Philosophy of the Reliability of Qualitative Data and Interpretation

Mustafa ERGÜN*

AfyonKocatepe University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences

Abstract

In educational research the data are mostly collected through the scales which are about the views, perceptions, attitudes of students, teachers or parents about a topic. However, there is a significant question about these data: How do these data represent true assumptions of the participants? In educational research the bias of the researchers affects the hypothesis and data collection process (it may refer to the view that all scholarship is ideological). Therefore, all data collection analysis should be reviewed.

In educational research the data collected from textual and audio sources are regarded as having a single meaning and the resulting interpretation is carried out based on this assumption. In some cases different coders are used to improve the reliability of the study. In this attempts the consistency of coding is aimed (such as Miles/Huberman, Clippendorf Alpha). In linguistic and semiological studies it is assumed that there is intertextuality which means that each text is dependent on the previous texts and that language determines the perceptions, views and attitudes of individuals. However, texts are also influenced by historical, psychological and sociological factors. In educational research do researchers follow true information? It seems that pragmatic philosophy which argues that correctness is not absolute, but functional is still dominant in educational research. On the other hand, many people regard belief as one of the major criterion for correctness. The reliability of the study results about the views, attitudes and interests of individuals leads to the question of "do people produce truth?"

In scientific research textual data are considered to have a single meaning. This assumption is valid for text mining and content analysis techniques. However, in order to reach true scientific information the data should be analysed through such techniques as hermeneutics, deconstruction and archeology of knowledge. This study deals with the role of these techniques in qualitative research design.

The ultimate goal of scientific research is to capture truth and correction. Scientific knowledge is the one of which truth is commonly accepted and is consistent with the dominant paradigms. There are certain methods to gather such scientific knowledge.

It has been accepted that research methods used in social science is different from those used in natural sciences. Cause-effect relationships observed in non-living beings cannot be valid for individuals. In social sciences the reactions of individuals are accepted to be searched for. Reactions have been considered to be affected by many distinct factors.

In qualitative research data are gathered through observations and interviews. Answers by the study participants to scales are considered to reflect the true views of them. However, researchers may have doubt about these answers. Hermeneutics also contain such doubts which make it difficult to capture scientific knowledge.

* ergun@aku.edu.tr

There is no absolute true information. Instead, there are different sense and interpretations of individuals, which is the basic premise of hermeneutics. It requires the use of different coders and different interpretations. Therefore, the data collected should be coded by different people and interpretations should be done by different individuals. In educational research survey questionnaires used as a data collection tool deal with the views of teachers. Instead, these tools provide us with the legal and correct answers based on the current regulations. We may study this case following Foucault's "Archeology of Knowledge" technique and see that teachers should give such answers. Many argue that in qualitative research hermeneutics should be major basis. Everybody recognise the significance of interpretation in qualitative research, but the valid method for it has not been well-established. The data gathered from social science and humanist studies should be discussed in relation to their benefits and use in developing solutions.

Key words: educational research, data, coding, textual data, reliability, interpretation

Introduction

Educational research mostly depends on self-reports of students, teachers or parents about a certain topic or depends on their answers to the scales. Whether or not these answers truly reflect the views of the participants is one of the major questions. In addition, bias of researchers significantly influence their research design, including hypotheses and data collection (therefore, it is possible to argue that all scholarship is ideological) (Schilb 1988, Grace 1998). On the other hand educational research is also affected by the social and psychological backgrounds, anxiety and expectations of the participants. Therefore, it is needed to reevaluate and review the analysis, grouping and interpretation of the data.

The data taken from textual and audio sources in educational research are interpreted based on the view that the data have a single meaning. In order to improve the reliability sometimes different coders are employed and the intercoder consistency is analysed through various techniques such as the Miles/Huberman, Clippendorf Alpha. In the linguistic and semiotic studies, it is accepted that each text has a close connection with previous texts, called intertextuality, and that language determines the perspectives, views and attitudes of people. It is further argued that language does not directly represent either internal world or external world, and even that people may use language to manipulate others. In short, linguistic texts are affected by historical, psychological and sociological factors. Does the educational research move away from the real information? It seems that in education the pragmatist philosophy which argues for the fact that correctness is not the absolute truth, but is the usefullness is still dominant. On the other hand, many people regard the beliefs as one of the major criteria of truth. Does the dependence on the findings of the studies based on views, attitudes and interests move us to a situation "in which truth is produced by people"?

As stated above, our basis is the single meaning of textual data. We will continue to employ the techniques of text mining and content analysis which adopts the single-meaning approach. However, these data should also be analysed through the techniques of hermeneutics, deconstruction and archaeology of knowledge. This study deals with the philosophy of the qualitative data and the information processing techniques given above.

Hermeneutics

Everyday everyone tries to understand everything they come across. Understanding is necessary for everything. People "live" in an alien world which is social and historical,1 and come across many meanings in a complex universe. They do know where they are and at which time period they are living. We try to both understand and tell everything. We acquired a certain perspective and there are meaning between subjects which was constructed through language. The feelings, views and acts of people are fixed. Therefore, people cannot understand things independent of their environment and past. However, in such an environment people' physical body, attitudes, views, anxiety, expectations are different. All these significantly affect their understandings. People first know themselves and find their way. In short, understanding is a practical act influenced by the expectations, bias and environment of people. It also produce stress, because it requires one to be alert everytime, change the plans and expectations and it includes frustration and disappointment... Sometimes people cannot understand! Similarly, learning also requires continuous revision of the positions and self-management as well as transforming oneself.

Both understanding and interpretation is carried out on texts. The word "text" was formerly used to refer to written work and statements (Aytaş, 2013), but later it expanded to cover verbal expressions, artistic work, architectural monuments, songs and even gardens and other natural products, all human expressions (Gadamer 2002).

Where does meaning lie, in the intention of the text producer or in the mental patterns of the interpreter? Schleiermacher and Dilthey looked for meaning in the intention of the text producer and argued that in order to capture the meaning the view of the producer should be seen and that the text should be recreated with his perspective (intentionalism). Others argued that the intention of the text producer is not important and that the meaning is constructed by the interpreter (Ulukütük 2009). Meaning is not fixes, for that reason each interpreter attaches different senses to the text. It is reflected in the interpretation of scriptures. As it is known Christianity has different branches such as Orthodoxy, Catholicism, and Protestantism. Similarly, there are different cults and sects due to the differential interpretation of scriptures. It may also be expanded into historical events. For instance, the Ottoman ruler Fatih regarded the murder of his brothers as a legal action due to his interpretation of the conditions of his period. Thus, there is a dynamic process between actions and interpreters.

