

Political discourse analysis. Methodological proposal for its use as a tool

Análisis político del discurso. Propuesta metodológica para su uso como herramienta

Javier Vega-Ramírez

Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación

Universidad Austral de Chile

javier.vega@uach.cl

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0335-1557>

Received on: 08/01/2023 **Revised on:** 20/01/2023 **Approved on:** 27/01/2023 **Published on:** 01/03/2023

Abstract

This article offers the results of a bibliographical research conducted with the intention of offering a methodological proposal based on the epistemological perspective underlying the Political Discourse Analysis, whose origin is found in the work of Laclau and other authors. For this purpose, an exhaustive review of the conceptualisations surrounding Discourse, Hegemony and Politics is made in order to, subsequently, present in detail the possibilities offered by Political Discourse Analysis as a tool for social analysis. Finally, based on the authors reviewed, a proposal of methodological steps to develop Political Discourse Analysis applied to focused social phenomena is presented. It is concluded that Political Discourse Analysis as a perspective of analysis is fully valid for both large and small phenomena, and that the proposed methodology can be dynamically adapted to each of the requirements presented.

Keywords

Discourse analysis, political discourse analysis, hegemony, politics, Laclau.

Suggested citation: Vega-Ramírez, J. (2023). Political discourse analysis. Methodological proposal for its use as a tool. *Universitas-XXI*, 38, *Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, pp. 182-200. <https://doi.org/10.17163/uni.n38.2023.08>

Resumen

Este artículo ofrece los resultados de una investigación bibliográfica generada con la intención de ofrecer una propuesta metodológica basada en la perspectiva epistemológica subyacente al Análisis Político del Discurso (APD), cuyo origen se encuentra en la obra de Laclau y otros autores. Para esto se realiza una revisión exhaustiva de las conceptualizaciones sobre discurso, hegemonía y política con el fin de presentar en detalle las posibilidades que ofrece el análisis político del discurso como herramienta de análisis social. Finalmente, con base en los autores revisados, se presenta una propuesta de pasos metodológicos para desarrollar el análisis político del discurso aplicado a fenómenos sociales focalizados. Se concluye que el análisis político del discurso como perspectiva de análisis es plenamente válido tanto para fenómenos extensos como pequeños, y que la metodología propuesta puede adaptarse dinámicamente a cada uno de los requerimientos presentados.

Palabras clave

Análisis del discurso, análisis político del discurso, hegemonía, política, Laclau.

Introduction

The notion of discourse, understood as an elaboration rooted in reality that does not generate a parallel construction abstracted from the concrete, but rather denotes another form of materiality, belongs to the very understanding of the social aspect. This elaboration tells us that discourse exists in itself, seeking to install its understanding of reality on other understandings, in a development whose materiality is not necessarily a set of declared words, but a series of intentional actions or decisions (Halliday, 1978; Wodak and Meyer, 2003). Each discourse seeks to rise up and install itself with the intention of validating, through its representation, a form of society that ultimately finds in itself a form of preservation. Discourse thus becomes a way of power,¹ without being power itself. The nature of power is expressed in

1 Given the divergence of understanding in the concept of “power”, we will use its spelling with lower case when alluding to the word as a verb (power as an action) and with initial capital letter when alluding to the word as a noun (power as an object).

the imposition of a discourse with the pretension of being superior, overcoming other forms of understanding, establishing its primacy and confirming its scope thanks to its hegemonic character (Butler *et al.*, 2003; Foucault, 1979, 2002; Wink, 1986).

Therefore, developing discourse analysis processes allows to deepen our understanding of reality, although it should be noted that not all analytical perspectives allow us to understand in the same way the reality denoted in discursive bodies organized around certain phenomena. In this article we offer a proposal for methodological development based on the political analysis of discourse promoted by Laclau and other authors (Barrett, 1994; Buenfil Burgos, 2019; Critchley and Marchart, 2008; Laclau, 1987, 2005; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985), based on the revision of conceptualizations around discourse, hegemony, society and politics.

Discourse and reality

The idea of discourse is not that of an orderly presentation of narratives of meaning, but rather a statement assumed in diverse manifestations expressed in different contexts, always denoting the need to impose itself on other elaborations. Discourse denotes the understanding of reality, without it necessarily being the discourse that artificially composes or creates reality. Reality can be influenced, modified and altered by discourse (Jäger, 2001), but it does not construct it by itself. The accent of discourse, as a construction, is that it seeks collectivity, demanding a double hermeneutic for its understanding (Giddens, 1982; Infante, 2019) where the subject does not exist but in the understanding of society, which in turn is constituted by the understanding of the subject. This recursivity makes us understand that discourse will never be naive, but will always be constituted as an effective materiality denoting a relation of Power. This double hermeneutic, as a double articulation of Power, assumes that the person constitutes (and not only composes) society, which in turn constitutes (and is not only composed of) people.

