

Revision articles

Discourse analysis and Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences – a promising dialogue

Análise de discurso e a fonoaudiologia: um diálogo promissor

Cynthia Ferreira Gonçalves⁽¹⁾

Regina Maria Ayres de Camargo Freire⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brasil.

Conflict of interest: non-existent

ABSTRACT

Purpose: in the Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences field, there is a growing interest in studies directing their focus on the discourse, especially those centering conjectural disciplines, such as the French Discourse Analysis, which is highlighted in this paper. Several Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences areas have benefited when approaching discourse analysis as a theory and method for researching. There is a mutual interest between theory and method allowing for dialogue in the search for answers to questions that are recurrent in the practice of each one in particular.

Methods: to identify articles and dissertations in the area of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences which used the French Discourse Analysis as a theoretical and methodological device, and compile the findings.

Results: it was possible to identify certain discursive properties in stuttering; to point out the interpretation as a therapeutic technique to act on the speech of patients; accept the demand of patients from the effects indicated by the subject's sayings; raise the listening and interpretation for speech and language diagnosis committed to the subject in its language symptom, and the audiologist's subjection to the dominant ideology, giving his training some maneuvering space.

Conclusion: the Discourse Analysis contributes to questioning the field of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences as it relates to clinical method and its institutional operation, discussing ideological issues and questioning the listening, interpretation and discourse, in a perspective that faces ideology and subjectivity, serving, perhaps, as a tool for the Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences practice data analysis.

Keywords: Speech; Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences; Therapeutics; Hearing

RESUMO

Objetivo: há um crescente interesse da Fonoaudiologia por estudos que dirigem seu foco ao discurso, em especial os que centralizam disciplinas indiciárias, como a Análise de Discurso de linha francesa, destaque neste trabalho. Diversas áreas da Fonoaudiologia têm sido beneficiadas ao se aproximar da Análise do Discurso como teoria e método para a pesquisa. Há uma relação de interesses entre ambas que permite o diálogo na busca de respostas às questões recorrentes da prática de cada uma em particular.

Métodos: identificar artigos e dissertações produzidas na área da Fonoaudiologia que utilizaram a Análise de Discurso de linha francesa como dispositivo teórico-metodológico e compilar seus achados.

Resultados: foi possível identificar certas propriedades discursivas na gagueira; pontuar a interpretação enquanto técnica terapêutica para agir sobre a fala de pacientes; acolher a demanda de pacientes a partir dos efeitos que o sujeito indicia em seus dizeres; alçar a escuta e a interpretação para o diagnóstico fonoaudiológico comprometido com o sujeito em seu sintoma de linguagem e o assujeitamento do Fonoaudiólogo à ideologia dominante abrindo-lhe um espaço de manobra em sua formação.

Conclusão: a Análise do Discurso contribui para a problematização do campo fonoaudiológico no que diz respeito ao seu método clínico e sua atuação institucional, discutindo questões ideológicas e questionando a escuta, a interpretação e o discurso, dentro de uma perspectiva que faceia ideologia e subjetividade, podendo servir de instrumento para análise de dados da prática fonoaudiológica.

Descritores: Fala; Fonoaudiologia; Terapêutica; Audição

Received on: December 03, 2015
Accepted on: June 09, 2016

Mailing address:

Cynthia Ferreira Gonçalves
Rua Doutor Clementino, 456. Apto: 114 B
Belenzinho – São Paulo – SP
CEP: 03059-030
E-mail: cynthiafgon@yahoo.com.br

INTRODUCTION

The French Discourse Analysis is a theoretical and methodological approach significantly used in the Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences field. Its assumptions are in line with issues pertaining to this field by highly recognizing, in its studies, speech and its effects, the subjugated subject, the Other, interpretation, meaning, and ideology.

It is understood that this analysis model could be more widely used. To reinforce this, we identified several articles and research papers in the field of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences that have used the French Discourse Analysis tools. Therefore, the objective of this study is to present these papers and to attest to the meaningful dialogue that can take place between these two disciplines.

