Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Fundamentals (ISSN: 2748-9345)

Received: 20 September 2026 | Accepted: 17 October 2026 | Published: 09 November 2026

DOI: 10.55640/jsshrf-06-11-03

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Philosophical, Linguistic, And Pedagogical Foundations of The Deconstructive Approach

Abdug'offorova Mohlaroyim Ibrohimjon qizi
Independent Researcher, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue11 2026

PAGE: 14-17

Copyright © 2026 Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Fundamentals, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This article provides a theoretical and methodological analysis of the philosophical, linguistic, and pedagogical foundations of the deconstructive approach, drawing primarily on Russian and international scholarly traditions. Deconstruction is conceptualized not as the mechanical destruction of textual meaning, but as a reflective analytical strategy aimed at questioning logocentrism, identifying binary oppositions, uncovering polyphonic, intertextual, and discursive relations, and revealing peripheral layers of meaning. Based on a comprehensive literature review of works by N. S. Avtonomova, I. P. Ilyin, M. M. Bakhtin, Yu. M. Lotman, V. E. Chernyavskaya, M. L. Makarov, B. M. Bim-Bad, V. V. Serikov, and I. A. Zimnyaya, the study substantiates a three-dimensional integrative model of the deconstructive approach and presents the author's own theoretical and methodological perspective. Furthermore, the article addresses potential limitations in educational settings, including radical relativism, subjective detachment from textual evidence, and terminological overload, proposing practical didactic solutions.

KEYWORDS

Deconstruction, deconstructive approach, philosophical foundations, text linguistics, pedagogical anthropology, discourse, intertextuality, dialogism, critical thinking.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary humanities and the education system are evolving under conditions of a sharp increase in information flow, the growing complexity of texts, and the multi-layered nature of sociocultural communication. In such circumstances, traditional approaches based on the passive assimilation of text and knowledge as a ready-made, immutable, and singular truth demonstrate their methodological limitations. Today's learner and researcher are required to perceive a text not merely as a source of encoded information, but as a living space where philosophical worldviews, linguistic structures, and cultural discourses intersect. In our view, in order to foster independent analytical and critical thinking in learners, it is necessary to shift their focus from memorizing ready-made conclusions toward investigating the internal logic of the text, its hidden contradictions, and the meaning-making mechanisms of linguistic units. From this perspective, examining the tripartite — philosophical, linguistic, and pedagogical — foundations of the deconstructive approach, which emerged in philosophy and literary studies in the second half of the twentieth century and subsequently penetrated deeply into linguistics and pedagogy, as a holistic system holds pressing scholarly significance.

The concept of deconstruction is directly associated with the name of the French philosopher J. Derrida and initially emerged as a method for reconsidering the logocentrism and hierarchy of binary oppositions characteristic of European metaphysics [1]. However, the true theoretical and methodological potential of this direction acquired a new

interpretation and practical scope in the fundamental studies of representatives of the Russian philosophical, philological, and pedagogical schools. In particular, while N. S. Avtonomova and I. P. Ilyin thoroughly analyzed the epistemological and aesthetic nature of deconstruction [2; 3], E. N. Gurko systematized its mechanisms related to text and interpretation [4]. Examined more deeply, the roots of the deconstructive approach in linguistics and pedagogy are organically aligned with M. M. Bakhtin's theory of dialogism and polyphony [5], Yu. M. Lotman's doctrine on the semiosphere and the structure of the artistic text [6], the conceptions of text linguistics and discourse analysis developed by V. E. Chernyavskaya and M. L. Makarov [7; 8], as well as the views of B. M. Bim-Bad, V. V. Serikov, and I. A. Zimnyaya on learner-centered and competency-based education [9; 10; 11]. The aim of this article is to reveal the philosophical, linguistic, and pedagogical foundations of the deconstructive approach as an integrated methodological system based on a review of Russian and international scholarly literature as well as our own academic and methodological observations, and to develop its conceptual model within the educational process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In studying the theoretical roots of the deconstructive approach, the works of representatives of the Russian philosophical and philological school hold a special place, as they critically synthesize the ideas of Western poststructuralism with the local humanitarian tradition — dialogism, semiotics, and hermeneutics. In J. Derrida's work "O grammatologii" ("Of Grammatology"), published with a translation and extensive scholarly commentary by N. S. Avtonomova, traditional views on language and writing are fundamentally reconsidered [1]. Derrida critiques the principles of "logocentrism" (belief in a single, final, and immutable center of meaning) and "phonocentrism" (the primacy of spoken speech over writing), which dominated Western thought for centuries. As N. S. Avtonomova emphasizes in her fundamental monograph "Filosofskiy yazyk Zhaka Derrida" ("The Philosophical Language of Jacques Derrida"), deconstruction is by no means "demolition" or "destruction," but rather the art of carefully disassembling a structure to understand how it is assembled, identifying internal contradictions and overlooked "traces" (sled) within the text [2]. In our opinion, N. S. Avtonomova's characterization of deconstruction as a "practice of responsible reading" that expands the boundaries of language and thought serves as the most important philosophical pillar for introducing this approach into the educational process: the learner does not negate the text, but rather understands how it "functions."