This way of understanding discourse makes it understand itself as a contingent and necessary form of analysis, since discourse functions as a manifestation and support of an ideological framework, which is also a message, a statement, a materialization (Vega and Contreras, 2022). There is an ideological construct, understood as a notion of sustaining a way of being society, a

constituted collective, where relations of collaboration and subjection (Butler *et al.*, 2003; Gee, 2005), of relation and antagonism-agonism (Mouffe, 2007; Mouffe, 1999), of obscuring and manipulation (Sloterdijk, 2003; Žižek, 1989).

Therefore, we can approach this materiality called discourse from a submissive, optimistic or critical position. We can consider it as a vehicle of valid ideas, in a naive vision, or we can consider it as a propagandistic medium. In any case, we can raise a suspicion about the layers in which it is constructed, understanding that what is said will never be only what is said, but the whole. As Angenot (2010) states, we can not only enter the discourse from its manifestation, but also from the social “decipherable” possibility, making it possible to analyze the discourse permanently from its greater depth.

Therefore, a valid tool for understanding reality is discourse analysis (Alonso, 1993; Wodak, 2001b; Garrido, 2002; Wodak and Meyer, 2003; Butler *et al.*, 2003; van-Dijk, 2003; Gee, 2005; Berg Dyrberg, 2008), understood as the visualization of ideas and conceptions expressed in different ways that constitute a unitary whole and allow us to understand a particular worldview. As Jäger says:

Discourse analysis is not (only) concerned with the interpretations of something that already exists, and therefore it is not (only) concerned with an analysis aimed at the *post festum* assignment of meaning, but with the production analysis of the discourse (2001, p. 67).²

Forms of discourse analysis

There are three possible currents in the literature review that allow us to approach the phenomenon of discourse(s) from the density of the ideological background of the same: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Mediated Discourse Analysis (MDA) and Political Discourse Analysis (PDA).

When this deepening takes on the character of a linguistic discourse analysis that denotes the relationship of power, injustice and inequality expressed, we speak of critical discourse analysis (van Dijk, 1999a). Thus, critical discourse analysis (CDA) is the study that is concerned with the relations-

2 From this perspective, it is understood that discourse denotes a reality, both from psychology and from sociology and linguistics, enabling its analysis from a background in permanent dialogue with the context.

hip between the discourse presented (from its different materiality) and the context in which it arises to analyze not only what it means in its context, but also how much it influences the construction of reality. We can say then that critical discourse analysis is a field concerned with the interrelationship built between discourse and the context in which it occurs (Franquesa, 2002).

As a field of study, its history can be traced in full use to 1970; however, its first mention dates back to 1952, in the articles by Z. S. Harris “Discourse analysis” and “Discourse analysis: a sample text” (Harris, 1952a, 1952b), which develop an analysis of utterances in overcoming the limits of their expressions (Sayago, 2014). One of the difficulties alluded to by the author in his articles is the difficulty in establishing the relationship between social behavior and language, which opens the door to the analysis of discourse in its context (Garrido, 2002). The consideration of language as an object of interest in its broad relationship is an interesting challenge previously addressed by the studies of the Vienna circle, especially Wittgenstein (2003) and complemented by the sociological studies of Halliday (1978) and the linguistic studies of van Dijk (1999b). This indicates that there is not a single development of critical discourse analysis, nor a single methodology of development (Wodak, 2001a; Berardi, 2003; Wodak and Meyer, 2003), since its installation occurred both from Linguistics and Semiotics, with its application and appropriation by the Social Sciences as a particularly positive tool (Santander, 2011).

Critical discourse analysis proposes that this analysis can always be developed in phases: linguistic and semantic relationships, linkages of families of meanings, speech styles, ways of saying, turns of phrase and regionalisms that denote types of relationship. In all of them, the dynamics of Power as a constituent of society is seen as the main vector, as observed in the work of Foucault and others (van Dijk, 1999b; Jäger, 2001; Franquesa, 2002; Berardi, 2003; Wodak and Meyer, 2003).