Nearly in all cultures religious texts are distinctly interpreted. Hence, it can be stated that hermeneutics include many different acts of explanations and interpretations of texts such as the commentary of religious texts and of religious books, laws based on these books and the interpretation of legal and literary texts.

Schleiermacher (from 1805) began to use hermeneutics for all types of texts, making it much more universal. Schleiermacher, who was the first scholar questioning the conditions of understanding, developed a distinct approach towards hermeneutics. In fact, the use of hermeneutics for literary works began in this period (Toprak, 2003).

---

[1]The metaphors of thrown into the world and go up exist in many belief systems.

Schleiermacher developed two methods in hermeneutics: grammatical interpretation and psychological interpretation.

Grammatical interpretation deals with meaning in terms of the semantic and syntactic patterns of texts. In this method the starting point is the individual words. Then, sentences are analysed to reveal the meaning. In other words, the text is divided into its smallest parts and then, the whole text is analysed.

In the psychological interpretation the intention of the text producer is significant and therefore, the goal is to correctly understand it. It requires the analysis of the historical conditions under which the text was produced. The other significant points in the psychological interpretation are as follows: conditions outside the text, the past of the author, cultural characteristics of the society where he live in. Interpreter tries to put himself instead of the text producer taking into consideration the characteristics of the related conditions (Toprak 2003). Thus, in order to uncover the intention of the text producer it is necessary to think about the social and historical conditions of the period when the text is developed. However, sometimes it is necessary to think about the text independently of these social and historical conditions. In other words, it is also possible to carry out a purely psychological interpretation out the original context (Bilen 2002).

Following Schleiermacher his pupil Dilthey regarded the hermeneutics as an enterprise to understand the acts of people and the thinkers, including G.Misch, J.Wach, H.Freyer, E.Rothacker, and F.W.Bollnow developed this approach towards hermeneutics (Aytaş 2013).

Dilthey, unlike Schleiermacher, regarded understanding as an interpretive technique (Özcan, 2000, Dilthey 1999). Given than people are qualitatively distinct from other living beings in the world, their acts cannot be explained through the uniformity natural laws. Instead, such acts occur in a situation where many factors such as economy, policy, history, geography, values, traditions and conventions have significant roles to play. The textual interpretation is influenced by various factors, including individuals' hope, fear, expectations, beliefs, views as well as by differential perspectives about the world, and the current historical, economic and political environment (Tatar 2004). Therefore, Dilthey makes a distinction between natural universe and spiritual universe. For Dilthey positive sciences can account for physical events taking place in the nature, but spiritual universe can only be "understood" ("die Naturerklärenwir, das Seelenlebenverstehenwir")[2] (Bourgeois 1976, Schurz 2002, Anlı 2010). The acts and thinking of individuals occur and are shaped in a world of meaning. The most significant act of individuals is their attempt to understand themselves and the world (Ulukütük, 2011). Therefore, the acts of individuals cannot be accounted for by the causality which is commonly used in natural sciences to present explanations due to the fact that individuals live with many various values. Dilthey, like Schleiermacher, attempted to understand the social conditions affecting the psychology of the text producer.

Nietzsche argued that individuals do not have any organ to comprehend the absolute truth and to discover knowledge (Nietzsche 2003). However, although they do not have ability to comprehend the truth, they need to believe in and understand the truth to survive.

---

[2]Even in natural sciences understanding and interpretation are significant. Faye, J. 2007, Interpretation in the Natural Sciences. in: *EPSA07: 1st Conference of the European Philosophy of Science Association* (Madrid, 15-17 November, 2007). http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/3736/1/Interpretation_in_the_Natural_Sciences.doc

For Nietzsche, perspectivism is the only one which should be supported in the domain of knowledge (Çelik 2013). Although individuals consider themselves to be objective, they can only reach themselves at the end of the act of knowing (Nietzsche 2007). For Nietzsche, it is not possible for the subjects to understand and know something surpassing themselves and the significant effects of socio-historical conditions and language (Nietzsche 2009). Nietzsche emphasized the fact that in linguistic activity the lexical meaning is fixed and that these words do not have a fixed and common meaning, which can be shared by everyone. Meaning changes over time, leading to an infinite number of comments and interpretations. Furthermore, Nietzsche stated that each understanding is different at different time periods and the meaning of a text cannot be limited to the intention of its producer.

Gadamer, in Truth and Method, emphasized the fact that the questions of understanding and interpretation is not limited to semantics (Gadamer 2009). He objected the claims of the seeking of "absolute" and of objective knowledge. He developed an approach towards the design of "truth" with the philosophical hermeneutics, which was based on the concepts of "tradition" and "prejudice". He argued that when people try to reach the meaning of something, they in fact reach our object with pre-understanding, which is shaped by our prejudices. People may try to avoid their prejudices, but it is not possible to understand and interpret the world and other things regardless of these prejudice. On the contrary, these prejudices are the prerequisites for opening to the world. He further argued that it is prejudices not judgements that lead to historical reality of people (Gadamer 2009). In order to have experience people first should have prejudices. Therefore, the claims of "avoiding prejudices" and objectivity which dominated the scientific understanding are invalid. In short, prejudices significantly affect understanding and interpretation and are subject to change. Therefore, there are two types of prejudices; legitimate-productive prejudices and illegitimate- misleading prejudices (Nesterova 2004). If we make a distinction among these prejudice types, it is possible for us to avoid misunderstandings. Gadamer argued that when we are able to avoid misleading prejudices and to adopt a questioning attitude, it is possible to access new meanings as well as novice and reliable information.

It is basic prejudices which people first think about and talk about. Language is the basic functioning mode of people's existence in the world and covers everything about the formation of the earth. The first attempt to the world is realized through learning a language and language is the mediator of people to express their knowledge about the world (Gadamer 2002b). Given that language is a play experienced by individuals, it is not only played by the players, but it is a play to which the players are got into and which occurs itself.

