

# THE ROLE OF THE EVENT IN RESEARCH WITHIN THE SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES IN HEALTHCARE

O PAPEL DO EVENTO NA PESQUISA NAS CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E HUMANAS  
NA SAÚDE

EL PAPEL DEL EVENTO EN LA INVESTIGACIÓN EN LAS CIENCIAS  
SOCIALES Y HUMANAS EN LA SALUD

## Emília Biato

Associate Professor at University of Brasília (UnB). She holds a PhD in Education from the Federal University of Mato Grosso (2015), and a Postdoctoral fellowship at the Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra, Portugal. Her research focuses on Public Health, with an emphasis on Human and Social Sciences in Health, drawing on the philosophy of difference to explore topics such as health education, didactics, qualitative research in health and education, and the health-disease concept.

## Sílvia Portugal

PhD in Sociology from the University of Coimbra. Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Economics of the University of Coimbra (FEUC). Researcher at the Centre for Social Studies (CES). Her research has employed Network Theory to analyze the relationships between formal and informal systems of welfare production. In this context, she has studied the role of the family in the Portuguese social protection system, with a particular focus on the role of women. Her research interests and recent studies focus on disability and mental illness.

## ABSTRACT

The study begins by recognizing the value of an interdisciplinary perspective from the Social and Human Sciences in Health, both in establishing research in the field and in contribution to the understanding of the health-disease-care processes. The hypothesis suggests that the event emerges as an important element for research in this context, as it provides a powerful element to the construction of knowledge that values and considers the relational dimension of subjective experiences, which are central to the study objects in this field. This theoretical essay adopts the notion of event as interpreted through Jacques Derrida's work and other authors who expand and deepen this concept. With this premise, it seeks to relate this notion to the research path (method) that connects health to the social and human sciences, focusing on three simultaneous or complementary topics: Investigative Composites, Turbulence in Knowledge Production, and Performative Gestures.

**Keywords:** Event, Qualitative Health Research, Healthcare, Knowledge, Creation

## RESUMO

Parte-se do reconhecimento do valor do mirante interdisciplinar das Ciências Sociais e Humanas em Saúde, no estabelecimento de pesquisas na área a na composição do conhecimento sobre os processos saúde-doença-cuidado. Sugere-se a hipótese de que o acontecimento se apresenta como elemento caro às pesquisas neste contexto, pois se afigura um contributo potente para a composição de um conhecimento que considera e valoriza a dimensão relacional das experiências subjetivas, como é o caso dos objetos de estudo nessa área. Nesse sentido, este ensaio teórico toma a noção de acontecimento conforme a leitura que fazemos da obra de Jacques Derrida e de outros autores que ampliam e, simultaneamente, aprofundam a abordagem deste conceito. Com esse pressuposto, propõe-se a abordá-la na relação com o caminho (método) de pesquisas que articulam o tema da saúde com as ciências sociais e humanas, e o faz a partir de três tópicos — simultâneos ou complementares — quais sejam: Compósitos investigativos, Turbulências na produção de conhecimento e Gestos performativos.

**Palavras-chave:** Acontecimento, Pesquisa Qualitativa em Saúde, Cuidado em saúde, Conhecimento, Criação

## RESUMEN

El estudio comienza reconociendo el valor de una perspectiva interdisciplinaria de las Ciencias Sociales y Humanas en la Salud, tanto en el establecimiento de investigaciones en el campo como en la contribución a la comprensión de los procesos salud-enfermedad-cuidado. La hipótesis sugiere que el evento surge como un elemento importante para la investigación en este contexto, ya que proporciona un potente recurso para la construcción del conocimiento que valora y considera la dimensión relacional de las experiencias subjetivas, las cuales son centrales en los objetos de estudio de este campo. Este ensayo teórico adopta la noción de evento tal como es interpretada a través de la obra de Jacques Derrida y otros autores que expanden y profundizan este concepto. Con esta premisa, se busca relacionar esta noción con el camino de investigación (método) que conecta la salud con las ciencias sociales y humanas, enfocándose en tres temas simultáneos o complementarios: Compuestos Investigativos, Turbulencia en la Producción del Conocimiento y Gestos Performativos.

**Palabras clave:** Evento, Investigación Cualitativa en Salud, Atención en Salud, Conocimiento, Creación

## INTRODUCTION

This study begins by recognizing the value of the interdisciplinary perspective of Social and Human Sciences in Health, in establishing research in the area and the composition of knowledge about health-disease-care processes.