A brief summary of the main concepts of the French Discourse Analysis will be presented below.

The French Discourse Analysis (DA) began its historic journey in France in the 60s, in an environment dominated by the structuralism of Levi Strauss and Roland Barthes, with a discourse analysis model based on the assumptions of the Social Sciences. The theoretical proposal of DA, which occurs in between disciplines, is often called transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary. DA proposes a theory that combines the relation between discourse, history, and the subject of enunciation. Pêcheux indicates that the reference to history could be threatened by a major impasse: to understand that social factors materialize themselves in the language or to try to address a linguistic change through the perspective of speech and speakers. Therefore, he makes a proposal that will be called the French Discourse Analysis to differentiate it from other approaches. Michel Pêcheux - whose works address issues related to discourse ideology - and other authors who translate his work and give continuity to it: Françoise Gadet, Catherine Fuchs, in France, and Eni Orlandi, among others, will be the reference authors for this paper.

According to Gadet¹, Pêcheux had two reasons for choosing speech as the precise point where one could theoretically intervene, and therefore propose a theory for discourse -- "the hidden relationship between political practice and social sciences" and "a link between political practice and discourse". In this sense, Pêcheux rejects the reductionist concept of language as a communication tool. To theoretically develop an "original concept of language", Pêcheux went to Structuralism in search of definitions. Pêcheux's

major concern was the "link between discourse and political practice, a link that, according to him, passes through ideology." In making this reference, Pêcheux introduces the concept of the subject as "elementary ideological effect", i.e., one that is "always already a subject." According to him, "it is as a subject that anyone is challenged to occupy a particular place in the production system"¹.

Pêcheux was committed to discern the relationship between "the subject of language" and "the subject of ideology", i.e., "the relationship between the subjective evidence and the evidence of sense (or meaning), and he placed discourse between language (from a linguistic perspective, the Saussurean concept of language) and ideology"¹. At this point, his concern was not to define the concept of ideology, but to understand the connection between the object of the discourse theory analysis and the object of linguistics.

According to Gadet and Hak¹, for Pêcheux, language, a concept taken from Saussure, "should be thought of as a system," not having the function of expressing meaning, "becomes an object from which a science can describe the operation (...) one should not seek what each part means, but what are the rules that make any part possible, that is, language is a set of systems that allow combinations and substitutions."

In DA, the object of study is the discourse, understood as an historical object whose specific materiality is linguistic. To the speech analyst it is important to address that which causes a discourse to be one single sequence, a specific linguistic totality and not just a set of phrases.

DA seeks to understand the language making sense as a symbolic work, part of the general social work, constitutive of man and his history. Language is the possibility of discourse. From this perspective, language is understood as "incomplete and heterogeneous because it is affected by history, being always prone to slips, to multiple meanings, and to ambiguity. It is understood as a material way to reach the subject. Discourse analysis comprises both subject and meaning constituting themselves at the same time. Neither are transparent and should be observed from their linguistic materiality"².

In DA, language is the possibility of discourse between subjects, speech is its object of study, and language is understood as "speech, use, language actions, interaction, mediation, action that transforms"³ and becomes functional when there is a relationship between language and speech.

In the subject's speech, one can identify discourse that slides between paraphrastic and polysemic processes. The paraphrastic processes are those, which, maintaining the same meaning, can be said in various ways, and the polysemic processes are those determining different meanings of what is being said.

Discourse varies according to conditions under which it is produced and its meaning depends on the position of the one who speaks, to whom he/she is speaking, and from where he/she speaks. "The socio-historical context, the situation, and the other parties - technically called production conditions - constitute the produced verbal instance, i.e., the discourse"³.

Production conditions are imaginary formations representing the mechanism of locating protagonists and the object of discourse; they can be thought of in a broad sense. They comprehend the enunciation circumstances, that is, the immediate context, and include sociohistorical and ideological context. They comprehend the images of the subjects, as well as of the object of the discourse, before a sociohistorical context. "Therefore, images of the enunciation subject position are formed (who am I to speak to you this way?), but also of the other party's subject position (who is he to speak to me this way? or, that I speak to him this way?), as well as images of the discourse object (about what am I talking? about what is he talking to me?)"¹.