Understanding and interpretation are not only related to sciences, but also to all kinds of experience. The task of hermeneutics is to reread the meaning due to the fact that it is included not only in speech and writings, but all artefacts created by people (Gadamer 2003). Understanding is the basic way for people, who are conscious beings with the disposition of historicity, to interact with the world. People can understand themselves only when their starting point is their past. Thus, the sense of history (WirkungsgeschictlichesBewusstsein) is the necessary condition for knowing himself (Çelik 2013).

For Gadamer, when we approach towards any text to understand it, we come across the dialogue among different traditions and this dialogue brings us to distinct situations from ours (Gadamer 2002a). In this process the representative of the different traditions is the object itself. There is an interaction between the object and the individual who attempts to understand it and eventually they change and transform each other.

One of the basic principles of hermeneutics is that each understanding is incomplete and distinct. The thing obtained at the end of this interpretive process to capture the meaning is the product of the dialogue in which both parties took part and determined each other's limits (Nesterova 2004). It is the combination of "mine" and "the different one". Thus, understanding occurs under a historical effect (Gadamer 2009). Gadamer called this view "fusion of horizons". It refers to an endless and unlimited dialogue. For Gadamer, each understanding took place at the fusion of horizons is the interpretation; understanding is based on the mental design of the interpreter; therefore, in the understanding process there is a productive contribution the part of the interpreter. Understanding is an event of the realization of the transmission of tradition in which the past and future mediate each other. In the present period in which individuals live the past and future are inevitably interwined. Understanding is the reflection of the past to the future and the connection of the past with the future.

In accordance with Gadamer's hermeneutics the meaning of others' acts is not composed of their views about these acts. Instead, the meaning is the one we (or other interpreters) attach to the acts of other people (Fay 1996). Gadamer's teacher Heidegger also stated that the meaning can only be revealed and developed through interpretation. In order to capture the meaning, we must have previous connections with the thing which we try to understand. Therefore, interpretation occurs through the processing of the pre-conceptions (Vorgriff) or pre-assumptions (Voraussetzung), which are determined by this connection (Tsai 2011). According the analysed developed by Gadamer meaning could only occur when it is interpreted and reappear with each new interpretation (Fay 1996). Given that different interpreters have distinct interpretive horizons, the new dimensions of meaning occur. In short, the meaning of acts changes over time and also, cannot be in its original form.

Hermeneutical phenomenology: Phenomenology refers to personal experiences constructed by consciousness. Hermeneutics deals with making sense of and interpretation of texts (Abulad, 2007). It attempts to reveal the methodological principles of interpretation. Philosophical hermeneutics is generally used in three different domains: understanding and interpreting philosophical texts, understanding the acts and work by people and understanding the existential basis of people. Sometimes there is no overlapping between the meaning attached by the reader to objects and facts and that by the writers. This technique asserts that the statements in the text are not enough and attempts to explain and make it clear them. Elaboration is a fact which continuously change and is open to new views. Hermeneutical phenomenology deals with the experiences which are made meaningful, continuously reviewed and reinterpreted. In fact, phenomenology and hermeneutics require the use of each other (Ricoeur 2009). M. van Manen considered the hermeneutical phenomenology as a research method (Friesen et. al. 2012). This method rejects the process of making a distinction between experience and consciousness and researchers' cultural and historical background, which is commonly used in other types of phenomenology. Instead, this method attaches significance to the interpretation and reinterpretation of meanings. It focuses on the meaning of objects rather than on the object ("understand the object, but its meaning", Levinas 1987), therefore, it takes into consideration aesthetic, literary and poetic use of language (we 'are' language).

It was Heidegger who made phenomenology a field dealing with the experience and consciousness of people, which was formerly Husserl's philosophical analysis method (Öktem 2005). People's existence in the world leads to the questions of understanding and interpreting people. It is very significant that people should make sense of, analyse and interpret their religious, ethical, social aesthetic, psychological experience correctly (free of

bias, beliefs, conventional views). Such attempts are subjective and there is no attempt to develop theories about facts in this process (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). In the perception, understanding and interpreting of experience people's "meaning maps" and conditions are very significant (Sofuoğlu, 2009). Therefore, in the phenomenological studies there are both types of subjectivity; the first one is the subjectivity of individuals and the other one is the subjectivity of the researcher. People experience events through their sensory organs, perceive them in accordance with their internal world and therefore, they recreate these events (Slattery 2012). Each individual attaches certain meanings to actions and objects, which are the basis for his life. Phenomenon is not an external (or internal) fact. Instead, it refers to the mental enterprise to understand interpret this fact. For instance, such concepts as crime, truth, love are all the matter of interpretation (In education there are many distinct interpretations and understandings about what and how to be taught). Researcher penetrates the phenomenon and attempts to understand the situation within it (Çiftçi 1999).

Another method which includes the perceptions, interpretations and understanding of people is the ethnomethology. Major ethnomedologists (i.e., Douglas, Schutz, Garfinkel and Goffman) argued that in order to understand the social events or the acts of individuals perceptions of people about them should be analysed. It also stated that the goals and value judgements of individuals lie behing their acts. In the ethnomedological analysis researcher puts himself into the place of individuals to be examined and attempts to understand their acts, perceptions and views about society. This analysis deals with how individual perceive and describe their status. Therefore, it attaches great importance to the subjectivity and perceptions of individuals (Glesne, 2012; Özdemir, 2011).

Hermeneutics in educational research: Post-modernism and the reconceptualization wave in the field of educational programs moved away from the view of causal explanation to hermeneutical understanding of people. In addition, the reconceptualization wave attempted to critically and hermeneutically understand the educational activities (KırbaşoğluKılıç and Bayram 2014, Kale 1995). In educational studies it is common to examine, understand and account for each case. Given that students and teachers have individuality, although education is given to the groups of students, the analysis of students' uniqueness should be carried out, which can be achieved through the analyses of students individually. Child-centered educational movement (Aytaç, 1972) could only produce practicable and useful views when it deals with educational issues using a hermeneutical technique.