Castellanos et al (2014) state that Social Sciences serve critical thinking to the traditional epistemology of health and resulting practices of diagnosis and clinical conduct in collective health. This interface contributes to the search for the production of a form of knowledge that provides an opportunity to overcome mass and generalized explanations about people's health and lives. There is, therefore, a focus on understanding these phenomena based on an intercession of knowledge, assuming the need for a field that transcends the barriers of each area. Consequently, it must be powerful in looking at experiences linked to health-illness-care processes "through knowledge of world of life" (Portugal, 2021, p. 78).

It is necessary to consider the topic of health through composition of a kaleidoscope, so that it can face the processes of scientific production which, in the name of the necessary rigor to recognize its quality, end up neglecting fundamental elements that can only known through a composition of looks.

It is in this sense that Feyerabend (2011) states the impossibility of decoupling scientific production from "changing conditions of History" (p.20) — which include knowledge that already exists and is used in different ways — as well as the transformations in progress or what we can call it what is to come or *what is coming* (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004). It is, therefore, a matter of realizing that Science operates with unforeseen circumstances and, precisely there, lies its beauty and usefulness: dealing with the unexpected or unpredictable brings us closer to the notion of *events* in Jacques Derrida (2012), as we will see later.

Even with care not to fall into generalizations, it is possible to state that there is, included in the work of scientists, an impetus to prevent the

instabilities of historical, cultural, and social movements from having a direct influence on the production of scientific knowledge, in an attempt to control what is coming — as if control were the key to effectively knowing. It is in this effort that, artificially, the conditions considered ideal for the research in question are created: variables are stabilized to allow a specific focus of study; rigid steps are established; measures that reduce the risks of bias, among others, are faithfully followed. There is no problem in taking these measures. On the contrary: there is great value in results that are found by this way. The criticism that arises here is about the intention to unveil data, the lack of recognition that the maneuvers carried out are also influencing results, the assertion that it is possible to access facts/truths/absolutes, and the low porosity to unforeseen circumstances/events in the research.

In search of arguments to highlight the possibility and need to carry out research available to the event, we understand that the statement that “science does not, in any way, know naked facts”, by Feyerabend (2011, p. 33), corroborates and Derrida’s phrase “*la chose même se dérobe toujours*” (Derrida, 1967, p. 117) resonates, which comes to us as “the thing itself always escapes”. There seems to be, here, an invitation to recognize the impossibility of accessing the *naked facts* or the *thing itself*, whatever the object of knowledge. Specifically, Health Sciences aims to study ambiguous processes, full of subjectivities and chaos. Disregarding these characteristics can have limiting effects on the production of knowledge in the area, with expression in our research and ways of composing health care for population.

Care is taken, therefore, to recognize the importance of this way of looking at health phenomena and the production of knowledge, having as its premise a less pretentious stance from the point of view of scientific knowledge and, thus, not wanting to be dogmatic.

As a metaphor for the dogmatic path of Science, Descartes takes the mythological figure of Ariadne as responsible for proposing Theseus’s *escape path*. From this perspective, the thread presents itself as the hero’s only escape option. Ariadne, as seen through Nietzsche’s eyes, is the creator of paths,

perspectives, and multiple viewpoints for the focus of the same phenomenon, of things, of values. The paths are diverse, just as the methods (*path*) are diverse (Monteiro; Biato, 2008).

When taking the research path from this other perspective, the process of knowing becomes more similar to gestures of creation than movements of discovery. And, by taking Dionysus' phrase "I am your labyrinth", Ariadne seems to teach us that what is at stake is the experience of the journey and the knowledge produced with it, much more than just arriving at a final result, with the establishment of a univocal response (Monteiro; Biato, 2008). The path itself is potent with thoughts. It involves trying to see an "aesthetic horizon that expands the experience" of the researcher (Aquino et al, 2018, p. 2).

Based on this image of the labyrinth and the power of its ambiguities, one can ask about scientific research in Social and Human Sciences in Health: is there a right path for the development of research or is it about entering the labyrinth and gaining momentum to follow the paths that are made there? What lessons can path-creating Ariadne offer for qualitative health research? How can we guarantee the rigor necessary for scientific production and, at the same time, not stiffen our thinking, but pay attention to the path, considering that it is powerful in offering opportunities for knowledge production?

