet the needs of speakers when making use of language. Metafunctions are classified as ideational, interpersonal and textual, acting simultaneously in texts. Martin and White (2005) deepened Halliday's studies and developed the evaluative theory. The Evaluation System is divided into three subsystems: Attitude – affection, judgment and appreciation; Gradation – intensity (strength) and precision (focus); Engagement - monoglossia and heteroglossia.

We chose the Evaluation System (VIAN JR., 2010) to indicate the lexical-grammatical aspects that validate the reading of the chosen theme and that will be explained at the same time that we proceed with the analyses.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In order to achieve the proposed goal (To analyze linguistically and discursively the demanding discourses of the deaf regarding their intercultural right to have a formal bilingual education), we collected 12 essays from deaf candidates who took the special entrance exam to enter the "Letras Libras" course at the Universidade Federal de Sergipe (UFS), in the year 2020, and we selected twelve textual-discursive fragments (F) that contemplated the claim for a bilingual education.

**F1: 01 - LL - UFS/2020**<sup>4</sup>“*So Bilingual School for the Deaf helps a lot, it's not the same as inclusion school where the deaf will be happy, understand better, communicate easily. Sign language is the first language and Portuguese is the second for the deaf*”<sup>5</sup>.

**F2: 04 - LL - UFS/2020**<sup>6</sup>“*It is notorious in schools that have deaf children that their reality still leaves something to be desired because there are still cases of children not being assisted by professionals and due to the lack of bilingual teachers, thus leaving these students dissatisfied or even frustrated for not being able to interact with the environment. which are found*”<sup>7</sup>.

**F3: 05 - LL - UFS/2020**“*In the bilingual school itself, the teacher knows Sign language taught Deaf students well. (...) The teachers taught many and things the Deaf learned by developing good very important bilingual education for the deaf*”<sup>8</sup>.

**F4: 06 - LL - UFS/2020** “*Difficult in the inclusion of the deaf and hearing is not easily*

4 A nomenclature was created to preserve the identity of candidates, namely, 01 (random number per candidate), LL (Sign language course), UFS (Federal University of Sergipe, Brazil), 2020 (year of entrance exam).

5 **F1: 01 - LL - UFS/2020** “*Então Escola Bilingue para surdos, ajuda muito, não é igual escola inclusão que surdo vai ficar feliz, entende melhor, comunica facilmente. Libras é primeira a língua e Português é segunda para surdo*

6 DA candidate (hearing impaired).

7 **F2: 04 - LL - UFS/2020** “*É notório em escolas que tem crianças surdas que sua realidade ainda deixa a desejar pois ainda existem casos de crianças não assistida pelos profissionais e por falta de professores bilingües, deixando assim esses alunatos descontentato ou até mesmo frustados por não poder interagir com o meio os quais se encontram*”.

8 **F3: 05 - LL - UFS/2020** “*Na escola próprio bilingue, o professor sabe Libras ensinaram alunos dos Surdos bem. (...) Os professores ensinaram muitos e coisas dos Surdos aprenderam desenvolvindo bom muito importante educação bilingue para surdos*”.

*why the deaf do not understand Portuguese and there is a limit problem neither does not learn and does not exchange conversation, teacher is a Portuguese language but it is more difficult that the deaf do not have bilingual for inclusion than the deaf are limit are difficult have no acquisition to learn*<sup>9</sup>.

**F5: 12 - LL - UFS/2020** *“All bilingual education schools can be developed because, school has bilingual, teachers will be knowing sign language through, deaf and deaf are sharing Sign language. The important thing to teach all deaf people is Sign language”*<sup>10</sup>.

It is observed in the speeches of the deaf the use of lexicons (lacks, lack, dissatisfied, frustrated - F2; difficult, not gullible, limit problem, does not exchange conversation - F4) that refer to the educational context experienced by the deaf, and this reflects on a feeling (affection) of disrespect for their rights, as well as a negative judgment of society not in solidarity with their cause and, with regard to their right and the lack of access to education, the subjects make a negative assessment, which “it concerns the evaluations of elements around us, goods and services of our day-to-day” (ALMEIDA, 2010, p. 108).