On the other hand, there is what some researchers, headed by Ron Scollon (Scollon, 1998b), have called mediated discourse analysis (MDA), a perspective that states that the discourse-individual relationship belongs to a circularity closer to what is observed, since discourse accounts for a vision of society and the relationships generated in it, which in turn modify the vision of the individual who generates these discourses, a circularity that is understood when we realize that discourse always arises from collectivized individualities. This type of analysis emphasizes the action generated by discourse and its relationship with society, so that its main points of analysis are

action, context, history and community (Scollon, 1998a, 1999, 2001; Wodak, 2001a; Wodak and Meyer, 2003).

Finally, political discourse analysis (PDA) states that discourse is never innocuous, but is an effective materiality, which focuses on “the decisions of inclusion and exclusion of any system of meanings” (Buenfil Burgos, 2010, p. 1). Circularity is generated in the dynamics of the double circularity or double articulation that assumes that the person builds society, which in turn builds people; however, this construction process is the one that gives consistency to the political act, since all enunciated language is an act of Power and, in turn, of politics. The differentiated deepening in this aspect is the understanding of the ideology-power relationship that is seen in the constituted discourse, with the contribution of the new studies of politics and the political from poststructuralism (Pineda, 2022) and, given that all discourse thus entails an ideological/political component, its analysis allows understanding the constitution of society in a permanent struggle of ideology, hegemony and power (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Butler *et al*, 2003; Gómez Bocanegra and Morillo-Velarde Pérez, 2006; Critchley and Marchart, 2008; Correa and Dimaté, 2011; Burgos *et al.*, 2012; Southwell, 2020).

This allows to use it as a tool of analysis focused on determined and sufficiently dense phenomena, in Hegelian terms, which in turn serves as a manifestation of society at a certain point or at a particular moment in its history. Collectivized history usually finds these moments or phenomena in its adequate analysis. Thus from PDA we can identify this form of positioning on the discourse studies as varied as political structures, revolutionary movements, totalitarian regimes, indigenist movements, social movements, feminism, gender studies, racism, philosophical currents, state, nationalism and indigenism, homosexuality, discrimination, Kemalism, religion and others, in a long journey of multiple academics and intellectuals who continue to conduct research and crossings between the perspective of PDA positioning and reality, in terms of the social (Buenfil Burgos and Navarrete, 2012).

Political discourse analysis

How can we define political discourse analysis? We will take as a positioning the understanding offered by Rosa Nidia Buenfil Burgos, who speaks of political discourse analysis as a research perspective on social processes,

which includes education among other areas. It highlights the political dimension of any discourse, i.e., it focuses on decisions about inclusion and exclusion in any system of meanings (2010, p. 1).

PDA is a work that “seeks to account for the ways in which structures of signification determine ‘certain forms of behavior’” (Correa and Dimaté, 2011, p. 96). Its focus of interest is centered on understanding the way in which these discourses are generated and the influence it has on the construction of identity, in order to understand “how the discourses that structure the activities of social agents are generated, how they function and how they are changed” (Howarth, 1997, p. 125). The axes in which this relationship is defined are the understanding of hegemony and the hegemonic of the discursive exercise of power, ideology from a vision that goes beyond the merely symbolic of its understanding as mental representation proposed by Marxism (Howarth, 1997) and “the” political, as articulation between the particular and the universal and “the” political as structuring of hegemonic relations (Berg Dyrberg, 2008).

Its main analysis is observed in the work of Ernesto Laclau (1935-2014) and his study on the concepts of ideology, hegemony and politics (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Critchley *et al.*, 1998; Butler *et al.*, 2003; Critchley and Marchart, 2008). Laclau’s work, deeply linked to his period of work at the Essex School (Townshend, 2003), has generated consensus, being developed by political theorists such as Mouffe (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Critchley *et al.*, 1998) and other first-generation researchers, trained directly with Laclau at Essex, such as Rosa Nidia Buenfil Burgos, Myriam Southwell and Ernesto Treviño Ronzón, among others.