I. P. Ilyin, who established the theoretical framework of poststructuralism and deconstructivism in Russian literary studies, demonstrates in his work "Poststructuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism" that the primary focus of deconstruction is directed toward exposing the discrepancy between the rhetorical nature of a text and its logical claims [3]. As the author notes, any text is internally constructed upon "binary oppositions" (nature/culture, center/periphery, rational/emotional, author/reader), yet these pairs are never equal in status — one of them is always placed in a dominant position. Meanwhile, E. N. Gurko, in the study "Deconstruction: Texts and Interpretation," analyzes the concept of "différance" (differentiation and deferral), substantiating that meaning never freezes at a single point, but is continually renewed through the interplay of textual units [4]. Analyzing these philosophical sources leads us to conclude that the philosophical foundation of deconstruction manifests itself in overcoming dogmatic thinking, namely, in questioning stereotypes accepted as self-evident and the sole truth, and re-examining them through evidence.

METHODOLOGY

This study is theoretical-methodological and interdisciplinary in nature and does not employ empirical surveys or mathematical-statistical calculations. Since artificially fabricating non-existent experimental figures contradicts the principles of academic ethics and methodological rigor, the research was conducted using the methods of critical-analytical literature review, interdisciplinary comparative synthesis, conceptual generalization, linguo-pedagogical interpretation, and didactic modeling. Eleven fundamental Russian-language scholarly sources covering philosophy and poststructuralist theory [1–4], text and discourse linguistics and semiotics [5–8], as well as pedagogical anthropology and learner-centered education theory [9–11] were selected as the basis for analysis. The research process was organized into three logical stages: in the first stage, the philosophical categories of deconstruction (critique of logocentrism, binary oppositions, trace, différance) were analyzed and their role in epistemology was determined; in the second stage, these philosophical principles were compared with the linguistic and

semiotic concepts of M. M. Bakhtin, Yu. M. Lotman, V. E. Chernyavskaya, and M. L. Makarov to identify key linguistic reference points for text analysis; and in the third stage, philosophical and linguistic regularities were organized into a didactic system based on the requirements of pedagogical anthropology and competency-based education. Our authorial methodological position is that the deconstructive approach yields positive results in education only when its three foundations — philosophical reflection, linguistic evidence, and pedagogical expediency — are in mutual balance; otherwise, it may degenerate into subjectivism detached from the text.

RESULTS

As a result of the conducted interdisciplinary analysis and review of Russian scholarly literature, three interconnected foundations of the deconstructive approach and their six conceptual directions within the educational process were identified. The first direction is the philosophical-ontological foundation, which entails abandoning dogmatism and monologic truth. According to the works of J. Derrida and N. S. Avtonomova, a text is not subordinated to a single and absolute center [1; 2]. In our view, in education this principle frees the learner from the intellectual inertia of assuming that "the statement in the textbook or spoken by the teacher is the final truth" and transforms them into an active researcher who questions the text. The second direction is the philosophical-epistemological foundation, which involves identifying binary oppositions and reconsidering hierarchies [3; 4]. The learner locates opposing concepts within the text, such as "positive/negative," "primary/secondary," and "center/periphery," and critically examines why the author or traditional interpretation has privileged one side over the other. The third direction is the linguo-semiotic foundation, which relies on the polysemy of the linguistic sign and the internal polyphony of the text. As M. M. Bakhtin and Yu. M. Lotman emphasized, both artistic and popular-science texts constitute a space of dialogue among multiple voices and codes [5; 6]. In deconstructive analysis, the learner uses linguistic evidence to reveal how metaphor, irony, polysemy, silence, and stylistic shifts generate additional layers of meaning within the text.

The fourth direction - the communicative-discursive foundation, relies on the concepts of intertextuality and discursive context substantiated in the studies of V. E. Chernyavskaya and M. L. Makarov [7; 8]. According to our observations, no text is created in a vacuum; therefore, deconstructive reading requires the learner to identify hidden quotations, cultural allusions, and social presuppositions within the text. The fifth direction - the pedagogical-anthropological foundation, is defined by personal agency (subjectivity) and the freedom of meaning-making advanced by B. M. Bim-Bad and V. V. Serikov [9; 10]. Within the deconstructive approach, the learner appears not as a mechanical repeater of someone else's thought, but as an active subject engaging in a personal and responsible dialogue with the text. The sixth direction - the didactic-methodological foundation, transforms the relationship between teacher and learner from authoritarian transmission to facilitation and heuristic dialogue, fostering the critical-reflective competencies outlined by I. A. Zimnyaya [11].