We raise the hypothesis that the Derridean notion of event (Derrida, 2012) can contribute to this debate about the paths of research at the interface of Social and Human Sciences in Health.

In general terms, the event can be understood as *that which comes* and, therefore, that which is outside the possibility of control. Otherness, for example, is a limit to the control exercised by the self and, thus, confronts the desire for the calculable (Derrida, 2012; Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004). In the case of the production of knowledge in question — at the interface of Social and Human Sciences in Health —, the encounter with the other (research participant or a certain group) is emblematic of this limit of control exercised

by the researcher. Addressing the other in the research process already symbolizes an affirmation of the event, as it requires opening space to otherness. This gesture of addressing the other can function as a way of saying yes and exercising a certain hospitality to those who come, as the other is always the frontier of what someone can control and has the potential to bring about the unusual. It operates, therefore, as an event, as can be seen in the statement:

The event is also, what comes, what arrives... There is a “yes” to the event or to the other, or the event as another or coming from the other, in which one can ask oneself whether precisely this is being said, whether this “Yes” is said or not (Derrida, 2012, p. 233).

Piero Eyben, translator of this text by Derrida (2012), points out that the philosopher proposes rhetorical constructions regarding the notion of event. He explains that the author, when using the expression “*ce qui arrive*”, points to “what happens”, and “what occurs”. However, the preference for maintaining the translation “what arrives” is due to other elements, equally important in the argument, such as the verb *arriver* (to arrive) – and its substantiation, by *arrivant* – which confers the degree of surprise, eventuality, event to the happening<sup>1</sup>.

The hypothesis suggests that the event presents itself as an important element in research in Social and Human Sciences in Health, as it appears to be a powerful contribution to the composition of knowledge that considers and values “the relational dimension of subjective experiences” (Portugal, 2021, p. 78), as is the case with the objects of study in this area.

In this sense, this theoretical essay takes the notion of the event according to our reading of the work of Jacques Derrida and other authors who expand and,

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. N. de T. em Derrida, 2012

at the same time, deepen the approach to this concept. With this assumption, it is proposed to approach it about the path (method) of research that articulates the theme of health with the social and human sciences and does so from three topics — simultaneous or complementary — namely: Investigative composites, Turbulences in knowledge production and Performative gestures.

## TOPIC 1: INVESTIGATIVE COMPOSITES

Firstly, the notion of event presents itself as an alternative, as a way to confront — or, at least, criticize — the “will to truth” (Nietzsche, 2005, p. 8). With this expression, it is about recognizing that, in our studies, there are fewer facts and more ways of knowing, paths to follow, and viewpoints from which to observe.

In the aphorism *Origin of Knowledge*, Nietzsche (2001) asserts that

only much later did truth appear, as the weakest form of knowledge. It seemed that we were unable to live with it, that our organism was adjusted to its opposite (p.137).

Our organism seems adjusted to raise questions about what is taken for granted, in the search for ways to escape what has been established as scientism. By scientism, we understand

establishing hard objects, direct and objective questions, and certainty based on scientifically correct, evident, and effective explanations. This logic sets aside a set of variables and ways of seeing — perspectives, translations, inventions, dreams — as it stabilizes, cuts, and simplifies them, in the name of scientific rigor (Biato, 2022, p. 308).



By criticizing scientism, for treating scientific knowledge as if it were capable of providing *the* correct answer to phenomena, with neutrality and exemption about socio-cultural values and historically composed knowledge, we assume that there is no purity in the composition of scientific knowledge. With this assumption, we can deal with Science in a less dogmatic way that is more appropriate to the possibilities of our investigations.

It is important, in this context — and, especially in the historical moment we live in, of devaluation of scientific knowledge — that we defend Science and know that it is “in its name, that we need to be vigilant against scientism” (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, p. 64), as we consider that it operates with low levels of criticism and self-criticism, with fixed and hermetic processes, little porous to the variations and exuberances of which the experience is made and what can be taken as an object of study.