One of the great contributions of Laclau’s PDA has been the revitalization of the concept of politics and the political, beyond the partisan, which emerges from his analysis, focusing on a “post-Marxist” position, which should not be interpreted at all as a “non-Marxist” position (Berg Dyrberg, 2008) but rather assumes the need to review, unambiguously, the limits of Marxism as an explanatory account of reality in order to develop and overcome it without opposition. This element becomes the main reason of the Laclaudian effort, already outlined in “Hegemony and Socialist Strategy” (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985), and developed until the end of his days: the historical object of socialism, by its very nature, must be reviewed at each stage or moment of history, not as a modernist type of update, but as a requirement in the form

of existence. Laclau shows explicitly the reasons that summon him, indicating as a necessity the:

Structural transformations of capitalism that have reduced the classic working class in post-industrial countries; increasingly deep penetration of capitalist production relations in vast areas of social life, whose dislocatory effects - together with those derived from the bureaucratic forms that have characterized the welfare state - have generated new forms of social protest; the crisis and discredit of the model of society implemented in the countries of the so-called “actually existing socialism”, which includes the denunciation of the new forms of domination established in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Laclau, 1987, p. 111)

Laclau and Mouffe’s position refers to “new forms of domination established in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat”, an analysis where Foucault’s theory of Power joins the French theory of discourse to understand how what is said is a social construction that also requires a vision sufficiently updated in its contingent historical components to understand the way in which what is said is always a sign of the mode and the limit of what is said (Angenot, 2010). For the same reason, the PDA allows addressing, among other elements, the “cultural conditioning of what, in a given circumstance or historical-political process, can be said, thought and desired, and what is socially constituted as a taboo subject, being repressed, tendentially, from its public enunciation” (Fair, 2016, p. 202). The PDA analyzes what is said, what can be said and what is taboo, as a pivotal element to understand the social idea of what is said not only in context, but also in project, in a subjective positioning with the aim of perpetuating a certain vision of history, subject and meaning (Fair, 2021).

Hegemony and society

The vision of hegemony proposed by PDA makes sense in this complexity. Hegemony from Laclau’s PDA inherits the vision of Gramsci, who in turn inherits it from Russian social democracy and Leninism (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985), as the social discourse of the minority group that, in turn, holds power and represents it by imposing it on the majority, opening the door to the concepts of liberation (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985), representation of power that in historical perspective opens the doors to the concepts of li-

beration (Gutiérrez, 1971), alienation (Wink, 1986) and oppression (Freire, 2005), typical of the Latin American tradition. While Gramsci visualizes that the power of the few can be exercised against the many, given the cultural conditioning of these many, the cultural conditioning of these many is transformed into a culture of oppression, so much so that whoever is oppressed is not visualized as someone in himself, and therefore is not understood as a constituent of a whole. The understanding of the community, the whole and the collective become essential to overcome the oppression that is installed in each one and that unfolds in the opposite direction from the each one (Freire), therefore the old explanatory structures of the social order need to be reversed, even disdaining the logic of hierarchy as a power structure, even when it tries to justify it, for example, from an arbitrary divine configuration (Boff, 1989). The category of liberation is a structure that explains the class struggle of classical socialism, revised by Laclau given the need for contingent adequacy. The unrevised power structure ends up being a structure of sin (Wink, 1986) and oppression (Gutiérrez, 1971) for those who are born in it, and by being born in it (or living with it) ends up justifying oppression without noticing its yoke (Casaldáliga and Vigil, 1992). Thus, the person disappears and the individual is installed, lacking a project, uprooted from his own power, unconscious of his transforming capacity and, therefore, alienated, justifying his oppression, which is not called as such, but rather as a “natural condition” (Jesuitas, 1997).

Laclau analyzes the concept of hegemony from the archeology of concepts, tracing its origins in Russian social democracy in which “hegemony” describes the execution of a political task by a group different from the one suggesting its emergence (working class carrying out the struggles for political freedom that the bourgeois class is incapable of executing). The historical contingency that justifies this assumption of roles is what gives its particular character to this form of understanding, allowing also to give a positive sign to the relationship between groups (already minority to majority), since the “hegemonized” majority group is allowed to enter history through this dynamic.

Thus, the concept of hegemony names a space rather than a relation, dominated by the tension between two relations “a) the relation between the hegemonized task and the class that is its “natural” agent, and b) the relation between the hegemonized task and the class that hegemonizes it” (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985, p. 87). In their analysis, it is inevitable to notice that the relation is totally external and contingent, not causal or casual. The his-

toricity of the conditions of the relationship means that it takes a different turn in the case of the relationship between the bourgeoisie and the working class when analyzed in the context of Europe and the surrounding history as a whole. It is then necessary to clarify the type of conditioning factors of the relationship and hegemonic space, among which the main one is the epistemological ideology that sustains the positioning of a collective: ideology. Ideology plays a unifying role in narratives and at the same time functions as supratext, sustenance, of the discursivity deployed.