Two factors related to the conditions of production are worth nothing: the first one concerns the relationship of forces - which refers to the place from where the subject speaks and the value of his/her position in the discourse. The second factor relates to the anticipation mechanism, in which the subject will say it in one way or another, according to the effect the subject believes to have on his/her listener. According to Orlandi³, "By anticipation the speaker experiences the place of his/her listener from his/her own place: it is the way the speaker depicts representations of his/her interlocutor and vice versa." In this case, what the enunciator assumes that the listener will think will be his own saying.

In DA, enunciation of the same linguistic materiality, under different conditions, can generate different effects of meaning. According to Orlandi³, "the effects of meaning are produced by mechanisms such as records, types of discourse, and are also produced by the fact that the place of the interlocutors has significance. This is specificity: in the interlocutor dialogue

marks there are traces of the relationship between discursive formation and ideological formation."

Another important concept in DA refers to discursive formations (DF) which represent, in discourse, ideological formations (IF) corresponding to them. In DA, the same word can have different meanings, according to the discourse formation in which it was produced. "What is said has a meaning in relation to what is not said, to the social place of which it is said, to whom it is said, in relation to other discourses, etc. All of that - articulated as imaginary formations - can be seen in the existing relationship between discursive formations and the dominant ideological formation"³.

A DF is formed within an interdiscourse, also called discursive memory, which is the place where the subject extracts what is possible and what is not possible in his/her speech, according to his/her DF. "This interdiscourse would be like a trunk, where the subject finds a set of possibilities for his/her verbal expression, and these can be confused with verbal expression possibilities from other FDs, therefore generating new meanings"². Discursive formation is the place of meaning, metaphor, interpretation, and ideology. It is through DFs that ideological formation presents itself. Discursive formation mediates, on the one hand, production conditions and discursive functioning, and, on the other hand, ideological formation. Discursive functioning, according to Orlandi³ "is the structuring activity of a given discourse, by a particular speaker, with specific purposes."

In considering discursive issues, Pêcheux⁴ mentions two *forgettings* in discourse. *Forgetting* number 1, of unconscious nature, is called ideological concealment in which the subject has the illusion of being the origin of what he says. According to the author, a discursive formation dominates the subject, where the already spoken discourse of the other is reproduced. This area is inaccessible to the subject. *Forgetting* number 2 relates to enunciation processes in which there is partial linguistic concealment, a preconscious/conscious type, where the subject has the illusion that his/her saying expresses exactly what he/she thinks. This is a zone where the subject can consciously enter. This occurs when the subject reformats his/her saying with the intention of expressing in the best possible way his/her ideas, with the illusion of controlling the meaning of what is said.

In this sense, the author makes an analogy between these two types of *forgettings* and the "opposition of the forgettings of Lacanian theory, when mentioning that in

the first type of forgetting the process of interpellation-subjection of the subject was referred to by Lacan as *Other*. Regarding the second type of forgetting, Lacan called it imaginary identification. [(Wherein the *Other* relates to *another (Other)*)]^{5,6}.

DA also brings the concept of interpretation, which, according to Orlandi³ is the condition for the existence of meaning, illustrating the presence of ideology. The subject is led to interpret any symbolic object, and this interpretation is actually an ideological effect, because the meaning attributed by the subject, refers to its historicity and, therefore, language and history lose opacity and depth. Discourse is where one can observe the relationship between language and ideology -- language being understood as production of meaning by/for subjects.

“The interpretation in DA deals with the process of signification, but not seeking a sole or true meaning, because that interpretation is involved with different possible meanings that speech may have, depending on the conditions in which it was produced, not only on subject intentions, but also on situations experienced”².