Gadamer's hermeneutics inspired some theoretical studies in the field of education (Rashford 2009, Margini 2013, Margini 2015). S.Gallagher, based on Gadamer's hermeneutics, developed a moderate educational theory. Understanding in epistemology and understanding in hermeneutics are totally different from each other. In epistemology understanding is a mental process. Understanding in hermeneutics provides an opportunity to interpret the existence in the world, perspectives, the acts of people based on familiarity or unfamiliarity. In learning this hermeneutical step is also very significant. When people learn something, they attempt to uncover unfamiliar parts using the familiar parts in their mind. Individuals' bias makes a distinction about those which are novice and different. Novice learning is conditioned by prior learning. For Gallagher each learning experience is a hermeneutical experience (Gallagher 1992). However here a question can be asked: do understanding and learning refer to the same experience? Understanding occurs from the tension between familiar and unfamiliar. There are further questions to be answered, such as how mind could solve this tension, making unfamiliar one familiar.

The Archaeology of Knowledge

Hermeneutics points out that there are many distinct factors in the production of texts and objects to be interpret and in understanding and interpreting them. Foucault argued that individuals are directly produced by knowledge systems and that powers "creates" and continuously pry into individuals. There are certain knowledge systems (episteme) of each period, which produces and guides theoretical and practical life. In other words, each period has its own thinking-cultural rules and codes. These cultural passwords guide social and individual life and their discourses.3 These passwords are like Kant's a-priori or Kuhn's paradigms. During the historical course one episteme can be replaced by another one; the existing episteme invalidates the rules and formulas of the former episteme (Foucault, 2004). An episteme occurs in the thinking pattern of a period, which is also valid for scientific thinking. Episteme covers the generality of both conscious and unconscious at a certain period. Classical periods such as 17th and 18th centuries and "modern" periods such as 19th and 20th have distinct epistemes. Foucault made a comprehensive analysis of the epistemes of these periods. He called this analysis method "The Archaeology of Knowledge". He used this method in his book The History of Madness to produce the "the archaeology of psychiatry". He also employed this method in his book The Birth of the Clinic to produce "the archaeology of medical perspective" and in another book The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. He mostly dealt with the relationships between power and episteme. In his book The History of Madness Foucault dealt with the power of reason on madness. In his book The Birth of the Clinic he analysed the power of physicians on patients. In his book Discipline and Punish he examined the power of legal system on criminals and in another book The History of Sexuality he dealt with the individuals' power on their bodies and pleasure.

Power penetrates into subjects' thinking and behaviour patterns and makes their life practical. In addition, power continuously controls and manipulates their life. For Foucault modern subject, "individual", was "created" for this aim. Subject is in the middle of the relationships between power and knowledge; subjects are created by historical powers and therefore, distinct conditions produce different subjects (Çelebi 2013). There is no individual beyond history and no transcendental subject; there are subjects created by the periods. Therefore, Foucault rejects the hermeneutical studies, which aim at uncovering the intentions and meaning hidden in texts and at producing texts from the previous texts (Foucault, 2005; Foucault, 1999). Such a hermeneutical method begins with suspecting about texts and attempts to develop different past and future from texts. However, what was told should be analysed as it was (Balcı 2015). Even not subjects and discourse, but the conditions which produce this statement should be examined, because this discourse is imposed on the subjects (Foucault, 1999).

The potential sayings of the subjects and their potential understandings and interpretations are mostly determined by the conditions of the related period. There are limitations of individuals' "discourse". These limits are determined by the power system of the period.4 For Foucault discourse does not refer to sentences produced by individuals; discourse has limits and conditions and are placed in an expression network (Foucault 1999).

3Even natural sciences are shaped historically. It is reflected in Thomas Kuhn's paradigms (Kuhn,)

4In this theory like language discourse has rules and an order. Foucault's views on the "order of discourse" guided many critical linguists. Discourse analysis has a subbrach called "Foucauldian discourse analysis".

Thus, Foucault examined the rare discourses of limited number of subjects which are produced in an environment where not everyone talks what they want. Those talked out the limits are made by power devices invalid or worthless or pointless (Foucault 1999). For instance, if the system regards someone as a "physician" he could perform his profession which has fixed duties and discourse. There is no random statement, but a statement within a certain system and the whole. The method used by Foucault does not analyse each and every text. For instance, in order to analyse the public of the state one should examine certain documents, including parliamentary proceedings, court decisions and verdicts, newspaper articles, textbooks, party statutes, reports, legal texts and autobiographies. Discourse is a concept like a paradigm (for instance, medical discourse). Here Foucault attempted to discover the rules determining and configuring the scientific discourse.

Power produces the necessary knowledge for its hegemony and controls and disciplines others using it (Foucault 2003). Foucault argued that knowledge is a kind of power imposed on people and defines them. For him knowledge is mode, which attempts to pry, order and discipline people intercepting liberation (Sarup, 2004). Subjects are raised and capacitated by power and express the views possible in their discourse, which are consistent with their task and position. However, both included and not included or taught and not thought in the program are important, because "ideology in texts exists silently." Teachers helps their students in shaping their thinking, values and preferences through what they tell and do not tell (Ergün, 2015).

Foucault deals with the original conditions for knowledge and concepts using a historical perspective. Foucault used this method to produce a history of individuals' thinking system and concepts. He concluded that thinking and concepts are identified by very special conditions of the related historical period. For him there is no object, but knowledge. Objects are created by the dominant discourse of the period. There are rules which produce an object and statements which make this object different from other objects. In other words, objects are shaped and imposed by discourse (objects of knowledge). When discourse changes, both objects and their connections change. Knowledge does not belong to objects, but objects belong to knowledge (Foucault 2013).

Foucault rewrote the thinking history of the west with his method. For him discourse is a pattern above the subjects. It determines all individuals in certain places and time periods. Individuals' statements about the views of the period are their achievement, because they are just the spokesman of psyche. Therefore, it may be expressed by others (Foucault 1999).

The other method which shaped Foucault's study and thought is genealogy. Foucault employed archaeology in determining the rules governing the occurrence and change of discourse. He employed genealogy to examine how discourse are binded to power relations, power domains and objects. Genealogy accounts for these connections. In other words, genealogy attempts to explain how subjects occur under certain conditions. Instead of analysing subjects, it reveals the related conditions, rules and their functioning. Therefore, archaeology and genealogy complement each other (Alataş 2012). In short, archaeology only focuses on discoursal expressions, and genealogy focuses on practices.