This understanding also allows us to visualize the importance of the dissident voice. The hegemonic discourse is transformed into populist discourse that resolves the need for a unifying narrative by needy collectives, generated in the spaces by empty signifiers (Castro Orellana, 2019). Populism in Laclau's vision of hegemony responds to the need for a unifying narrative, transforming politics into "a dispute in the order of signifiers that crystallizes in a collective identity" (p. 124), a vision that contrasts with the development of the hegemonic vision in Dussel, heir to the Latin American liberationist tradition of Gutiérrez and Boff. In Dussel, the understanding of hegemony is more material (embodied) than in Laclau, attributing to politics the capacity to solve the body's deficiencies, material needs in planning the needs of a narrative of meaning (Dussel, 1977, 2009). Laclau's interpretation is the populist vision, revised numerous times throughout his work (Laclau, 2005) which, resolved by the hegemonic discourse, generates adhesion by representation or dissidence for feeling unrepresented and, on the contrary, deviated from the original feeling. The unrepresented is in a perspective that is not opposed but is in constant dialogue with respect to the original postulate.

The us/them, friend/enemy logic, typical of Schmitt's reading (Mouffe, 2007), does not make sense in a pluralist vision of social relations and above all of politics, given that the dichotomous relation of opposition closes the positions and, therefore, prevents the relationship. The understanding of hegemony in Laclau, and in general in the PDA, is that of relation and therefore the recognition of the other. It is the location of the other in the perspective of the antagonist, which makes the other, the one who escapes the logic of hegemonic discourse, *to be*, because insofar as the other *is he/she* establishes my own limit and possibility. Thus, the other is always in my relational sphere and defines me. Hence Mouffe prefers the term "agonism" to refer to:

The conflicting parties, while assuming that there is no radical solution to their conflict, nevertheless recognize the legitimacy of their opponents (...) perceive themselves as belonging to the same political association, sharing a common symbolic space within which the conflict takes place. (Mouffe, 2007, p. 27)

A name that explains much better the relationship to be established in democratic contexts with a pluralist, radical and non-exclusive democracy (Mouffe, 1999).

Results: proposal for using political discourse analysis as a theoretical tool

Having established the main postulates of Laclau's PDA and their sources, we can try to formulate a proposal for organizing the PDA as a tool to analyze, assuming the limitation of moving from a perspective to a tool, proper to social research.

First, trying to define its limits, Fair (2016) analyzes the characteristics of the Laclaudian theory in comparison with the theory of social semiosis of Eliseo Verón (1987) and the theory of social discourse of Marc Angenot (2010), positing that the PDA has as a distinctive feature:

- a. Emphasis on the constructive and social dimension of discourse, identities and community.
- b. Emphasis on the material dimension of the signifying order.
- c. The existence of a performative and transformative dimension of discourse.
- d. Emphasis on the contingency, historicity and precariousness of the social.
- e. The relational and intersubjective dimension of identities.
- f. The polemic and antagonistic dimension of the social.
- g. The interpretative character of all discourse analysis (Fair, 2016, p. 203).

As mentioned by Fair, the interpretative character of all discourse analysis helps us to focus on the type of interpretation. In the case of PDA, it is not a hermeneutics centered on grammar and rhetoric, but on semiotics and the ca-

capacity of discourse that make up hegemonic discourses valid in themselves. It should be mentioned that Laclau introduces the notion of empty signifier to refer to those signifiers devoid of meaning that leave an open field of exploitation for those who, in turn, emit it and make possible the development of a hegemonic discourse. This category of empty signifier fulfills a particular function, that of “renouncing its differential identity for the purpose of representing the purely equivalent identity of a communal space” (Laclau, 1996, p. 78), an essential issue to understand that the community cannot be represented absolutely by a form of understanding, but neither can it renounce being signified at all. Neither under-representation nor over-representation is a solution to the signifiers whose sign is a communitarian reality, the fact of being called an empty signifier is the recognition of its limit and self-definition without this meaning a closure.

Secondly, and following Jäger’s discourse theory (2001), we must assume that discourse analysis cannot be limited only to the analysis of discursive practices, but also to non-discursive practices and their manifestations and materializations (pp. 93-99). This indicates that there are three types of strategies that can be analyzed in every discursive construction which must be related to the topic. Hence, the distinction between “discourse” and “text” must be assumed (Lemke, 1995), understanding discourse as a set of linguistic acts grouped around a “macro-theme”, where the text is one of its possible manifestations (Wodak, 2001b). Thus, the following possible strategies can be used to analyze in a PDA process:

“*Discursive practices*” types: a) Intentional stories or narratives that arise from a personal reflection and that are publicly exposed in a context, and therefore are subject to revisions, omissions and intentions prior to their exposure. It is the perfectible discursive practice. b) Stories or narratives arising from a reflection of the exchange of ideas in a given context, and which is therefore reactive to a particular topic where the vision of the issuer is compelled to support or refute any of the positions. It is the emerging discursive practice.

