

AN INTRODUCTION TO A POSTMODERN APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

LAETITIA ZEEMAN
MARIE POGGENPOEL
CPH MYBURGH
N VAN DER LINDE

*Faculty of Education and Nursing,
Rand Afrikaans University, Republic of South Africa*

This article serves as an introduction to discourse analysis. Due to logistical reasons, because this is a relatively new and multi-faceted approach in research, this article involves only introductory remarks about discourse analysis as approach to qualitative, reflexive educational research. Different postmodern "approaches" to qualitative nursing research derived from other disciplines are being rooted in nursing as epistemology. Discourse analysis is introduced as a Poststructuralist and Social Constructionist "approach" to educational research developing within the postmodern line of thought. The ideas on discourse analysis as a research 'approach' of Parker (1992: 6-20) and Terre Blanche & Durrheim (1999: 154-167) are discussed. Discourse analysis could serve as a valuable "approach" in educational research as it challenges current dominant ways of understanding or viewing the objects of study. This process opens up space for alternative reflections that could lead to change.

Postmodernism is not a school of thought. It is not a unified intellectual movement with a definite goal or perspective. "Postmodernism can be the set of ideas which try to define or explain the state of affairs in society or a word used in many different contexts to cover many different aspects (Ward, 1997:4)" Postmodern theory sets about dismantling most of our normal ways of thinking about how meaning interpretation and reality works. This dismantling process is also visible in education and educational research. Different postmodern "approaches" to educational research derived from other disciplines are

being rooted in education as an epistemology. Discourse analysis will be introduced as a Poststructuralist and Social Constructionist "approach" to educational research developing from a postmodern line of thought.

The value of this research lies under alia in the following: Postmodernism creates distance for the generation of alternatives in inter alia the culture, language, ways of thinking, stories and interpretations. The existence of alternative stories on one event, the existence of more than one interpretation of the world and the thought that the self has more than one

view or part bring about big shifts and freedom.

Narrative therapy originated from the poststructuralistic way of thinking and the social constructivism. It works through the deconstruction of previous therapeutic models, therapeutic practices and dominant discourses that exist inside the culture group. Discourse analysis does not describe and explain the world. It does not make any claim on the truth, it is a reflexive process that is directed at change and progress.

Problem Statement

Discourse analysis has not widely been described in literature as a qualitative "approach" in educational research. In South Africa this research "approach" is reasonably unfamiliar in educational research. "Discourse analysis has its roots in linguistics, literary studies, and anthropology" (Ward, 1997:129). It is being practiced at present in virtually all of the humanities and the social sciences. Discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary research "approach" and can be of great worth if it is derived as Social Constructionist and Poststructuralist epistemology into educational research.

Paradigm

"Discourse analysis is a qualitative research design" (Terre Blanche & Durheim, 2000:48). It should first be situated in its broader paradigmatic context namely: Poststructuralism and Social constructionism. "Poststructuralism and Social constructionism developed within the postmodern line of thought" (Kvale, 1992:8). Certain central Structuralist ideas need to be highlighted before Poststructuralism can be introduced.

Structuralism

"Structuralism is thought of as an approach or method rather than a clearly defined discipline" (Ward, 1997:80). The object of study in structuralist thought is the system and structure of language and how meaning is generated. To summarise: Structuralism asks where meaning come from: "Does it come from the text itself? Does it come from the context in which the text is consumed: Is the reader free to create his or her own meaning? To what degree can the author of a text control how it is interpreted? Does the production of meaning arise from the interaction of these factors. If so, how do they interact?" (Ward, 1997:88)

Structuralist thought in research studies the deeper or underlying systems in language practices and how meaning is produced. "Structuralism and Poststructuralism form much of the philosophical background of postmodern theory" (Ward, 1997:80). Within the Postmodern line of thought Poststructuralism developed from the above mentioned central Structuralist ideas.

Poststructuralism

Poststructuralist ideas received widespread attention with the work of "Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Barthes" (Gavey, 1998:460). This line of thought is also informed by "post-Saussurean linguistics, Marxism (particularly Althusser's theory of ideology), feminism, the "new French feminists" (Kristeva, Cixous, Irigaray)" (Gavey, 1998:460, Ward, 1997:80-100).