The deaf, throughout their history, were denied the right to education, the use of speech and oralism were imposed. The devaluation of their language, sign language, led the education of the deaf to a great lag in their formal learning. We perceive this in the difficulty that most deaf people have with the Portuguese language (*the deaf do not understand Portuguese, the teacher is a Portuguese language, but this one is more difficult* - F4), which was taught to the deaf, with imposition, in its oral form. and writing,

**9 F4: 06 - LL - UFS/2020** *“Difícil na inclusão de surdo e ouvinte não tem ingulmente por que maior os surdos não entender de português e coisa problema limite nenhum não aprender e não troca conversar, professor é língua de português mas é mais difícil essa os surdos não tem bilingue para inclusão que surdos estão limite são difícil não tem aquisição de aprender”.*

**10 F5: 12 - LL - UFS/2020** *“A todas as escolas de bilingue de educação podem ser desenvolvidos pois, escola tem bilingue, os professores estarão conhecendo a língua de sinais por meio, surdo e surdo estão compartilhando a Libras. O importante de ensinar a todos os surdos é Libras”.*

disregarding sign language and the difference in the modality of the two languages in the teaching process, as well as the appropriate methodology for teaching Portuguese as L2. The subject recognizes the difficulty faced by the deaf, the historical burden of oppression, which is rescued in their speeches, as well as recognizes the imposition of oralization,

About this educational situation, we can reason as Professor Quadros does:

The Portuguese language is the L1 of Brazilian hearing children and, necessarily, it must be taught differently for deaf children who will acquire it as L2. In addition to the fact that the Portuguese language is not the L1 of the deaf, there is the question of the difference in the modality of the languages. The deaf child must acquire an L2 that is presented in a linguistic modality different from his L1, that is, he must learn a GRAPHIC-VISUAL language while his L1 is VISUAL-SPACE. Studies on the teaching of L2 start from the assumption that the child will be acquiring an L2 in the same linguistic modality as his L1. Thus, teaching L2 - Portuguese - for the deaf presents more complex issues that require further investigation. The process of acquiring an L2 in deaf children depends on at least two prerequisites:

The implementation of a bilingual school is one of the demands of the deaf community (*So Bilingual School for the deaf helps a lot, it is not the same school inclusion that the deaf will be happy, understand better, communicate easily. Sign language is the first language and Portuguese is second to Deaf- F1; In the bilingual school, the teacher knows Sign language taught Deaf students well. (...) The teachers taught many and things the Deaf learned by developing good very important bilingual education for the deaf* - F3). In this proposal, sign language is



the language of instruction in schools (L1), and Portuguese is the second language, taught through L1. This way, sign language has its linguistic recognition (QUADROS, 1997, 2010).

The practice of teachers without training for bilingual education, criticized by the deaf, is often related to the lack of a bilingual education policy and practices that consider the modality of sign language. Assuming that Sign language is a language of spatial-visual modality and the reception channel of a user of this language is visual, the use of technological resources or Assistive Technology can be used to increase the stimuli in the reception of sign language and hence the vocabulary repertoire. With this in focus, we have an example of some research, among them, one carried out in an institution for the habilitation and rehabilitation of the deaf, located in the interior of São Paulo, which sought through Augmented Reality (AR) technology.<sup>11</sup> Sign language RA software, teach vocabulary to students. The researchers evaluated the teaching program with AR as efficient, as it provided learning for all participants, with AR technology being skillful and valid to expand the dimension of the teaching-learning process (CARVALHO; MANZINI, 2017).

With the difficulties encountered by educators in the education of the deaf, research aimed at improving the teaching-learning process of deaf students comes in handy in this educational process under construction, for the benefit of the deaf community, as can be seen in the aforementioned work.

The educational process is a territory of struggles in which multiple deaf identities

are constituted – and at the same time denied. The nature of representations about deafness and the deaf that educators have certainly interfere and influence the representations of deaf people about themselves and about other deaf people. Power relations are asymmetrical, so when opportunities for group coexistence and knowledge of culture are denied, the process of constituting deaf identities becomes more difficult, causing many deaf people to reject their deaf identity and deny their difference (SÁ, 2002, p. 355-356).

In their speeches, deaf people express resistance (*very important bilingual education for the deaf* - F3; *The important thing to teach all deaf people is Sign language* - F5), because through the appreciation of their culture and identity, which is essential for the construction of a vision of deafness (identity), the deaf subject finds motivation to resist and fight for recognition. “The individual constructs the subject’s reasons: his motivations to act and the resistances that oppose him”, a hypothesis, from Sociology for Social Change, defended by Pedrosa (2012, p. 09) in the ASCD, which the individual can follow in his social relationships. The fact that you have a college entrance exam that meets your language needs (exam translated into Sign language,

When making a critical analysis of these discourses, we perceive, through the expression of emotion (affection), the self-esteem of these subjects, when seeing the deaf community having space and being recognized, “After all, seeking justice, equality and democracy consists of in an inescapable ideal for critical science” (GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, 2018, p. 79), for Critical Discourse Analysis.