In a contribution to the critique of scientism, Annemarie Mol (2016) addresses the research method using the unusual image of *clafoutis*. The presentation of the aspects and dynamics surrounding the dessert made from milk, eggs, and fruit serves to instigate problematization of the task of creating a scientific composition in an environment of tension and change, like the one we experienced. In the case of dessert, it is a matter of combining historical, agricultural, and technical factors, ideas, cooking methods, and nutritional practices, among many others. In the case of scientific production, similarly, it is important to combine variants and unprecedented ways of looking at the same phenomena. Both dessert and scientific production are made up of different elements that are not always completely faithful to the recipe or original project, a fact that does not prevent different composites — with other fruits, different resources, and varied origins — from being, even so, called *clafoutis*, nor should the studies be considered scientific.

The author's proposal sounds provocative and encouraging for researchers to see themselves as legitimized to develop creative processes, as we also noted in Gérard Lébrun's comment 1983 (p. 35):

The impotence of the will to create originated the will to Truth. Instead of creating a world according to their wishes, men — religious, then metaphysical, then scientific — preferred to imagine a comforting true world.

The search for the will to truth tends to place us in a more secure, consoling, and comfortable position, while the vision of a composite that is effective in the most diverse ways, without ceasing to be so, places us in a zone of instability, but also of horsepower. It is about understanding that scientific knowledge does not occur independently of what comes from it, of the attributions of value, and of the researcher's role of "creating according to their wishes" (idem).

Once again with Nietzsche, these aspects gain importance: the notion that "there is only one perspective view, only one perspective knowledge" (Nietzsche, 2009, p. 177) can open new fronts to the discussion about the conception of Science, when we recognize that, instead of there being facts and truths, we deal with different perspectives about what happens. We can resist the determinisms of the scientific machine (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, 2004): if, on the one hand, it works as a calculation device, on the other, we can insist on accessing the non-machine in scientific production: we need to find, there, an openness to the incalculable, to that which characterizes the event (idem).

A health event seems to require a "perspective procedure" which is inevitably based on life itself (Corazza, 2013, p. 153), as it is necessary to think about

how far does the perspectivist character of existence go, or even if it has some other character, if an existence without interpretation, without 'meaning' [*Sinn*], does not turn out to be precisely 'absurd' [*Unsinn*], if, on the other hand, all existence is not essentially interpretative (Nietzsche, 2001, p. 278).

We found an example of a “perspective procedure” in the study by Souza and Biato (2023), which addresses the use of reading and writing practices during a Collective Oral Health subject, in the Dentistry curriculum. The authors take texts produced by the students as research material and act in co-authorship: they consider the writing of the research participants as complete texts and make use of the Derridean notion of supplement<sup>2</sup>, to participate, extrapolate them, analyze them, and create new meanings.

In this sense, instead of trying to find the marks (accuracy) of what was said — or what the participant wanted to say —, the authors worked on the margins (inaccuracies, overflows), assuming the sharing of what was written, of the fiction and interpretation.

## **TOPIC 2: TURBULENCES IN THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE**

The openness to the event in the research leads us to the realization that it occurs amidst turbulence, as argued by John Law (2004):

my argument is that academic methods of investigation do not capture these nuances (fuzzy, complex, even messy objects). So, what are the textures they are leaving out? (p.2)

If we consider, with Law, that events are turbulent and disconcerting and that the objects of study have an occurrence, a movement, a mess, we precisely need corresponding methods, capable of not leaving important elements, textures, and nuances out.

---

<sup>2</sup> Supplement is a term used by Derrida (2001) to describe a plenitude — like a complete text, for example — that is enriched by another plenitude — the production of the reader who acts as a writer, at the same time. An overflow is therefore established (p.15).

In this context, Nietzsche's statement that "one still needs to have chaos within oneself, to be able to give birth to a dancing star" (Nietzsche, 2011, p. 19) seems to make sense. It is therefore important to recognize that, especially when health-disease-care processes are addressed, it is necessary to seek alternatives to research paths that are limited to understanding health based on aspects such as statistical frequency and norms and gaining the courage to manage what Caponi (2009) presents as "health without an idea, present and opaque" (p. 64), as a theme that requires a somewhat imprecise language that opens up to multiple meanings.

There are very impactful events in people's lives, but they are hidden from distracted eyes and are completely unaware of the alleged truths of certain scientific evidence. It is in this sense that "it is necessary to have chaos within oneself" (Nietzsche), capture "messy objects" (LAW, 2004), and perceive details that are, in fact, as big as life itself in focus in our research.