“*Non-discursive practices*”: c) Non-discursive practices with direct register, contextual actions that denote certain positions or understandings of reality and that generate the transmission of hegemonic positions from their symbolic force. The recording and the review can be reviewed, analyzed or discussed in the temporal distance established when these practices find their expression in physical supports. d) Non-discursive practices with indirect recording, contextual actions that denote certain positions or understandings of

reality and that generate transmission of hegemonic positions from their symbolic force but are not directly recorded, but are assumed or noticed through the recording of other actions.

“*Manifestations and Materializations*”: e) They are the stable expressions of ways of expressing a discourse not in words or actions, but in non-communicative physical supports, typical of the stabilization of certain discourses over time. These are the social structures, the ways of operating of certain collectives, the naturalizations of certain actions or intentional practices with an ideological background.

A PDA proposal can be made with all these materials for the focalized phenomena, understanding them as the spaces of density in which the ideological idea manifests. Thus, four critical steps are proposed based on the various authors presented:

- Assumption of the notion of discourse not as a totalizing whole (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985), therefore, filtering and eliminating elaborations that present univocal structures of truth from the general understanding. This step will allow a new revision of the previous discursive bodies, generating new levels of understanding regarding the discourses generated.
- Clarification of the ideological background underlying each set of discourses, understood from the double hermeneutic (Giddens, 1982) of recursive individual-society articulation: individual.
- Definition of the antagonist to the discourse, from its triple idea of enemy, limit and identity enabler (Butler *et al.*, 2003).
- Manifestation/declaration of the consistency of the hegemony concept in the discourses from the logic of the diffusion of frontiers (Butler *et al.*, 2003; Critchley *et al.*, 1998; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985).

The verification of each of these steps will allow to generate a conclusive proposal, which could be framed in a proposal for analyzing politics and the political from the selected phenomenon (Berg Dyrberg, 2008).

Conclusions and discussion

Political discourse analysis as a perspective of analysis is an option for an epistemological position on what discourses mean, no longer adopting

the equivalence “discourse: word”, but the understanding that a discourse is a statement of a way of understanding and living reality that is expressed through various strategies, the spoken word being one of these forms, and also the unspoken word, symbolisms, omissions and any action that reports a form of understanding of the world.

This places us in the perspective that the discourse is a statement assumed in diverse intentional manifestations expressed in different contexts, always denoting the need to impose itself over other less valid elaborations in the judgment of its holder.

Reality, as a consensus, can be influenced, modified and altered by discourse (Jäger, 2001), but it does not construct it by itself, hence discourse is validated as a hegemonic proposal for understanding the world. Discourse is placed as a construction since it seeks collectivity, demanding a double hermeneutic for its understanding (Giddens, 1982; Infante, 2019) where the subject only exists in the understanding of society, which in turn is constituted by the understanding of the subject.

The assumption of this way of understanding discourse gives more meaning to politics and the political (in Mouffe’s classic statement) since we move on to the continuous political condition of the public act from the non-neutrality of the discursive act, affecting society and therefore each of the actions, expressions, omissions or silences in the context that supports the phenomenon studied.

The methodological proposal of organization and analysis that we offer from the perspective provided by the political analysis of discourse is a methodology that presents limitations of an exercise in permanent revision and development; however, it is presented as a coherent proposal, epistemically consistent and sufficiently attractive and necessary to approach the different phenomena that shape reality.

References

- Alonso, L. E. (1993). Sujeto y Discurso: el lugar de la entrevista abierta en las prácticas de la sociología cualitativa. En *Métodos y técnicas cualitativas de investigación en ciencias sociales* (pp. 225-240). Síntesis.
- Angenot, M. (2010). *El discurso social. Los límites de lo pensable y lo decible*. S. XXI editores.