Although Foucault objected to the hermeneutical analysis about intentions and backgrounds, he tried to uncover the order and disorder in discourse without any reference to. In short, he argued that in discourse there is no "ideal, continous and smooth" and that it is possible to come across irregularities (Foucault, 1999).

Deconstructivism

Jacques Derrida followed the critical approach of Nietzsche and Heidegger towards the thinking system of west and tried to develop an alternative critical reading about the philosophical tradition of west (FırıncıOrman 2015). Derrida argued that language is ambiguous, indicating that the reason for all problems is language itself. Like Foucault he stated that language is not a function of subjects who speak it.

Heidegger argued that language does not belong to people and that people belong to language. Therefore, people does not speak language, but language makes people speak. In other words, for Heidegger unlike conventional views argues that thought does not determine language, but it is language which determines thought. Based on Heidegger's assumptions given above Derrida developed his technique of deconstructivism. In fact, the term deconstruction used by Derrida is just the French translation of the German term, "destruction", in Heidegger's book entitled Sein und Zeit (1927) (Heidegger 2008; Küçükalp 2008, Eser 2015).

The another basis for Derrida is the linguistic approach developed by F.de Saussure, a Swiss linguist. Saussure's linguistic approach was dependent on the relationship between signifier and signified. Signifier and signified are similar to both sides of the coin. Signifier refers to words and statements (sounds), signified, on the other hand, to concepts (Sign is the product of the combination of signifier and signified) (Özmakas 2010). Signs are not an objective thing, and therefore, the meaning of signs continously change. Thus, language is a completely mental enterprise and has no direct relationship with the objectivity of the external world (language get braces objects) (Yılmaz 2007). Signifier is not directly connected with signified. While analysing signifiers, we come across a set of signifieds. It indicates that meaning cannot be limited and fixed to one sign. Language has not have a fixed structure. For Derrida"there is no difference between signifier and signified" (Özmakas, 2010). However, it is necessary to make a distinction between meanings and between meaningful and meaningless, indicating their differences. On the other hand, not meaning and meaningless become baseless and human mind falls on the"bottomless abyss of language" (Derrida 1999).

Derrida's deconstruction technique is also based on the criticism of modernity and postmodern discourse. The basis for the postmodernist making sense is Derrida's understanding of "sign". Postmodernism challenges everything produced during the modern times to open a space for itself. It absolutizes nothing and has doubt about every and each knowledge piece. Postmodernism points chaos, confusion and deadlock, which Derrida applied on texts. A postmodernist reading does not accept the general and concentional rules, and changelles these rules; it reads everything again and again and criticizes. In this form, postmodernism refers to the pain of not being able to make sense of people, the universe, objects and the reason for their existence (Uçan 2009).

In the Postmodernism the subject of everything which determines everything is "language; there is nothing except for language. "People exist as much as their language". Language is playful and slippery, and it is inevitable. For instance, in Turkish the word "kör" (blind), like the other words in Turkish and in other languages, is not only used for people who have sightedness. Instead, it may have many distinct meanings based on its use with other words, as follows: "unsharp" (blunt knife), something with less light (blind lantern, blind lamb), not open-ended (dead end), shortsighted, bad (bad luck)… As can be seen from these examples, words cannot be limited to the uniform meanings. Therefore, language is

composed of complex and unlimited patterns (Uçan 2009). Thus, everything is interpretation. Here the money methaphor is also employed; like a coin, its front and back are different. Meaning can be further developed with reference to the other meanings. Meaning continously changes within the historicity of language; sings gain different meaning and senses over time. Signs change from one context to another and their meanings also changes in these processes. Therefore, the "meaning play" becomes one with no end.

There is no absolute truth, but hermeneutical truth; truth is people's choice over the available meanings and interpretations. For J. Derrida each sign will produce distinct meanings in different contexts (reiteration of text in different contexts, iterability), therefore, it is not possible to consume meaning (Balkin 2004). Meaning cannot be limited. Given that meaning is not eligible for limitation and is always cancelled, there can be no "true meaning", or "absolute meaning". Therefore, Derrida leaves meanings into the space. In Derrida's deconstruction there are no determinist perception and interpretation, causality, objectivity, a hierarchical reality and only one truth. Instead of being a reading or analysis method deconstruction refers to rewriting of a text based on its contradiction in an opposite manner of the original form, running upside down the authority of its writer. Deconstructivism is based on the structuralist reading of texts. Structuralist reading attempts to analyse the textual structure, to uncover the connections among the textual elements and constituents of sentences. Structuralism employs this to reach the meaning. Deconstructive reading, on the other hand, attempts to question the consistency and validity of the textual structure and to show how the textual meaning stumbles and is opposite to its original reasoning dealing with the contradictions and doubtful points included in the text (Türe Abacı 2015). The ultimate goal is to reveal inconsistency and inability of texts to tell and transmit its messages. In general, people are not able to completely express their views. Similar to having different social faces, people have various distinct linguistic faces. Sometimes they just imply, they want the hearer to understand the message. Sometimes they tell the opposite of what they truly want to say. It is certain that there are more things than they could tell. Sometimes they are not able to express their true intention, "hum and haw". Sometimes they cannot tell their emotions and views, "words are useless" (OrhanVeli' poem entitled "Anlatamıyorum").

As stated above, in the structuralist reading method, the focus is on the textual pattern. Deconstructive reading decentrizes texts. It focuses on seemingly insignificant details and attempts to look for the message that was not expressed, but implied (Zariç 2014). Meaning is the invitation of those words that were expressed as well as those that were not expressed. The unsaid always exceeds what is said, reflecting that the understanding of people is based on time and has serious limitations. Understanding is connected to words; but, everything beyond words also need words to be understood (Tatar 2004).

Deconstructive reading tries to show the inconsistency of the basis or basic judgments of text and to reveal the structure of these basic judgments based on binary opposites. Deconstruction allows for other meanings in texts to speak. In other words, it makes it possible to open the text for distinct readings and to indicate the bias of the writer of the text. It attempts to achieve these goals in two ways: "reversal", and "displacement". The ultimate goal here is to challenge the order in the text and to "deconstruct" the dominant concepts.