In search of a definition for or a description of Poststructuralism many problems are encountered. It is a virtually impossi-

ble process to define Poststructuralism. At the center of post-structuralism is a resistance to any form of definition or identification "...presumably because such practices represent an attempt to pin down an essence which does not exist" (Gavey, 1998:119).

According to Foucault (1988:18) "...the premises of post-structuralism disallow any denominative, unified, or 'proper' definition of itself. Broadly it involves a critique of metaphysics: of the concepts of causality, of identity, of the subject, of power, knowledge and of truth".

Poststructuralist premises become clearer when its ideas on language and meaning in relation to Structuralist ideas are discussed. There is a difference between Structuralist and Poststructuralist's views on language and meaning. Ward (1997:92,100) explains that Structuralism sees language as a closed system and tries to fix individual texts to rigid linguistic frameworks whereby underlying meaning is exposed. Structuralism as mentioned, seeks the 'facts' about texts and the deeper, underlying, hidden fundamental structures that supports the texts. For Post-structuralists there are no facts (Ward, 1996:86-104). There are only interpretations.

As Gergen (1991b:10) argues, Post-structuralists try to open texts up and cut meaning loose. Poststructuralists do not necessarily believe that everything is meaningless, just that meaning is never factual or final. Poststructuralism rejects the notion of ultimate, underlying grounds beneath meaning.

To Poststructuralist researchers language and language systems are important.

One such a system operating through language described in Poststructuralist thought is discourse (Monk, Winslade, Crocket, Epston 1996:30; Hare-Mustin, 1994:19; Hollway, 1983:231). Discourse can have many different meanings according to where it is used and by whom. "A discourse is an abstract public sphere of words and images" (Ward, 1997:129).

A discourse is not just an abstract concept; it exists in concrete social situations and has very real effects" (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2000:48-52). In the discussion that follows discourse analysis will be introduced as a Poststructuralist and Social Constructionist "approach" to educational research.

Social constructionism

Social constructionism studies how people interact with one another to construct modify and maintain what their society holds to be true, real and meaningful. Social constructionism maintains that meanings are produced by a process of reflexivity (Denzin & Lincoln 1994:127,128; Freedman & Combs, 1996:22-28; Terre Blanche & Durrheim 2000:48).

Constructionism is concerned with broader patterns of social meaning encoded in language. According to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (2000:48) these premises leads to the following implications in research:

Social Constructionist methods want to show how understanding and experiences are derived from larger discourses. Social Constructionist approaches treat people as though their thoughts feelings and experiences were the products of systems of meaning that exist at a social rather than

an individual level. Constructionism holds that human life-world is fundamentally constituted in language and that language should therefore be the object of study. Constructionists do not treat language as if it was neutral and transparent or as a route to underlying realities, rather language helps to construct reality.

Constructionism is concerned with broader patterns of social meaning encoded in language (Monk, et al. 1996:30; Hare-Mustin, 1994:19; Holloway, 1983:231). A discourse is a system with broader patterns of social meaning encoded in language that forms the object of study in Social Constructionist and Post-structuralist research. A short preface to discourse analysis, as a qualitative research design will ensue:

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is not a descriptive and explanatory practice that aims at truth claims. It rather is a form of reflexive research. "Discourse analysts understand the task of research to be a reflexive and productive not a descriptive practice" (Parker, 1992:6).

The aim of discourse analysis

"Rather than describing and explaining the world and making truth claims, discourse analysis aims to account for how particular conceptions of the world become fixed and pass as truth" (Durrheim, 1997:181). "Seeing historically how effects of truth are produced in discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false" (Foucault, 1984b: 88).

Durrheim (1997:181) explains that discourse analysis is a reflexive process that aims to provide an account of how 'objects' in the world are constructed against a back-

ground of socially shared understandings. These socially shared understandings often have become institutionalized and gained factual status. It is a form of social critique.