DA is undergoing a theoretical reformulation as it relates to the concept of subjectivity. Initially there is talk of “subject as ideological effect”¹. In 1975, along with Fuchs, Pêcheux starts to talk about “a theory of subjectivity, of psychoanalytical nature”¹. Later, Pêcheux enunciates notions of the unconscious and ideology when proposing what he called a “non-subjective theory of subjectivity”⁴.

As for discourse typology, which is also part of discussions in DA, three types may be differentiated: ludic, authoritative and controversial, respectively characterized as predominantly polysemic, paraphrastic and balanced. This typology was structured taking the Pedagogic Discourse study by Orlandi³, as a basis, with the purpose of serving as a discourse analysis method. Ludic discourse is the discourse of joking and of irony (in the sense of saying the opposite of what one wants to say). The authoritative discourse is directed by the one who speaks, characterized by non-reversibility, that is, absence of shift change in discourse. This type of discourse tends to silence the *Other*, denying the occupation of different positions and immobilizing him/her - producing meaning that is not forbidden. In the controversial speech however, the referent changes direction and in doing so, the discourse is changed or modified.

According to Gadet and Hak¹, the term *referent* is clarified by Pêcheux when referring to Roman⁷, who says that this is a context being used as a message between the sender and the recipient.

DA has an extensive theory, however; this study will be limited to the main concepts, discussed throughout the text.

METHODS

Survey in bibliographical sources of articles, dissertations and theses in the Postgraduate Programs in the area of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences in which the French Discourse Analysis has been used as theoretical and methodological tool. Eight research papers published from 2000 to 2012 were selected, all from the Postgraduate Program in Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences at PUC-SP. The papers were read in full and will be summarized throughout the article.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Data Analysis

Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, as DA, is structured around the concept that the subject is marked by meaning in the different conditions of production to which he/she is submitted and, therefore, to the ideology to which he/she is subjugated. In Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences activities in the field of language and speech, many studies have benefited from the methodological theoretical model of the French Discourse Analysis.

Neiva⁸ investigated interpretation in Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, opening the possibility of proposing devices that theoretically guide interpretation as a clinical procedure. For the author, interpretation in Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences is the technique or the clinical instrument capable of generating displacements in the discourse of patients, transforming the language and, therefore, erasing the symptom. Noteworthy in this study is the fact that the terms *listening* and *interpretation* are in the center of the discussion for being considered fundamental for a phonoaudiologic diagnosis committed to the symptoms of language. In this manner, the term “*listening*” refers to working with the meaning carried by the clinician: it is nothing other than “*be open to what is said by the other*”, that is, open to meaning, counting on polysemy to interpret what is said. Repeating what is said, the clinician is setting up a possible effect of

meaning. The idea of opacity is the condition for the notion of listening because the meanings are not transparent. Therefore, the clinician needs to make temporary conjectures, that is, to interpret⁹.

In another research paper, Castellano¹⁰ examines the terms “*Listening* and *Interpretation*” because he “considers them fundamental in the therapeutic process committed to a relationship dialectically built”. For the author, “to assume a dialectic is to foresee that therapist and patient engage in a subjective manner, which imposes the statement that each session evokes a unique relation between subjects, rejecting any proposal that defends homogeneity” (p. 2). The author started from theoretical assumptions based on the French Discourse Analysis, in that “the reading of the discourse is processed in the direction of the meaning surrounding it, without losing sight that what is not (or cannot be) verbalized by the patient is told by his/her story as a speaker” (p. 2). In this same perspective, “according to Orlandi¹¹ the word ‘*speech*’ supports the idea of route/path/words in motion. Discourse, made up of language, is the mediator between man and the world. Thus, language is not treated from the perspective of code, but from the multiple possibilities of connotation, in the various meanings it takes, according to the situations experienced by man in his reality”(p. 2).