Deleuze and Guattari (1992) propose that the production of knowledge is based on three chaoids: science, art, and philosophy: "Chaos has three daughters according to the plane that cuts it: they are the Chaoids, art, science, and philosophy, as forms of thought or creation" (Deleuze; Guattari, 1992, p. 267). Thus, our research seems to want to spread throughout this chaoid plane open to knowledge. According to Corazza (2013), philosophy forms the concept, and creates conceptual characters; art brings the strength of sensation, aesthetic figures, and what affects us; and science, with its reference or coordination plane, gives a function to knowledge, establishes powerful and admittedly partial observers.

These three planes can slide over one another and their functions can mix so that the multiple languages make up a "creative dynamism", capable of perceiving less what is given and more what is being constituted; capable of noticing gestures, actions, unsaid things, tasks, "configurations to come" (Corazza, 2013, p. 37).

The value of confronting the search for full control and the strict interest in the calculable nature of research, as well as the will to truth (Nietzsche)

and the homogenizing tendency of academic knowledge (Law, 2004), seems clear to us. We therefore realize the importance of the chaotic and messy dimension regarding what we have as an object of research and which requires us to take it, in correspondence, as a method. To this observation, we can add Gastaldo's (2021) consideration regarding what is considered rigor in academic texts and the necessary "epistemological congruence" (p.77). The author works with a definition of rigor that rejects the origin of the word, with its meaning linked to rigidity or "methodological fetishism or methodology" (p.78), treating it as

consistent practice of examining and documenting the theoretical foundation, the purpose of the research, the contextual circumstances, and the techniques used to generate and analyze data, so that others can understand and criticize the process and knowledge produced (Gastaldo, 2021, p. 79)

With this premise, he states that he uses, adapts, and creates scientific methods to produce new knowledge, capable of "challenging and criticizing dominant and excluding discourses" (p. 79) and, to this end, makes use of theoretical-methodological rigor, according to the perspective adopted. We conclude, therefore, that it is important that research is available to the event and, along the way, its creators will encounter turbulence, which we can also understand as simultaneities: chaos and methodological and epistemological rigor. If, on the one hand, we assume chaos is necessary to the process of researching the event, on the other hand, we also assume the value of remaining *scientists*, to, critically, deepen the references and offer support and clarity to the study, without, however, aim for some neutrality.

The chapter by Lemos, Biato and Barsaglini (2021), expresses the turbulent character of the event under research. Qualitative data is collected

from men and women undergoing hemodialysis treatment, based on a semi-structured thematic script for interviews conducted at the participants' homes. Although there were already some hypotheses and vast and adequate preparation, the process of listening and sharing raised unexpected thematic structures and categories.

Both the gesture of research and the issue in question were involved in turbulent feelings: the relationship between the body and the hemodialysis machine was full of tensions and ambiguities. This event led the authors to raise many questions and seek readings on how to compose new ways of thinking about the ambiguities of the post-human and, more specifically, how to redefine/resignify the interface of the kidney patient with the machine, to affirm the life, even in the context of cyborgization.

In this context, unusual and powerful discussions were opened about the traditional mind/body, organism/machine, and nature/culture dichotomies, and their material and symbolic implications.

Faced with the turbulence expected in research events — such as this one cited as an example —, it seems necessary to choose not to silence them or forge hermeticisms, but to assume them consistently and sustain the cohabitation of languages and thoughts, even if they are messy.

In this sense, as Creswell (2014) points out, qualitative study reports are expected to function aesthetically, in correspondence with the richness (and chaos) of the data produced: the use of “creative analytical practices opens the text and invites interpretative responses (while) demonstrating a deeply grounded social perspective” (p. 202).

As discussed by Morse (2021), qualitative studies have a more flexible way of being reported, consistent with the research objects. In this sense, they should not be framed in checklists:

Accuracy and replicability are important for descriptive research, but less so for interpretive research where the concern is to get in-depth data that provide understanding as the research unfolds (p. 819).

It is interesting to live with simultaneities/turbulences in qualitative research on the health-disease-care process, based on the search to guarantee a secure epistemological basis in association with a clear definition of the method, in its steps and paths. The aim is to establish, in this way, the epistemological place from which to look at the phenomenon studied, without, however, claiming to have any neutrality, and to do so, precisely, by opening up to chaos.