In text it is not possible to reach its meaning, but the meaning can only be deconstructed.5 And this deconstruction process does not present only one meaning, but various distinct meanings. Doubts which occur during the reading of a sentence bring readers further doubts about the meaning of previous sentences and the meaning of words. Language is generally constructed on opposites, but these opposites are not sturdy and Derrida's deconstructive technique sometimes turns down or replaces them to demolish it.

For Derrida there is no sound basis for making a distinction between "talk" and "writing"; therefore, the approaches of sound-centerism or utterance-centerism are not correct. It is senseless to attach much more significance to sounds and utterances instead of writings. In fact, the distinction between "talk" and "writing" is the product of a metaphysical thought (Özmakas 2010, Küçükalp 2008). Derrida assumes that during speech speaker and his utterances simultaneously exist and that there is identification between his utterance and his message. Hence, the words in speech are the expressions of thought without any mediator and can be heard in speaker. Written texts later become open to all kinds of meaning and can be differently interpreted by other people and over time their potential meanings increase.6 Derrida argues that speech also has meaning differences and variance, which exist in written texts. Each utterance is open to many distinct interpretations rather than the intention of speakers (Özmakas 2010). Thus, both writings and talks are texts, and "there is nothing beyond texts." (Derrida, 2011).

Derrida generally attempted to demolish the basis of the western thought; he challenged and criticised this basis and the origins of the western thought and tried to show the mistakes of the western thought. He attempted to reveal the incorrectness of the seeking for absolute truth by Western metaphysics and to show that language is a domain beyond truth and untruth. To achieve this goal the linguistic structure should be reevaluated. He regards the Western metaphysics as a linguistic domination. Thus, overcoming this domination means overcoming a certain type of thinking.

Deconstructivism attempted to reveal and decompose the deep structure of texts. Derrida's technique expanded the methods of many disciplines, including literary theory, linguistics, philosophy, law, sociology, cultural theory and architecture. In this manner deconstructive analysis emphasizes the significance of the legal context and the change of meanings in parallel to the changes in the legal context (Balkin 2009). Critical legal experts have frequently employed deconstructive technique due to several reasons, including the uncertainty of legal texts, the diversity of social structure and social meanings and the insignificance of the legal doctrines and evidences.

Based on postmodernism and deconstructivism, intertextuality is another method for the textual analysis which should be taken into consideration. This method argued that each text has a natural connection with the previously developed texts. Therefore, a text has many distinct meaning as many as its readers. In addition, each reading may vary based on the background of readers and the reading process. Another significant theory to be given here is the reader-response theory. This theory argues that the meaning of a text is constructed in the process in which readers come across the meaning (Moran, 1994).

---

5 Deconstructive analysed is compared to the attempts of Penelope in the ancient Greek mythology who rips what she knitted during daytime at night while waiting for Ulysses (Yılmaz 2007).
6 Even scientific texts like literary ones do not have the exact meaning and contain uncertainty (Derrida 2011).

Conclusion

Scientific research seeks for only truth and accurateness. Scientific knowledge are consistent with the dominant paradigm of the period and are commonly accepted in terms of its accuracy. There are certain methods to obtain such scientific knowledge.

It has been long accepted that research methods in social and human sciences should be different from those used in natural sciences. Therefore, causality which is observed in objects cannot be seen in living beings. In social and human sciences it is possible to look at only the reactions about the events and challenges. However, such reactions are not uniform and may change due to the fact that there are many external factors affecting these reactions.

In qualitative research the data are mostly collected through observations, interviews and the scales administrated to the participants and these data can also be gathered from texts. Researchers generally assume that the answers of the participants to the scales are true and sincere and reflect their true opinions and attitudes. However, it is possible to have doubts about the sincerity of these data. There are many distinct factors supporting such a sceptical approach. If the hermeneutical skepticism about the differential interpretations of "texts" is also adopted, the construction of scientific knowledge becomes much harder.

Hermeneutics claims that there is no absolute truth, but distinct understandings and interpretations. Therefore, it requires the coding of the data by different researchers and interpretation of the data in addition to the coding. It necessitates that like the use of different coders in the coding process different interpreters should exist in the process.

In educational research the answers of teachers participated in the studies to the questionnaire items do not reflect their completely true views. Instead, these answers are legitimate and true only in the context and discourse legal frameworks and regulations. This fact can be interpreted using Foucault's technique of the "archaeology of knowledge" and there is nothing to be done to avoid it.

It is widely argued that in qualitative research the necessary basis should be hermeneutics (Jardine 1992). Although everyone is certain about the significance of the qualitative studies, there is no consensus about which method or methods should be employed in such studies (Kerdeman 1998).In social and human sciences scientific knowledge and the suggestions based on it should be critically discussed in terms of how these are useful in solving the problems.

References

Abulad, R.E. 2007, What is Hermeneutics?,*Kritike*, 1/2, 11-23. http://www.kritike.org/journal/issue_2/abulad_december2007.pdf

Alataş, B. 2012, Foucault: EtikÖzneninKurulumu, BilgiÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüYüksekLisansTezi

Anlı, Ö.F. 2010, HermeneutikTemelli Tin – DoğaAyrımı İle Hegel'in 'GerçekBütündür' YaklaşımınınKarşılaştırılması, *FelsefeVeSosyalBilimlerDergisi*, 9, 29-48. www.flsfdergisi.com/sayi9/29-48.pdf

Aytaç, K. 2007, ÇağdaşEğitimAkımları (YabancıÜlkelerde), Ankara: Mevsimsiz yay.

Aytaş, G. 2013, TürkçeEğitimindeHermeneutiğinKullanımGerekçesiVeSonuçları, *Mustafa Kemal ÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüDergisi*, 10/23, 47-56. http://sbed.mku.edu.tr/article/viewFile/1038000174/1038000049

Balcı, A. 2015, Michel Foucault'dametod: Arkeoloji, SoybilimveEtik, *International Journal of Political Studies*, 1/1, 26-34. http://openaccess.bilgi.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11411/133/FoucaultEtikÖznenin Kurulumu.pdf

Balkin, J.M. 2004, Yapısöküm, *UludağÜniversitesiİlahiyatFakültesiDergisi*, 13/1, 321-332 http://ucmaz.home.uludag.edu.tr/PDF/ilh/2004-13(1)/M16.pdf

Bilen, O. 2002, *ÇağdaşYorumbilimKuramları: FelsefiveEleştirelHermeneutik*, Ankara: Kitabiyat yay.