11 Among the activities carried out in the research, students must sign the figure in Sign language, interpret the sign of the word and write it, or read the word and represent its corresponding sign. There were relationships between the written word in Portuguese, figure and sign of the word in Sign language. In the construction activities, the ones that had the best results were the construction of signs in Sign language, either through the figure or the Portuguese language, with the relationship with the figure being more significant than the relationship with the Portuguese language. The results with the lowest levels were those of construction in the relationship between the Portuguese Language and the figure or sign in Sign language, with the student being required to write the word in Portuguese, with percentages of a maximum of 3% initially, and not reaching 50% at the end. With this result,

## CONCLUSION

The identified results, that is, the claims for a bilingual education of the deaf in their LP productions, consolidate the need to look at Human Rights in an intercultural way, so that we do not deny the cultural aspects that are different to us, but with which we can establish dialogues, as we recognize the incompleteness of each of the cultures, and thus learn new daily lessons (SANTOS, 2010a; 2010b; 2020). Lessons that evoke “a new politics of rights” (SANTOS, 2010a, p. 462) that include recognition and redistribution.

According to Cagliari (1989), there is no reasonable explanation for what is learned in school over the course of twelve or thirteen years. Therefore, it is time to see the needs that

deaf people, as a minority group, lack in order to be truly included in society. We believe that there is a theoretical and legal contribution to this guarantee and participation, however, the barriers imposed by listening, by linguistic inaccessibility in everyday social life distance the deaf people, making them limited and dependent on third parties.

Critical and reflective positioning of researchers who develop academic projects (VAN DIJK, 2008), aimed at a critical reading of the society in which they are inserted, are responses of engagement that are so necessary for inclusion processes to happen socially in the face of such abyssal distance from rights and privileges that “choose” whom to serve, and this occurs in such a way that they pass themselves off as naturalized.

## REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA, F. S. D. P. Atitude: afeto, julgamento e apreciação. In: VIAN JR., O.; SOUZA, A. A. de; ALMEIDA, F. S. D. P. (Orgs.). *A linguagem da avaliação em língua portuguesa*. Estudos sistêmico-funcionais com base no Sistema de Avaliatividade. São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores, 2010, p. 99-112.
- CARVALHO, D. de; MANZINI, E. J. Aplicação de um Programa de Ensino de Palavras em Sign language Utilizando Tecnologia de Realidade Aumentada. *Rev. Bras. Ed. Esp.*, Marília, v. 23, n. 2, abr./jun., 2017, p. 215-232.
- CAGLIARI, Luis, C. *Alfabetização e Linguística*. São Paulo: Ed. Scipione, 1989
- GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, P. R. Discurso e prática social. In: BATISTA JR., J. R. L.; SATO, D. T. B.; MELO, I. F. de. (Orgs.). *Análise de discurso crítica para linguistas e não linguistas*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2018, p. 78-103.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman. *Discurso e Mudança Social*. Tradução de Izabel Magalhães. Brasília: Editora UnB, 2001[1992].
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman. *Language and globalization*. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.
- FERNANDES, E.; [et al]. *Surdez e bilinguismo*. 7 ed. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2015.
- FOUCAULT, M. *As palavras e as coisas*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1997.
- FOWLER, Roger. Sobre a Linguística Crítica. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso – LemD*, Tubarão. v.4, nesp. p.207-222, 2004. Disponível em: <[http://www.portaldeperiodicos.unisul.br/index.php/Linguagem\\_Discurso/article/view/296/310](http://www.portaldeperiodicos.unisul.br/index.php/Linguagem_Discurso/article/view/296/310)>. Acesso: 20.01.2011.
- FUZER, Cristiane; CABRAL, Sara Regina Scotta. *Introdução à gramática sistêmico-funcional em língua portuguesa*. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2014.228p.
- HONNETH, Axel. *Luta por reconhecimento: a gramática moral dos conflitos sociais*. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2009.
- LODI, A. C. B.; HARRISON, K. M. P.; CAMPOS, S. R. L. de. Letramento e surdez: um olhar sobre as particularidades dentro do contexto educacional. In: LODI, A. C. B.; et al. (Orgs.). *Letramento e minorias*. 3. ed. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2009, p. 35-46.