### **TOPIC 3: PERFORMATIVE GESTURES**

In the segment of the impossibility of neutrality of the researcher and the persistence in the turbulence of simultaneities between chaos and epistemological rigor, we open the topic on the performativity of the researcher, to further discuss this characteristic of the event in studies that articulate the Social and Human Sciences in Health.

The work *Otobiographies*<sup>3</sup>, by Jacques Derrida (2009) results from a conference presented by the philosopher at the University of Virginia, in 1976, on the bicentenary of the Declaration of Independence. The philosopher asks “*quién firma, y con qué nombre supuestamente propio, el acto declarativo que funda una institución?*” (p.13). In addition, in this context, it deals with the performative character of a signature. On the one hand, the signature is made with a “supposedly proper” name, the creation of a character or simply the set of which the signer is made up at the time of signing. This notion points us to the understanding that both those who participate in the research and those

---

<sup>3</sup> Here, we use the work translated to Spanish.

who investigate are in the process of becoming, in movements of becoming never complete and signing with their supposed names. In this sense, we operate — having the investigated material in hand — with simulacra and not with absolutes, as we noted in the statement: “*las interpretaciones no serán lecturas hermenéuticas o exegéticas, sino intervenciones performativas en la re-escritura...*” (p. 76). Given the material, we seek to investigate, the readings function as performative interventions, such as rewriting or co-authorship of the text and its destination.

Barsaglini and Biato (2019) discuss the communication process between people deprived of their liberty and the penitentiary institution's health team. The authors use the image of the tickets as emblematic of the difficulties in establishing communication processes and, therefore, providing adequate health care for that population. Health professionals take in their hands pieces of objects, torn paper, and Styrofoam from lunch boxes, among other materials, with parts of texts, which can be names of people, names of illnesses, requests and more requests, shipments, in short. The notion of sending, in Derrida (2007), necessarily involves the possibility of deviation, which, in that case, was frequently done.

By taking this study as a reference, we want to highlight the performative character of those who sign a note (even if it is not necessarily signed), but also of those who receive it, read it, and interpret it, to provide the necessary care.

Yet another study by Biato (2021) addresses the contact of a healthcare professional with a complaint, a headache, for example. Thus, consistently, it is stated that headache has diverse causes and specific characteristics such as throbbing or diffuse or... Symptoms contribute to the definition of diagnosis and therapy. This is a constant reading, however, it seems necessary, in advance,

recognize that the constative reading of this text-complaint narrated by the patient is a concessionary reading. To make it possible to get closer to the other's life, we list



names of signs and symptoms, although we recognize the impossibility of reality and the impossibility of knowing exactly what the other feels. In this sense, constative reading (even artificialized by our gesture of concession) needs to be associated with a performative reading, which is constituted by an operative saying: it creates meanings, like someone sewing a new text on the stretched fabric of the original text (p.141).

In a similar way to the exercise carried out by health professionals in both studies, the researcher moves towards artificially approaching what the Other says, writes, asks, reports, and narrates. We can consider that there is a certain amount of constative action, even if it is artificially produced to allow some kind of approximation, but there will necessarily be performative work, both on the part of the participant and the researcher. This point is very important: on the one hand, those who participate in the research create their characters, when choosing what will be shown, their fiction. On the other hand, those who investigate create their ways of reading and perceiving, based on field experience, theoretical assumptions assumed, axioms, criteria, and values established during the research.

It is in this sense that the researcher is required to be sensitive to the field, to perceive and embrace its characteristics, and to consider the frames of reference presented by those who participate in the study; that are still attentive and permeable to the progress of the research, without losing sight of the objectives or even the epistemological and methodological references.

In the research space, therefore, the researcher has the task of inaugurating one or more original meanings for what is being investigated, in an inventive movement, with the status of surprise.

Derrida's thesis in the lecture at the University of Cornell in 1984, entitled *Invention of the Truth*, seems to operate in this sense. The philosopher

states that deconstruction has the function of raising questions about traditional thoughts. One of them deals with actions of invention, capable of founding something for the first time: “Fictions, epistemic innovations, fables, techniques are invented”. In his speech, he considers that invention means the invention of truth, in a broader sense, as the production of knowledge, and not the unveiling.