Bourgeois, W. 1976, Verstehen in the social sciences, *ZeitschriftfürallgemeineWissenschaftstheorie*, 7/1, 26-38. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF01801570

Bravo, H. 2007, GünümüzFelsefesindeBilgi İle NesnesiArasındakiİlişkiÜzerineBirkaçÖrnek, FelsefeVeSosyalBilimlerDergisi, 4, 21-41. www.flsfdergisi.com/sayi4/21-42.pdf

Çelebi, V. 2013, Michel Foucault'daBilgi, İktidarVeÖzneİlişkişi, *SosyalVeBeşeriBilimlerDergisi*, 5(1), 512-523. http://www.sobiad.org/ejournals/dergi_SBD/arsiv/2013_1/Vedat_celebi%20.pdf

Çelik, E.E. 2013. Gadamer'inHermeneutikUfkuVeNietzsche'ninPerspektivizmi, *FLSF (FelsefeveSosyalBilimlerDergisi)*, 15, 127-144 http://www.flsfdergisi.com/sayi15/127-144.pdf

Çiftçi, A. 1999, *ToplumbilimiYazıları*. İzmir: AnadoluYayınları.

Derrida, J. 1999, Différance, (Çev. Ö.Sözer), *Toplumbilim (Jacques Derrida özelsayısı)*, 10. 49-61.

Derrida, J. 2011, *Gramatoloji*, (Çev.İ.Birkan), Bilgesu yay.

Dilthey, W. 1999. *Hermeneotikve Tin Bilimleri* (Çev: DoğanÖzlem). İstanbul: ParadigmaYayınları.

Ergün, M. (2015). EğitimFelsefesi (5.baskı), Ankara: PegemYayınları

Eser, O. 2015, Kıta FelsefesindeYapısökümYaklaşımınınÇeviriOlgusunaEtkisi, *UluslararasıSosyalAraştırmalarDergisi*, 38(8). 183-187.

Fay, B. 2001, *ÇağdaşSosyalBilimlerFelsefesi, "ÇokkültürlüBirYaklaşım"*, (Çev. İ.Türkmen), İstanbul: Ayrıntıyayınları

FırıncıOrman, T. (2015), "Jacques Derrida Düşüncesinde "Dil", *KilikyaFelsefeDergisi*, 1, 61-81.

Foucault, M. (2004), BilimlerinArkeolojisiÜzerine: EpistemolojiÇevresineCevap, *SeçmeYazılar 5: FelsefeSahnesi*, (Çev. I.Ergüden), İstanbul: AyrıntıYayınları, 139–178

Foucault, M. 1999, *BilgininArkeolojisi*. (çev. V.Urhan), İstanbul: BireyYayıncılık

Foucault, M. 2003, *İktidarınGözü: SeçmeYazılar*, (Çev. I.Ergüden), İstanbul: AyrıntıYayınları.

Foucault, M. 2005, EtiğinSoybilimiÜzerine: Sürmekte Olan ÇalışmayaİlişkinBirDeğerlendirme, *SeçmeYazılar 2: Özneveİktidar*, (Çev. O.Akınhay), İstanbul: AyrıntıYayınları, 193–220

Foucault, M. 2013, *KelimelerveŞeyler: İnsanBilimlerininBirArkeolojisi*, (çev. M.A.Kılıçbay), Ankara: İmgeKitabeviYayınları.

Friesen, N., Henriksson, C. &Saevi, T. (Ed.) 2012, *Hermeneutic Phenomenology in Education, Method and Practice*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Gadamer, H.G. (2002)."İnsanveDil", (Çev: HüsamettinArslan), içinde: *İnsanBilimlerine Prolegomena*, (Der. veÇev: HüsamettinArslan). İstanbul: Paradigma.

Gadamer, H.G. 2002a, "MetinveYorum", *HermeneutikveHumaniterDisiplinler*, (Çev. VeDerl. H.Arslan), İstanbul: ParadigmaYayınları

Gadamer, H.G. 2002b, "HermeneutikveLogosentrizm", *HermeneutikveHümaniterDisiplinler*, (Der-Çev., H.Arslan), İstanbul: ParadigmaYayınları.

Gadamer, H.G. 2003, "Hermeneutik", *HermeneutikÜzerineYazılar*, (Çev. D.Özlem) İstanbul: İnkılapYayınları, 2003

Gadamer, H.G. 2009, *HakikatveYöntem*, (Çev. H.Aslan, İ.Yavuzcan), İstanbul: Pradigma yay.

Gallagher, S. 1992, *Hermeneutics and Education*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Glesne, C. (2013). NitelAraştırmayaGiriş. (2. Baskı). Ali Ersoy&PelinYalçınoğlu (Çev. Edt.). Ankara: AnıYayıncılık

Grace, G. 1998, Scholarship and ideology in education policy studies, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8:1, 135-140, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0962021980020015

Heidegger, M. (2008), *VarlıkveZaman* (Çev. K.H.Ökten), İstanbul: Agora Yayıncılık

Henderson, D.K. 1993, Interpretation and Explanation in the Human Sciences, Albany: SUNY Press. https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=Tmd5yszl64oC

Henriksson, C, & Friesen, N. 2012, Hermeneutic Phenomenology, N. Friesen et al. (eds.), *Hermeneutic Phenomenology in Education*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. 1–14.

Jardine, D. 1992. Reflections on education, hermeneutics, and ambiguity: Hermeneutics as a restoring of life to its original difficulty. İç. William F. Pinar & William M. Reynolds (Eds.), Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text, New York: Teachers College Press. 116-129.

Kale, N. (1995). Postmodernizm- HermeneotikveEğitim. *Ankara ÜniversitesiEğitimBilimleriDergisi*, 28/1-2, http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/40/486/5727.pdf

Kerdeman, D. 1998, Hermeneutics and Education: Understanding, Control, And Agency, Educational Theory, 48/2. 241-266. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-5446.1998.00241.x/pdf

KırbaşoğluKılıç, L., Bayram, B. 2014, Postmodernizmveeğitim, *UluslararasıTürkçeEdebiyatKültürEğitimDergisi*, 3/1 368-376. http://www.tekedergisi.com/Makaleler/1663429569_23k%c4%b1l%c4%b1%c3%a7.pdf

Kuhn, T.S. 2010, *BilimselDevrimlerinYapısı*, (Çev. N.Kuyaş), İstanbul: KırmızıYayınları

Küçükalp, K. 2008, *BatıMetafiziğininDekonstrüksiyonunaYönelikİkiYaklaşım: Heidegger ve Derrida*, UludağÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüDoktoraTezi

Levinas, E. 1987. *Language and proximity. Collected philosophical papers*. Dordrecht: MartinusNijhoff.