- Barrett, M. (1994). Ideología, Política, hegemonía: de Gramsci a Laclau y Mouffe. En S. Žižek (ed.), *Ideología, Un mapa de la cuestión* (p. 374). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Berardi, L. (2003). *Análisis Crítico del Discurso. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*. FRASIS editores.
- Berg Dyrberg, T. (2008). Lo político y la política en el Análisis del Discurso (T. Arijón, Trans.). En S. Crichtley and O. Marchart (eds.), *Laclau. Aproximaciones críticas a su obra* (pp. 444). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Boff, L. (1989). *Iglesia: carisma y poder*. Indo-American Press Service.
- Buenfil Burgos, R. N. (2010). Dimensiones ético políticas en educación desde el análisis político de discurso. *Sinéctica. Revista Electrónica de Educación*, 35, 1-17. <https://bit.ly/3JfsdQL>
- Buenfil Burgos, R. N. (2019). *Ernesto Laclau y la investigación educativa en Latinoamérica: implicaciones y apropiaciones del Análisis Político del Discurso*. CLACSO.
- Buenfil Burgos, R. N. and Navarrete, Z. (2012). *Discursos educativos, identidades y formación profesional. producciones desde el análisis político de discurso*. Plaza y Valdés.
- Butler, J., Laclau, E. and Žizek, S. (2003). *Contingencia, hegemonía, universalidad. Diálogos contemporáneos en la izquierda*. (C. Sardoy y G. Homs, Trans.; 2 ed.). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Casaldáliga, P. and Vigil, J. M. (1992). *Espiritualidad de la Liberación*. Sal Terrae.
- Castro Orellana, R. (2019). Apuntes críticos sobre el concepto de hegemonía en Dussel y Laclau. *Alpha*(48), 123-137. <https://doi.org/10.32735/s0718-2201201900048621>
- Correa, J. and Dimaté, C. (2011). El Análisis Político del Discurso: Diálogo entre Ciencias del lenguaje y Ciencia Política. *Revista Folios*, 95-106. <https://bit.ly/3kLomAK>
- Crichtley, S., Derrida, J., Laclau, E. y Rorty, R. (1998). *Desconstrucción y pragmatismo* (M. Mayer and I. Pousadela, Trans.; C. Mouffe, Ed. 1 ed., Vol. 4). Paidós.
- Crichtley, S. and Marchart, O. (2008). *Laclau. Aproximaciones críticas a su obra*. [Laclau, a critical reader]. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Dussel, E. (1977). *Filosofía de la Liberación*. EDICOL.
- Dussel, E. (2009). *Política de la Liberación. La arquitectónica*. (Vol. II). Editorial Trotta.
- Fair, H. (2016). Análisis político del discurso de Ernesto Laclau: una propuesta para la investigación social transdisciplinaria. *Íconos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 54, 199-226. <https://doi.org/10.17141/iconos.54.2016.1514>

- Fair, H. (2021). El vínculo sujeto-estructura en la teoría política de Ernesto Laclau. *Las Torres de Lucca: revista internacional de filosofía política*, 10(19), 141-156. <https://doi.org/10.5209/ltld.76470>
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Microfísica del Poder*. Las Ediciones de la Piqueta.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Vigilar y Castigar. Nacimiento de la Prisión*. Siglo XXI.
- Franquesa, A. M. (2002). Breve reseña de la aplicación del análisis crítico del discurso a estructuras léxico-sintácticas. *Onomázein*, (7), 449-462. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.7.21>
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogía del Oprimido* (J. Mellado, Trans.; 2 ed.). Siglo XXI Editores.
- Garrido, M. del C. (2002). Análisis del Discurso, ¿problema sin resolver? *Contextos*, XIX-XX(37-40), 123-141.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *La ideología de en los Discursos* (1 ed.). Morata.
- Giddens, A. (1982). *Profiles and Critiques in social theory*. University of California Press.
- Gutiérrez, G. (1971). *Teología de la Liberación*. Trotta.
- Gómez Bocanegra, J. and Morillo-Velarde Pérez, R. (2006). *Fundamentos para el análisis del discurso político* <http://bit.ly/3kzXW4H>
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as social semiotic. The social interpretation of language and meaning* (2ª ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Harris, Z. (1952a). Discourse Analysis. *Language*, 28, 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/409987>
- Harris, Z. (1952b). Discourse analysis: a sample text. *Language*, 28, 474-494. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-6059-1_20
- Howarth, D. (1997). La Teoría del Discurso. En David Marsh y Gerry Stoker (eds.), *Teoría y Métodos de la ciencia política* (pp. 125-144). Alianza Editorial.
- Infante, J. M. (2019). Anthony Giddens. Una interpretación de la globalización. *Trayectorias*, IX(23), 55-66. <http://bit.ly/40hrzIC>
- Jesuitas, Superiores Latinoamericanos. (1997). Jesuitas: por la vida y contra el neoliberalismo. *Revista Envío Digital*, 1-5. <http://bit.ly/3j3WDeb>
- Jäger, S. (2001). Discurso y conocimiento: aspectos teóricos y metodológicos de la crítica del discurso y del análisis de dispositivos. En Ruth Wodak y Michael Meyer (eds.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso*. (1 ed., pp. 61-99). Gedisa editorial.
- Laclau, E. (1987). *Nuevas reflexiones sobre la revolución de nuestro tiempo*. Nueva Visión.
- Laclau, E. (1996). *Emancipación y diferencia*. Ariel.
- Laclau, E. (2005). *La razón populista*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.

- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, Ch. (1985). *Hegemonía y estrategia socialista. Hacia una radicalización de la democracia* (1 ed.). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual politics: discourse and social dynamics*. Taylor & Francis.
- Mouffe, Ch. (2007). *En torno a lo político* (Soledad Laclau, Trans.). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Mouffe, Ch. (1999). *El retorno de lo político. Comunidad, ciudadanía, pluralismo y democracia radical* (Marco Aurelio Galmarini, Trans.). Paidós.
- Pineda, A. (2022). Discurso y política. Aportes post-estructuralistas en la obra de Ernesto Laclau y Chantal Mouffe. *Espacio abierto. Cuaderno Venezolano de Sociología*, pp. 99-119. <http://bit.ly/3kG9K5v>
- Santander, P. (2011). Por qué y cómo hacer análisis del discurso. *Cinta Moebio*, 207-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-554X2011000200006>
- Sayago, S. (2014). El análisis del discurso como técnica de investigación cualitativa y cuantitativa de las ciencias sociales. *Cinta Moebio*, 1-10.
- Scollon, R. (1998a). *Mediated discourse as social interaction* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Scollon, R. (1998b). *Mediated discourse as social interaction: a study of news discourse (language in social life)*. Routledge.
- Scollon, R. (1999). Mediated discourse and social interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32, 149-154. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.1999.9683618>
- Scollon, R. (2001). Acción y texto: para una comprensión conjunta del lugar del texto en la (inter)acción social, el análisis mediato del discurso y el problema de la acción social. En Ruth Wodak y Michal Meyer (eds.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 205-265). Gedisa.
- Sloterdijk, P. (2003). *Crítica de la razón cínica* (Miguel Ángel Vega, Trans.). Siruela.
- Southwell, M. (2020). Análisis político del discurso educativo o cómo hacemos cosas con palabras en Educación. En Mónica Eliana García Gil, Diego Mauricio Plazas Gil, Nicolás Arata (eds.), *La pregunta por lo social en América Latina en el siglo xxi. Abordajes desde la comunicación, la educación y la política* (pp. 175-197). Ediciones USTA.
- Townshend, J. (2003). Discourse theory and political analysis: a new paradigm from the Essex School? *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5, 129-142. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-856X.00100>
- van Dijk, T. (1999a). El análisis crítico del discurso. *Revista anthopos: Huellas del conocimiento*, 186, 23-36.
- van Dijk, T. (1999b). El análisis crítico del discurso. *Anthopos*, 186, 23-36.
- van-Dijk, Teun (2003). *Ideología y discurso*. Editorial Ariel.

- Vega, J. and Contreras, P. (2022). Formas y núcleos de Discurso ideológico: en torno al concepto de crisis. <http://bit.ly/3jaekZi>
- Verón, E. (1987). *La semiosis social. Fragmentos de una teoría de la discursividad*. Gedisa.
- Wink, W. (1986). *Naming the Powers*. Fortress Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2003). *Los cuadernos azul y marrón* (3 ed.). Editorial Tecnos.
- Wodak, R. (2001a). De qué trata en análisis crítico del discurso (ACD). Resumen de su historia, sus conceptos fundamentales y sus desarrollos. En Ruth Wodak y Michael Wodak (eds.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 17-33). Gedisa.
- Wodak, R. (2001b). El enfoque histórico del discurso. En Ruth Wodak y Michael Meyer (eds.), *Métodos de análisis Crítico del Discurso* (pp. 101-142). Editorial.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2003). *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (1 ed.). Gedisa.
- Žižek, S. (1989). *El sublime objeto de la ideología* (Isabel Vericat Núñez, Trans.). Siglo XXI Editores.