MELO, Iran Ferreira de. História da análise de discurso crítica. In: BATISTA JR., J. R. L.; SATO, D. T. B.; MELO, I. F. de. (Orgs.). *Análise de discurso crítica para linguistas e não linguistas*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2018, p. 20-35.

PARDO, Maria Laura. METODOLOGIA DE LA INVESTIGACIÓN EM LINGÜÍSTICA: REFLEXIONES Y PROPUESTA. *Revista da ABRALIN*, v. 14, n. 2, jul./dez. 2015, p. 271-288. Disponível em: <https://revista.abralin.org/index.php/abralin/article/view/1267>. Acesso em: 15 de mar. 2021.

PEDROSA, Cleide Emília Faye. *Abordagem Sociológica e Comunicacional Do Discurso (ASCD): uma corrente para fazer Análise Crítica do Discurso*. PARTE 1: Herança teórica da Sociologia (Aplicada) para a Mudança Social. Natal: UFRN, 2012. Texto fundador. Disponível em: [www.ascd.com.br](http://www.ascd.com.br).

PEDROSA, Cleide Emília Faye; CUNHA, João Paulo Lima; BRITO, Maiane Vasconcelos de. CIDADANIA DE RESISTÊNCIA: OS ESTUDOS CRÍTICOS DO DISCURSO E A EDUCAÇÃO DE SURDOS. SOUZA, Rita de Cácia Santos; BARBOSA, Josilene Souza Lima (Orgs.) *Surdez e Sign language*. 1. ed. Aracaju, SE: Criação Editora, 2020, p. 31-55. 216 p. ISBN: 978-65-88593-08-0. Disponível em: <http://editoracriacao.com.br/e-books/>. Acesso em: 22 out. 2020.

PERLIN, Gladis. Identidades surdas. In: SKLIAR, Carlos. *A surdez: um olhar sobre as diferenças*. 8. ed. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2016, p. 51-73.

QUADROS, R. M. de. *Educação de surdos: aquisição da linguagem*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 1997.

QUADROS, R. M. de. O 'Bi' em bilinguismo na educação de surdos. In: FERNANDES, E. *Surdez e bilinguismo*. 4. ed. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2010, p. 27-37.

RAJAGOPALAN, Kanavillil. Por uma linguística crítica: linguagem, identidade e questão ética. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2003.

ROCHELE, E. L. *Le Congrès de Milan pour l'amélioration du sort des sourds- muets; rapport adresse a M. EugènePereire*. Paris: M. Saint-Jorre, 1880.

SÁ, N. R. L. de. *Cultura, poder e educação de surdos*. Manaus: Editora da Universidade Federal do Amazonas, 2002.

SALLES, Heloísa Maria Moreira Lima. *Ensino de Português para Surdos: caminhos para a prática pedagógica*. Vol. 2. Brasília: Programa de Apoio à Educação dos Surdos, 2004.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. *A gramática do tempo: para uma nova cultura política*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010a.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Descolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder*. Montivideu: Uruguai: Ediciones Trilce - Extensión Universitaria, Universidad de la República, 2010b.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Cruel Pedagogia do Vírus*. Coimbra, Portugal: Edições Almedina, S.A., 2020.

SEVERO, Cristine Gorski. *Política(s) Linguística(s) e questões de poder*. Alfa Revista de Linguística, v. 57, nº 2. São Paulo: Universidade Estadual Paulista, 2013, p. 451-473.

STROBEL, K. *As imagens do outro sobre a cultura surda*. 4. ed. Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC, 2016.

VAN DIJK, Teun A. Discurso e poder. Hoffnagel, J.; Falcone, K. (Orgs.). São Paulo: Contexto, 2008.

VIAN JR., Orlando. O Sistema de Avaliatividade e a linguagem da avaliação. In: VIAN JR., Orlando; SOUZA, Anderson Alves de; ALMEIDA, Fábíola Aparecida Sartin Dutra Parreira (Orgs.). *A linguagem da avaliação em língua portuguesa*. Estudos sistêmico-funcionais com base no Sistema de Avaliatividade. São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores, 2010, p. 19-29.

WALSH, Catherine. Interculturalid crítica y educación intercultural. Seminário "Interculturalidad y Educación Intercultural", organizado por el Instituto Internacional de Integración del Convenio Andrés Bello, La Paz, 9-11 de março de 2009.

WODAK, Ruth. De qué trata el análisis crítico del discurso (ACD). Resumen de su historia, sus conceptos fundamentales y sus desarrollos. In: WODAK, Ruth y MEYER, Michel. *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso*. Barcelona: Gedisa Editorial, 2003.