The DA methodological theoretical tool, the researcher adds, may be accepted by Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences clinic, in other words, “to state in the production of the patient, his/her discursive affiliations, which are the marks of the functioning of language. This search does not focus on the message, which assumes a linear movement of the transmitter to the receiver. The interest is located in the discourse, when both - therapist and patient - simultaneously perform the process of signification “(p. 2). In this manner, when considering organic and neurological limitations of a patient with aphasia, their fragmented speech can become text in the therapist’s speech. To structure the patient’s speech, according to the researcher, the audiologist should take a position of listening and investigation of the discourse that takes place at the clinical session. In the interpretation form, the practitioner can grasp disorganized meanings present in the speech of patients with language symptoms. The therapist, in the position of structurer of the discourse, can then determine the therapy. Anchored in these described concepts, Castellano points out that the terms *listening* and *interpretation* were understood as

“*intertwined* and *inseparable*” notions, that is, when speaking the subject causes effects on the other party, however, it is necessary to “plan an interpretation” for the meaning of what was said to have direction and take effect in the speech of the *Other*.

Azevedo¹² was able to look at stuttering from a discursive point of view, making discursive cuts on two types of texts – of mothers of children referred to as stuttering, and of stutterers. By identifying certain discursive properties, he concluded that “stuttering is a discursive event directly related to conditions of production, indicating a prevalence of authoritative discourse in the speech of parents addressed to their child. It is a type of discourse where there is contention of polysemy and suppression of the referent. Therefore, the stutterer subject is not allowed to choose: he/she is alienated in the language or is muted by the conditions of production “(ibid, p. 5).

Based on DA, Passos and Freire¹³ proposed mechanism to theorize stuttering. They reported that during the twentieth century, many researches on stuttering were developed, mostly based on the positivist logical model which works with phenomena in their apparent aspect, guided by a linearity, that is, by the search for causes and effects in order to control and predict the events. After an epistemological survey of the different theories explaining stuttering, the authors based themselves on the theoretical position of Azevedo and Freire¹⁴ to consider differently the phase called normal dysfluency of speech which, in this perspective is viewed as a “child’s position in relation to language.” From there, supported by the theoretical and methodological approach of the French Discourse Analysis, they researched possible relationships between the discourse of parents and the emergence of their child’s stuttering, turning their attention to the interpretation of the child’s discourse and its effects on that child’s fluency. They concluded that “to consider the genesis of stuttering, it would be essential to take into account: a) the interpretation that the Other gives to the child’s speech; b) how the child hears his/her own speech, and c) the symbolic over determination of language - re-signifying repetitions and hesitations as inherent to the process of language acquisition by the child “(p 1).

On the other hand, in the phonoaudiologic therapy at a high-risk nursery in a public hospital, when analyzing the speech of mothers of premature children, Girardi¹⁵ observed the effects of meaning of the terms “risk” and “time” in their speeches. According to the author,

in the context of hospital practice, Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences emerges and establishes itself starting with the medical discourse. The word *preterm* to name a baby is incorporated by Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences due to his/her premature condition, one of the most cited as a risk for the development of abnormalities in the short and long term. With DA tools, it was possible to identify the ideology that permeated the discourse of mothers of premature babies: the belief that they would present abnormalities in language development. However, in following the development of such babies, Girardi¹⁵ found that this prediction did not materialize and indicated the need to reframe the notions of risk and temporality involving parental discourse about the premature baby, believing that these aspects form the basis for the direction of phonoaudiologic therapy for these children. Therefore, another “look” at the peculiarities involved in phoaudiologic therapy practice of prematurely born babies resulted from the prominence given to DA.

In vestibular rehabilitation study in patients with complaints of vertigo and/or dizziness, in the field of audiology practice, Lardaro¹⁶ identified previously unnoticed meanings in the speech of these patients that could interfere with their ‘healing’. According to the literature, after a presentation of the existing symptoms in these cases, the researcher found several studies that linked organic symptoms to psychosocial impairments. The vestibular rehabilitation proposed by the audiologist, still according to the literature, is based on the concept of “neural plasticity” and, therefore, presents a series of maneuvers to “treat” the patient’s symptoms. This approach is similar to procedures proposed by clinical medical practice, sidelining the “listening” to the meanings given to the symptoms by the patient. In this way, the researcher searched for a theoretical approach that would allow for the analysis of the speech of patients affected by “vestibular syndrome.” This possibility was found in DA through “opening up of meaning for a symptomatic reading of dizziness” and consequently was able to propose a therapist-patient dialogic therapy. When interpreting, “the therapist takes the patient’s speech and as a result obtains the displacement of the subject, the reframing of his/her speech”, and therefore, the symptom displacement. Using the linguistic marks, the researcher was able to establish a link between dizziness and anxiety. A discourse marked by dispersion (fleeing the subject) that, paraphrasing Pêcheux (1997)⁶, “when saying x, I do not say y, and that already establishes the subject