Joana Alves’ dissertation (2016) produced new knowledge, with permanent, daily, and long-term care models and relationships as the object of investigation. It started from the premise that care occurs in relationships and, therefore, it is important to look at how these occur. When attending the study scenario in context, the researcher found herself faced with the need to prepare herself with readings on the concept of care, to compose a view like a kaleidoscope (actors involved, representations, contexts, theoretical-methodological foundations), and to take the house — and everything that permeated it — as a source of information. She recorded the routines, the daily routine, the voices of the participants, small gestures, and large structures. In all of this, she assumed her place, her perspective as a researcher, her voice, her limits, and her emotions.

The text presents the required characteristics in terms of scientific rigor in form, epistemological bases, and analytical models. What draws attention is that, in the midst of all this, the researcher appears in the text produced and appears sensitive and open to the unpredictable, to the eventful dimension of her field of study, which seems to be what precisely gave it richness and beauty.

## **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

We saw that the notion of event, according to our reading of Derrida’s notion of event, in conjunction with notions proposed by other authors, can be thought-provoking for us to think about our research in Social and Human Sciences in Health. We saw that the event, taken as it is, paves the way for a

creative process on the part of researchers, who begin to propose different recipes to make composites relevant, such as *clafoutis*.

Furthermore, we note that there is a chaotic element to the event, which presupposes instabilities and a certain loss of control. It is necessary to guarantee scientific rigors from very detailed and clear perspectives, both from an epistemological and a methodological point of view, taking into account the congruence necessary for scientific production.

At the end and in continuation of the observation of the impossibility of the researcher being neutral, it is important to sign the research, define the viewpoint from which the investigation is carried out in that time/space of the research, the field, and the researcher, in performative, not just constative, gestures.

The value of research being effective in “bringing to light what was not yet there” (Derrida, 2012, p. 240) stands out. It is in this sense that researching the event is configured as a gesture towards the creation of movements, the exercise of the ability to leave it open, in resistance to the desire for full control; and the consolidation of constituted knowledge, with a clear explanation of the steps followed; to the discovery of new paths, even if labyrinthine, which is effective in proposing unusual and appropriate ways of using/applying research methods.

In all this, our role as researchers on health-disease-care seems to be less about determining or implementing the *path* of research and more about creating, here and there, escape routes to build expanded knowledge that is closer to the needs of the population. Ultimately, the notion of event leads us to take on our role as researchers as those capable of letting go and sensitive to the beauty and aridity of what comes.

This work was supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) [grant numbers 425838/2018-8, 2023]; Foundation for the Support of Research of the Federal District [grant number 35/2024 - FAPDF/PRES/GAB] and UnB (UNESCO Chair in Distance Education).

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

ALVES, J. (2016). *Cuidar e ser cuidado: uma análise do cuidado cotidiano, permanente e de longa duração*. [Tese de Doutorado em Sociologia]. Coimbra: Faculdade de Economia da Universidade de Coimbra.

AQUINO, J. G., CORAZZA, S. M.; ADO, M. D. L. (2020). Por alguma poética na docência: a didática como criação [In favor of a poetic teaching: didactic as creation]. *Educação em Revista*, v. 34, p. 1-18, jan. 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698169875>.

BARSAGLINI, R. A.; BIATO, E. C. L. (2019). Bilhetes/bereus como agenciamento para comunicar necessidades de saúde em penitenciária, Mato Grosso. In: MACHADO, M. W. K. *Impactos das tecnologias nas ciências humanas e sociais aplicadas 5* [Impacts of Technologies on the Human and Social Applied Sciences 5]. Atena Editora. DOI: 10.22533/at.ed.65719110317.

BIATO, E. C. L. (2022). A-traduzir o arquivo da docência em aula: novas vias para o pensamento científico. In: AQUINO, J. G., CARVALHO, C. R.; ZORDAN, P. (Orgs.) *Sandramaracorazza: obra, vidas etc.* [*Sandramaracorazza: work, lives, etc.*] (p. 298 - 313). Ed. UFRGS.

CAPONI, S. (2009) A saúde como abertura ao risco. In: CZERESNIA, D.; FREITAS, C. M. *Promoção da saúde: conceitos, reflexões, tendências* [Health promotion: concepts, reflections, trends] (p. 80 -112). Ed. FIOCRUZ.

CASTELLANOS, M., LOYOLA, M.; IRIART, J. (2014). Ciências sociais em saúde coletiva. In: Paim, J.; Almeida-Filho, N. *Saúde Coletiva: teoria e prática* [Public Health: theory and practice] (p. 567-584). MedBook.