Magrini, J.M. 2013, A "Fundamental Theory" of Education Grounded in Ontology? A Phenomenological Rejoinder, *Reconstruction*: *Studies in Contemporary Culture,* 14/2. 17-44. http://reconstruction.eserver.org/Issues/142/Magrini.shtml

Magrini, J.M. 2015, *New Approaches to Curriculum as Phenomenological Text: Continental Philosophy and Ontological Inquiry*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moran, B. (1994). *EdebiyatKuramlarıveEleştiri*, İstanbul: CemYayınevi.

Nesterova, S. 2004, *Hans-Georg Gadamer'inHermeneutiğindeBirAnlamaModeliOlarakDiyalog*, Ankara ÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüFelsefeAnabilim Dalı YüksekLisansTezi (http://acikarsiv.ankara.edu.tr/browse/290/582.pdf)

Nietzsche, F. 2002, TarihÜzerine, Çev. N.Bozkurt, İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Nietzsche, F. 2003, *ŞenBilim*, (Çev. L.Özşar), İstanbul: AsaYayınları.

Nietzsche, F. 2007, *İnsanca, Pekİnsanca I*, (Çev. M.Tüzel), İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları

Nietzsche, F. 2009, *YunanlılarınTrajikÇağındaFelsefe*, (Çev. G.Aytaç), İstanbul: Say Yay.

Öktem, Ü. 2005, Fenomenolojive Edmund Husserl'deApaçıklık (Evidenz) Problemi, *Ankara ÜniversitesiDilveTarih-CoğrafyaFakültesiDergisi*, 45,1. 27-55. http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/26/1257/14459.pdf

Özcan, Z. 2000. *TeolojikHermenötik*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Özdemir, M. (2010). NitelVeriAnalizi: SosyalBilimlerdeYöntembilimSorunsalıÜzerineBirÇalışma.*EskişehirOsmangaziÜniver sitesiSosyalBilimlerDergisi*, 11/1, 323-343.

Özmakas, U. 2010, *Peirce, Saussure veDerrida'daGöstergeKavramı*, HacettepeÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüFelsefeAnabilim Dalı YüksekLisanstezi

Rashford, J.M., 2009, *Considering Hans-Georg Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics as a Referent for Student Understanding of Nature-of-Science Concepts.* Dissertation, Georgia State University, http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/msit_diss/51

Ricoeur, P. 2009, *YorumlarınÇatışması: HermenoytikÜzerineDenemeler*, c.1, (Çev. H.Arslan), İstanbul: ParadigmaYayıncılık.

Sarup, M. (1995). *Postyapısalcılıkvepostmodernizm*, (Çev. A.Güçlü), Ankara: Ark Yayınları.

Schilb, J. 1988, Ideology and Composition Scholarship, *Journal of Advanced Composition*, Vol. 8, No. 1/2, 22-29. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20865638

Schurz, G. 2002, *Erklären und Verstehen: Tradition, Transformation und AktualitäteinerklassischenKontroverse,* PhilosophischeVorveröffentlichungsreihean der Universität Erfurt, https://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/Institute/Philosophie/Theoretische_Philosophie/Schurz/papers/2002b2.pdf

Slattery, M. 2012. *SosyolojideTemelFikirler*. (Çev. Ü.Tatlıcan) Ankara: SentezYayıncılık.

Sofuoğlu, N. 2009, *Alfred Schutz'unFenomenolojikSosyolojisive Din SosyolojisineUygulanabilirliği*. İzmir: DokuzEylülÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüFelsefeve Din Bilimleri A.B.D. DoktoraTezi.

Şimşek, H. &Yıldırım, A. 2011, *SosyalBilimlerdeNitelAraştırmaYöntemleri*, Ankara: Seçkin

Tatar, B. 2004, *Hermenötik*, İstanbul: İnsanYayınları.

Toprak, M. 2003, *HermeneutikveEdebiyat*, İstanbul: BulutYayınları.

Tsai, W.-D. 2011, *Die ontologischeWende der Hermeneutik, Heidegger und Gadamer*, Inaugural-Dissertation zurErlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophiean der Ludwig-Maximilians-UniversitätMünchen (https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/12956/1/Tsai_Wei-Ding.pdf)

Türe Abacı, Ö., (2015). "TahsinYücel'in "Aramak" AdlıÖyküsününYapısökümcüBirOkuması, Turkish Studies, (Prof.Dr.ŞefikYaşarArmağanı), 10/12. 1143-1154. http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/2015678401_61T%c3%bcreAbac%c4%b1%c3%96zlem-tde-1143-1154.pdf

Uçan, H. 2009, Modernizm/PostmodernizmVeJ.Derrida'nınYapısökümcü Okuma VeAnlamlandırmaÖnerisi, *Turkish Studies*, 4(8). 2283-2306. http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/533080359_116-u%c3%a7anhilmi1413(D%c3%bczeltme).pdf

Ulukütük, M. 2009, AnlamveYorumunUfukları: Gadamer'deUfuklarınKaynaşmasıveGelenek, *HeceDergisi*, 149, 49-59. https://www.academia.edu/3026299/ANLAMIN_VE_YORUMUN_UFUKLARI_GADAMERDE_UFUKLARIN_KAYNA%C5%9EMASI_VE_GELENEK_HECE_DERG%C4%B0S%C4%B0_SAYI_149_2009

Yılmaz, Ç. 2007, *Derrida'nınMetaforKullanımı*, İstanbul ÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüYüksekLisansTezi

(https://www.academia.edu/11122865/DERRIDA_NIN_METAFOR_KULLANIMI_-_Çiğdem_Yılmaz)

Zariç, M. (2014). GöstergebilimveYapıbozumdan Postmodernist YapısalEleştiriye. *Turkish Studies*, 9(12), 751-767.