in a ‘possible place’ to be and, at the same time in a ‘forbidden place’ to move around.” As Orlandi¹¹ says, “the subject subjects himself/herself in different ways along a text”. Lardaro pointed out the relationship of dizziness with the emotional state of the subject affected by such symptom, for having found in his analysis the relationship between “if feeling balanced there is no dizziness” and “when feeling unbalanced, there is dizziness.” Lardaro, then, proposed that the phonoaudiologic therapy “go beyond the organic body,” and that the audiologist not look “only at the symptoms of the body, but also at the symptoms present in the words of patients.” In conclusion, he indicates that DA is an instrument that allows the clinician to listen to the words of their patients as part of the rehabilitation process.

In the use of audiology in the institutional phonoaudiologic setting, we found that the French Discourse Analysis guiding Biscaro’s⁵ research was chosen to consider that the sayings of the subject tell his/her history and is of fundamental importance in the constitution of meaning, as stressed in his text.

The author set out to find “the meanings that the Hearing Conservation Program takes in the discourse of engineers and work safety technicians who work in these programs. She also sought to discuss the ideology that permeates the work focused on the prevention of occupational hearing loss “(ibid, p. 8). From the analysis of the interviews, it was possible for the author to observe how the meanings historically built on the worker, work relations, and the Brazilian legislation directed toward workers’ health, affect their discourses. With the last uses of DA it was possible to identify that the program was related both to a legal imposition as well as to the generation of costs. In this sense, it was highlighted that the speech of respondents conveyed the idea of a separation between the economic issues related to the company and those intended for workers’ health. Thus, the author concludes the research believing that her work can contribute in a way that the audiologist might “recognize his/her subjection to the dominant ideology of the Hearing Conservation Program, whose primary focus is to protect the company, relegating the hearing health of workers to a secondary plan”. Exposing the ideology formerly concealed by sayings urges the audiologist to take the ethical stance, to intervene in the role of “mere executor of audiometries” and perform audiological evaluations that actually test the effectiveness of the Hearing Conservation Program and plan measures that

foster the hearing health of workers, enforcing what the law says.

In the field of voice, Castellano and Freire² write about the care of patients with voice complaint where it was observed that the subject with dysphonia not only suffers an organic symptom, but that this symptom says something about the subject's history. The meanings attached to the subject's complaints must be heard and interpreted in the clinical session since listening is an important tool for the management of symptoms, from which therapy is possible. The authors set out to "consider dysphonia, from a discursive point of view, beyond the literality of the words, as it relates to the symptoms and signs of dysphonia, considering that listening is possible when the subject can be seen in the interface of the organic, psychological, and social determinants," (ibid, p. 6). From these reflections they were able to see the therapist as an "enabler of actions and interventions that cause an effect on the patient, as he/she brings to the clinical office his/her history, symptoms, questions and expectations" (ibid, p.11).

CONCLUSION

The reviewed studies indicate that the methodology of the French Discourse Analysis is relevant for analyzing data from the perspective of social and ideologically established discourses. What matters to Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, when accessing DA, is the emergence of the subject in the discourse where surprise, faulty acts, and mistakes, reveal his/her uniqueness. In Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, it is important to understand how the subject, constituted in and by ideology, can be seen in his/her uniqueness as the speaking subject with his/her demands and grievances in Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences clinic.