CORAZZA, S. M. (2013). *O que se transcria em educação?* [What is transcribed in education]. UFRGS.

CRESWELL, J. (2014). *Investigação qualitativa e projeto de pesquisa: escolhendo entre cinco abordagens* [Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches]. Ed. Penso.

DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. (1992). *O que é a filosofia?* [What is philosophy?]. Ed. 34.

DERRIDA, J. (1967). *La voix et le phénomène*. Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl [The voice and the phenomenon. Introduction to the problem of the sign in Husserl's phenomenology]. PUF/Quadrige.

DERRIDA, J. (1984). *Invention of the truth*. University of Cornell, <https://ecommons.cornell.edu/items/7c8a4441-87c2-43bb-922f-28334029086f>.

DERRIDA, J. (2001). *Posições* [Positions]. Ed. Autêntica.

DERRIDA, J.; ROUDINESCO, E. (2004). *De que amanhã: diálogo* [Of which tomorrow: dialogue]. Zahar.

DERRIDA, J. (2007). *O cartão postal: de Sócrates a Freud e além* [The postcard: from Socrates to Freud and beyond]. Civilização brasileira.

DERRIDA, J. (2009). *Otobiografías*. La enseñanza de Nietzsche y la política del nombre propio [Otobiographies. Nietzsche's teaching and the politics of the proper name]. Amorrortu.

Derrida, J. (2012). Uma certa possibilidade impossível de dizer o acontecimento [A certain impossible possibility of saying the event]. *Revista Cerrados*, 21(33). <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/cerrados/article/view/26148>

FEYRABEND, P. (2011). *Contra o método* [Against method]. 2nd ed. Unesp.

LAW, J. (2004). *After method*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.

LAW, J. (2016). *Modes of Knowing: Resources from the Baroque*. Mattering press.

LÉBRUN, G.(1983). Para que ler Nietzsche, hoje? In: LÉBRUN, Gérard. *Passeios ao léu* [Random walks] (p. 32-40). Brasiliense.

LEMO, P., BIATO, E. C. L.; BARSAGLINI, R. A. (2021). (Con)fusões de fronteiras na experiência de pessoas em hemodiálise. BARSAGLINI, R.A.; PORTUGAL, S.; MELO, L. (Orgs.) *Experiência, saúde, cronicidade: um olhar socioantropológico* [Experience, health, chronicity: a socio-anthropological perspective] (p. 315-334). Editora Fiocruz/Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.

MOL, A. (2016). Clafoutis as a composite: on hanging together felicitously. In: LAW, J. **Modes of knowing**. Resources from the Baroque (p. 242-265). Mattering press.

MONTEIRO, S. B., & BIATO, E. C. L. (2008). Uma avaliação crítica acerca de método e suas noções [A critical evaluation of the method and its notions]. *Revista de educação pública*, 17(34), p.255-271.

MORSE, J. (2021). Why the Qualitative Health Research Review process does not use checklists. *Qualitative Health Research*, 31(5). p. 819-821. DOI: 10.1177/1049732321994114.

NIETZSCHE, F. W. (2001) *A gaia ciência* [Gaia Science]. Companhia das Letras.

NIETZSCHE, F. W. (2005). *Além do bem e do mal: prelúdio a uma filosofia do futuro* [Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future]. Companhia das Letras.

NIETZSCHE, F. W. (2009). *Genealogia da moral*. Uma polêmica [Genealogy of morality. A controversy]. Companhia das Letras.

NIETZSCHE, F. W. (2011). *Assim falou Zaratustra: um livro para todos e para ninguém* [Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and for No One]. Companhia das Letras.

PORTUGAL, S. (2021). Para uma leitura da experiência de adoecimento crônico: contributos de três paradigmas da teoria social. In: BARSAGLINI, R.A.; PORTUGAL, S.; MELO, L. (Orgs.) *Experiência, saúde, cronicidade: um olhar socioantropológico* [Experience, health, chronicity: a socio-anthropological perspective] (p. 63-83). Editora Fio-cruz/Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.

SOUZA, L.C.; BIATO, E.C.L. (2023). As traduções do conceito de saúde nos processos de aprendizagem e as escrituras na formação em saúde [The translations of the concept of Health in Learning processes and the writings in health undergraduation]. *Revista Signos*, 44(2), <https://doi.org/10.22410/issn.1983-0378.v44i2a2023.3504>.