"A social Constructionist epistemology moves away from the mechanistic and individualistic understanding of the object of study. It moves away from a conceptual critique to a social critique" (Durrheim, 1997:181). During discourse analysis we "want to understand the function of a particular discourse, the way they position their subjects in relations of contempt and respect, of domination and subordination or of opposition and resistance, we pass quickly and ineluctably from conceptual critique to social critique" (Parker, 1992:37).

Discourse analysis as described by Parker (1992:6) and Durrheim (1997:181) has a second goal: It is not only a reflexive process; it is also a productive process or a process that brings change. During discourse analysis reflexivity is employed to produce new meanings by showing how taken-for-granted everyday and scientific objects are embedded in certain 'regimes of truth'. During the reflexive process in research new meanings and ways of understanding the objects of research are generated.

Some discourse analysts describe this second aim as the aim of overturning commonly accepted understandings of 'objects' by drawing on other marginalized discourses to demonstrate the constructed nature of common understandings.

In the words of Durrheim (1997:181): "What is the point of overturning convention and deconstructing truth? In short it has political aims of disrupting the oppres-

sive and exploitative effects associated with institutionalized discourses and forms of life. Discourse analysis doesn't describe or explain the world; it is a critical enterprise, a reflexive process, a form of ideology critique".

Discourse analysis "... does not aspire to truth, but to change" (Durrheim, 1997:181). Foucault (1984b: 88) said: "Knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting". To do a discourse analysis is to exercise the cutting tool of knowledge toward the aims of human emancipation.

DISCUSSION

The "how" of discourse analysis

Discourses are not discreet entities, but are intertwined with each other and constantly changing. Therefore it is virtually impossible to pin down a discourse. Constructionist researchers study discourses as if they are living entities. "Discourses live in texts" (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999: 154-167). Books, articles, advertisements, movies, transcribed interviews serve as examples of texts. Discourses as objects are studied by examining them in texts.

There is no field guide to discourse analysis. "Even though researchers, students and teachers of discursive approaches have to set out a method, there is really no method as such, there is no one thing called discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is not a set of methodological techniques that only carefully trained experts understand and are able to use..." (Parker, Levett, Kot-

ter & Burman, 1997:198).

The ideas on discourse analysis as a research 'approach' of Parker (1992: 6-20) and Terre Blanche & Durrheim (1999: 154-167) are introduced. These ideas do not constitute a method, and they should not be followed sequentially (Parker, 1992: 6-20; Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999: 154-167). They serve as mere pointers in directing analyses.

Terre Blanche & Durrheim's (1999: 154-167) three-facet 'approach' to discourse analysis:

1. Discourses
Discourses manifest in texts. Texts become intelligible by drawing on discourses. Discourses can be identified using cultural competence and critical distance.
"Tricks": look for binary oppositions, identify recurrent terms, phrases and metaphors, identify subjects that include the author and listener.
2. Effects
Not 'what does the text say?', but 'what does the text do?'
Both explicit and implicit intentions of a text
Why? (these oppositions, these recurrent terms, these subjects)
What? (other elements could have been used)
How? (are the effects achieved)
3. Contexts
Show patterns of variation and consistency of discourses across texts
The micro-context of conversation and debate

Other texts and discourses

The institutional, ideological and historical context

The analyst (and the dangers of idealism and relativism)

The abovementioned 'method' of Terre Blanche & Durrheim can be combined with the following 'approach' of Parker.

Parker's (1992: 6-20) 'approach' to discourse analysis:

1. Discourse lives in texts: Consider everything to be text and explore the connotations, allusions and implications that the text evokes.
2. A discourse is about objects: Discourses are practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak. A discourse is about objects, and discourse analysis is about discourses as objects. Ask the question: "what objects are referred to?", and describe them. Talk about the talk as if it were an object, a discourse.
3. A discourse contains subjects: Specify what types of persons are talked about and speculate what rights they have to speak.
4. A discourse is a system of meanings: 'Map' a picture of the world this discourse represents. Work out how a text using this discourse would deal with objections.
5. A discourse refers to other discourses: Set different discourses against each other and see what objects they form. Identify points where they overlap.
6. A discourse reflects on its own way of speaking: Refer to other texts to elaborate the discourse. Reflect on the term used to describe the discourse.
7. Discourses are historically located:

Look at how and where the discourses emerged and describe how they have changed.