DISCUSSION

The obtained results make it possible to evaluate the deconstructive approach as an effective methodological foundation for developing high-level analytical competencies in contemporary philological and humanitarian education. At the same time, the literature review and our own methodological observations indicate that there are several serious challenges and limitations in implementing this approach in the educational process. The first issue - the risk of vulgar relativism and nihilism. Deconstruction is sometimes confused with the superficial view that "there is no definite meaning in a text, and anyone can interpret it however they wish." In our firm conviction, such an approach is erroneous from both a philosophical and a pedagogical standpoint. As N. S. Avtonomova specifically emphasized, J. Derrida never called for abolishing the rules of logic and language; on the contrary, he demanded an exceptionally meticulous close reading of the text down to its smallest grammatical and etymological details [2]. Consequently, any alternative or unconventional interpretation put forward by a learner during a lesson must be substantiated by specific linguistic and discursive markers — lexical units, syntactic constructions, or contextual evidence — as pointed out by V. E. Chernyavskaya and M. L. Makarov [7; 8].

The second important aspect concerns the sequence between traditional structural analysis and deconstructive analysis. As can be understood from the works of I. P. Ilyin and Yu. M. Lotman, in order to deconstruct a given structure, one must first thoroughly understand that structure itself, including its genre, compositional, and linguistic features [3; 6]. Therefore, in educational practice, we recommend applying the

deconstructive approach not as a substitute for initial reading and foundational philological knowledge, but as an advanced stage built upon them. It is methodologically sound for the learner to first master the main idea and traditional interpretation of the text, and only afterward work on deconstructive questions such as "What internal contradictions exist in the text?", "Which detail does not fit into the general conclusion?", and "What implicit attitude has the author expressed through linguistic means?"

The third issue - maintaining terminological moderation and taking age characteristics into account. Complex philosophical concepts employed in the works of J. Derrida, I. P. Ilyin, and E. N. Gurko, such as "logocentrism," "différance," "aporia," and "transcendental signified" [1; 3; 4], serve as a theoretical compass for the teacher, yet having pupils or students memorize them directly does not yield the expected didactic outcome. Relying on the pedagogical principles of B. M. Bim-Bad and V. V. Serikov [9; 10], we consider it necessary to translate these complex categories into practical and comprehensible learning tasks — specific cognitive operations such as "finding pairs of opposing concepts in the text," "explaining the function of an overlooked detail," and "observing how the same word undergoes a shift in meaning from the beginning to the end of the text."

A scholarly limitation of this article is that the proposed model of philosophical-linguistic and pedagogical integration was developed on the basis of theoretical synthesis and literature analysis and has not yet undergone large-scale pedagogical experimental testing. In future research, it is advisable to empirically test this model within philological and humanities programs at higher and general secondary educational institutions, evaluating the dynamics of learners' analytical and interpretive skills based on clear diagnostic criteria.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, investigating the philosophical, linguistic, and pedagogical foundations of the deconstructive approach within a unified system has demonstrated that for contemporary education it is not merely a fashionable theory, but an intellectual technology resting on a profound theoretical and methodological foundation. Philosophically, it liberates thought from one-sided dogmas and encourages multifaceted reflection; linguistically, it teaches the in-depth analysis of the semantic, stylistic, and discursive potential of linguistic units; and pedagogically, it elevates the learner to the level of an independent thinker and active subject capable of substantiating their viewpoint with textual evidence. Formed through the synthesis of the scholarly heritage of Russian and international researchers, this approach serves to advance the culture of conscious, evidence-based, and creative engagement with texts in the educational process to a new level.

REFERENCES

1. Derrida, J. Of Grammatology / Trans. from French and introd. by N. S. Avtonomova. — Moscow: Ad Marginem, 2000. — 512 p.
2. Avtonomova, N. S. The Philosophical Language of Jacques Derrida. — Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN), 2011. — 510 p.
3. Ilyin, I. P. Poststructuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism. — Moscow: Intrada, 1996. — 256 p.
4. Gurko, E. N. Deconstruction: Texts and Interpretation. Derrida, J. Leave This Name (Postscript), How to Avoid Speaking: Denials. — Minsk: Ekonompress, 2001. — 320 p.
5. Bakhtin, M. M. Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity / Comp. by S. G. Bocharov. — Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979. — 424 p.
6. Lotman, Yu. M. The Structure of the Artistic Text. — Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1970. — 384 p.
7. Chernyavskaya, V. E. Text Linguistics: Polycodality, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity. — Moscow: Knizhny Dom "LIBROKOM", 2009. — 248 p.
8. Makarov, M. L. Foundations of Discourse Theory. — Moscow: ITDGK "Gnozis", 2003. — 280 p.
9. Bim-Bad, B. M. Pedagogical Anthropology: A Course of Lectures. — Moscow: URAO Publishing House, 2002. — 208 p.
10. Serikov, V. V. Education and Personality. Theory and Practice of Designing Pedagogical Systems. — Moscow: Publishing Corporation "Logos", 1999. — 272 p.
11. Zimnyaya, I. A. Key Competencies — A New Paradigm of Educational Outcomes // Higher Education Today. — 2003. — No. 5. — Pp. 34–42.