Several segments of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences - voice, language, speech, and hearing - have experience in thinking about their clinical actions because of their access to the theory and method of the French Discourse Analysis. Therefore, there is a relationship between Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences and DA that allows dialogue with specific objectives and distinct objects, bringing answers to recurring questions of the clinical practice.

Thus, DA contributes to the issue in the field of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences as it relates to clinical method and its institutional operations, discussing issues of speaking, listening, interpreting, and discourse within a perspective that dialogues with

ideology (DA) and uniqueness (Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences), and may be a data analysis tool in phonoaudiologic practice.

REFERENCES

1. Gadet F, Hak T (orgs.). Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux. Campinas: Ed. Da Unicamp; 1993/1990/1969.
2. Castellano GB, Freire RMAC. Análise de Discurso de Sujeitos Disfônicos. *Rev.Soc.Bras.Fono.* 2006;11(1):43-51.
3. Orlandi EP. A Linguagem e seu funcionamento: as formas do Discurso. Campinas (SP): Pontes Ed; 2011/2003/1983.
4. Pêcheux M. Semântica e Discurso: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. Tradução de E. P. Orlandi ET et al. Campinas (SP): Ed. Da Unicamp; 1988.
5. Bísaro C. O Discurso sobre o Programa de Conservação Auditiva: a ideologia e seus efeitos [dissertação]. São Paulo (SP): PUC-SP; 2007. Disponível na internet: http://www.sapientia.pucsp.br/tde_busca/arquivo.php?codArquivo=3689
6. Pêcheux M. Análise Automática do Discurso (AAD-69). In: Gadet F, Hak T. (orgs.). Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Pêcheux. Campinas (SP): Ed. da Unicamp;1997. p.163-252.
7. Roman J. *Essais de Linguistique Générale*, Parins: Ed. De Minuit; 1963.
8. Neiva TGS. A Interpretação para a Fonoaudiologia: Primeiras questões [Dissertação]. São Paulo (SP): PUC-SP; 2001. Disponível na internet: http://www.pucsp.br/linguagemesubjetividade/PDF/26_01_2011_taisa_giannecchini_souza_neiva.pdf
9. Sobrino A. Dizer o dito: A questão da interpretação em fonoaudiologia. *Rev. Disturb. Comun.* 1996;8(1):23-39.
10. Castellano GB. Escuta e Interpretação na Clínica Fonoaudiológica. In: 8º Congresso Internacional da ISAPL; 2007; Porto Alegre (RS). Disponível na internet: http://www.pucsp.br/linguagemesubjetividade/PDF/escuta_e_interpretacao_isapl.pdf
11. Orlandi EP. Análise de Discurso: princípios e procedimentos. Campinas (SP): Pontes Ed; 2000.

12. Azevedo NPSG. *Análise Discursiva da Gagueira: trajetórias de silenciamento e alienação na língua* [Dissertação]. São Paulo (SP): PUC-SP; 2000. Disponível na internet: http://www.pucsp.br/linguagemesubjetividade/PDF/uma_analise_discursiva_da_gagueira_trajetorias_de_silenciamento_e_alienacao_na_lingua.pdf
13. Passos MCP, Freire RM. Gagueira: uma questão discursiva. *Trab. Ling. Aplic.* 2012;51(1):9-35.
14. Azevedo NPG, Freire RM. Trajetórias de silenciamento e aprisionamento na língua: o sujeito, a gagueira e o outro. In: Friedman S, Cunha MC. (org.) *Gagueira e Subjetividade: Possibilidades de Tratamento*. São Paulo: Artmed Editora; 2001. p.145-60.
15. Girardi ALFN. *O bebê prematuro no Discurso de suas Mães* [Dissertação]. São Paulo (SP): PUC-SP; 2003. Disponível na internet: http://www.pucsp.br/linguagemesubjetividade/PDF/ALNGirardi_AnaLucia.pdf
16. Lardaro VC. *Tontura e suas implicações para além do corpo orgânico* [Dissertação]. São Paulo (SP): PUC-SP; 2005. Disponível em http://www.pucsp.br/linguagemesubjetividade/PDF/20_04_lardarovc.pdf