8. Discourses support institutions: Identify institutions that are reinforced when this discourse is used, and identify the institutions that are subverted when this discourse appears.

9. Discourses reproduce power relations: Identify which categories of persons gain and lose from implying the discourse. Identify who would want to promote or dissolve the discourse.

10. Discourses have ideological effects: Show how a discourse connects with other discourses, which sanction oppression and how dominant groups prevent those who use subjugated discourses from 'making history'.

As mentioned these ideas do not form a specific methodology for discourse analysis. They do not constitute a technique or a method and should not be followed successively. They serve as mere pointers in directing analyses.

CONCLUSION

Discourse analysis was briefly introduced as a Postmodern 'approach' to educational research. The paradigmatic foundation for discourse analysis as mentioned is rooted within Poststructuralism and Social Constructionism that developed within the postmodern line of thought.

Discourse analysis could serve as a valuable "approach" in educational research as it challenges current dominant ways of understanding or viewing the objects of study. This process opens up space for alternative reflections that could lead to change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DENZIN, NK & LINCOLN, YS 1994: Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- DE VOS, AS; STRYDOM, H; FOUCHE, CB; POGGENPOEL, M & SCHURINK, E & W 1998: Research at grass roots. A primer for the caring professions. Pretoria: JL van Schaik Academic.
- DURRHEIM, K 1997: Social constructionism, discourse and psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(3), 1997 : 175-182.
- FOUCAULT, M 1984b: Nietzsche, genealogy, history. (In Rainbow, P; eds.: *The Foucault reader*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp 76-100.)
- FOUCAULT, M 1988: *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings 1977-1984*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- FREEDMAN, J & COMBS, G 1996: Narrative therapy. The social construction of preferred realities. Illinois: Evanston Family Therapy Center.
- GAVEY, N 1998: Feminist Poststructuralism and discourse analysis: Contributions to feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, No. 13, 1989 : 459-475.
- GERGEN, KJ 1991b. The saturated self. Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life. USA: Basic Books.
- HARE-MUSTIN, R 1994: Discourses in the mirrored room: A postmodern analysis of therapy. *Family Process*, 33, 1994: 19-35.
- HOLLWAY, W 1983. Heterosexual sex: Power and desire for the other - sex and love: new thoughts on old contradictions. London: The Women's Press.
- KVALE, S 1992: Psychology and postmodernism. London: Sage.
- MONK, G; WINSLADE, J; CROCKET, K & EPSTON, D 1996: Narrative therapy in practice. The archeology of hope. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MOUTON, J 1996: Understanding social research. Pretoria: JL van Schaik.
- TERRE BLANCHE, MJ & DURRHEIM, K 1999: Research in practice: applied methods for the social sciences. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- PARKER, I 1992: Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology. London: Routledge.
- PARKER, I; LEVETT, A; KOTTLER, A & BURMAN, E 1997: Culture, power and difference: Discourse analysis in South Africa. London: Zen Books.
- WARD, G 1997: Postmodernism. Illinois. Teach Yourself Books.
- ZEEMAN, L 2000: 'n Diskoers-analise: Unieke vroue leef te midde van die werking van 'n patriargale diskoers. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University (D.Cur Thesis).
-
- 2
- Mouton, J. 1996. Understanding social research. Pretoria: van Schaik.
- Mouton, J. & Marais H.C. 1992. Basiese begrippe: Metodologie van Geesteswetenskappe. Pretoria: Raadvir Geesteswetenskaplike Naorsing.
- Democratic Nurses Association of South Africa, 1998. Ethical standards for nurse researchers. Pretoria: Democratic Nurses Association of South Africa.
- Wilson, H.S. 1989. Research in nursing. California: Addison-Wesley.

A vertical bar on the left side of the page, consisting of a series of yellow and orange rectangular segments. A small red diamond is at the top of the bar.

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

TITLE: An Introduction to a Postmodern Approach to
Educational Research: Discourse Analysis

SOURCE: Education (Chula Vista, Calif.) 123 no1 Fall 2002

WN: 0228803481011

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited..

Copyright 1982-2002 The H.W. Wilson Company. All rights reserved.