



Positioning Within A Cultural Context: Using Ricoeur's Preunderstandings As A Heuristic For Narrative Data Analysis In Exploring Identity, Structure, And Agency

By: Rachel E. Wilson

Abstract

I argue that Ricoeur's preunderstandings can be used as a heuristic to aid researchers who collect narratives as data (1) to identify cultural meanings that become resources for participants' positioning work, (2) to ground the identified cultural meanings in participants' experiences, and (3) to understand participants' interpretations of constraint and agency within that context. I outline how the philosophical hermeneutics of Ricoeur is consistent with a sociocultural perspective on positioning and identity, as well as present data analysis questions developed from Ricoeur's ideas of narrative configuration to explore common cultural meanings used by participants in interpreting their lived experience. These questions provide a strategy to examine how participants may be referring to common cultural meanings but their individual interpretations of these meanings can have different implications for their feelings of agency.

Rachel E. Wilson (2015). Positioning within a cultural context: using Ricoeur's preunderstandings as a heuristic for narrative data analysis in exploring identity, structure, and agency, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28:8, 887-905, DOI: 10.1080/09518398.2014.948097. Publisher version of record available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2014.948097>

Positioning within a cultural context: using Ricoeur's preunderstandings as a heuristic for narrative data analysis in exploring identity, structure, and agency

Rachel E. Wilson*

*Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Reich College of Education,
Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, USA*

I argue that Ricoeur's *preunderstandings* can be used as a heuristic to aid researchers who collect narratives as data (1) to identify cultural meanings that become resources for participants' positioning work, (2) to ground the identified cultural meanings in participants' experiences, and (3) to understand participants' interpretations of constraint and agency within that context. I outline how the philosophical hermeneutics of Ricoeur is consistent with a sociocultural perspective on positioning and identity, as well as present data analysis questions developed from Ricoeur's ideas of narrative configuration to explore common cultural meanings used by participants in interpreting their lived experience. These questions provide a strategy to examine how participants may be referring to common cultural meanings but their individual interpretations of these meanings can have different implications for their feelings of agency.

Keywords: hermeneutics; narrative; Ricoeur

Introduction

In a study exploring the influence of cultural context on the interpretations of female first-generation college students as science majors, I interviewed two participants who shared very similar demographic information, yet their interpretations of their persistence toward their academic goals in science were very different (Wilson & Kittleson, 2013). These young women positioned themselves differently, as persistent or not, based on their interpretations of the events in their lived experience. In order to understand this difference in interpretation, I analyzed their narratives of their lived experiences in and out of school. By narratives, I mean the specifically textual data either written or transcribed from audio that is "thematically organized by plots" (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 5). I wanted to analyze these narratives to tease out the culturally available understandings within a particular context that students were using to make sense of their own persistence in the field of science. In paying attention to the power of the cultural narratives that these women were referring to and using to evaluate and interpret their experiences, I aimed to analyze how they positioned themselves vis-à-vis the cultural narratives and the implications for their feelings of persistence. For more detailed information about the purpose of the study and the results of this analysis, please see Wilson and Kittleson (2013).

*Email: wilsonre3@appstate.edu

When I looked to other sociocultural qualitative researchers for guidance on how to analyze narrative data to tease out cultural narratives, I could not find sufficiently detailed explanations that allowed me to think about how to approach data analysis. Polkinghorne (1988, 1995) has advocated analyzing narratives to explore the interpretations of lived experience and has used Ricoeur's (1984, 1992) philosophical writings on narrative as a basis for his arguments. Yet Polkinghorne (1988, 1995) and other narrative researchers (Austin & Carpenter, 2008; Hole, 2007) either do not outline specific data analysis strategies to analyze narratives or lack detail in their data analysis methods for analyzing narrative data. In addition, I found a lack of reference to specific data analysis strategies for analysis of narratives in qualitative studies examining either the influence of cultural context on positioning in education (Bartlett, 2007; Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Niesz, 2008) and in science education (Carlone, 2004; Johnson, 2007). These researchers either do not distinguish between data analysis methods for narrative and non-narrative data (Carlone, 2004; Johnson, 2007) or do not include specific information about their data analysis methods (Bartlett, 2007; Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Niesz, 2008). Other researchers who have explored the influences of race and class on the experiences of first-generation college students through in-depth interviews with participants have not described specific analysis methods for narrative and non-narrative data from interview transcripts (Orbe, 2004; Stuber, 2011). Therefore, I was left without an understanding as to how these researchers moved from narrative data to conclusions about their narrative data.

In the absence of models within the narrative research and sociocultural qualitative research literature for analysis of narratives, I decided to go back to theory underlying narrative construction in order to develop a strategy that would help me to identify culturally available understandings. Polkinghorne's (1988, 1995) work was instrumental in the design of my data collection, but because he did not outline data analysis methods, I went to his source: Ricoeur. Ricoeur's (1984, 1988) writings on the configuration of narratives and the implications for narrating identity (1988, 1992) are the foundation of the data analysis strategy that I developed. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to highlight the ways in which Ricoeur's (1984, 1988) writings can enrich research on cultural narratives and narrative identity. I argue that Ricoeur's *preunderstandings* (1984) can be used as a heuristic to aid researchers who collect narratives as data (1) to identify cultural meanings that become resources for participants' positioning work, (2) to ground the identified cultural meanings in participants' experiences, and (3) to understand participants' interpretations of constraint and agency within that context.

Based on the philosophical hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur (1984, 1988, 1992), I developed questions for analysis of narrative data from in-depth interviews in order to focus on the cultural resources that the participants were using to evaluate their experiences. In this article, I first outline the philosophical hermeneutic ideas of Ricoeur and argue that these ideas are consistent with a sociocultural perspective on positioning and identity. I then present the data analysis questions I developed from Ricoeur's (1984, 1988, 1992) writing and demonstrate how these were used to analyze one participant's narratives. In addition, I conclude by discussing how these questions can be used as a heuristic for analysis of narratives in sociocultural qualitative research.

Ricoeur's philosophical hermeneutics

Hermeneutics

As a philosophical foundation for qualitative research, philosophical hermeneutics does not give more primacy to the author or the reader, but instead focuses on the interpretations developed in dialogue between the text and the reader (Freeman, 2007). Philosophical hermeneutics is associated with the work of Gadamer and Heidegger. Heidegger writes that interpretation is our way of being in the world, and Gadamer, working from Heidegger's ideas, argues that language "is universal and forms the universe in that all understanding and human existence occur within it" (Grondin, 1994, p. 122). Language, as a form of communication, is "universal" in that humans use language to describe and capture our experiences in the world in words. The language we use to describe something is a product of a social context. Meanings are associated with the language we use to describe our experiences (Polkinghorne, 1988). Gadamer argued that it is only through open dialogue between people that we are able to understand more deeply the meanings being conveyed through language (Grondin, 1994). Therefore, research that uses philosophical hermeneutics as a foundation for social research is concerned with understanding how people make meaning from their experiences in the world by analyzing the language they use (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 159). Using philosophical hermeneutics as a methodological foundation for this research, therefore, encouraged me to focus on my participants' meanings of their lived experience as well as the sociocultural influences on those meanings, rather than pre-identified meanings from the researcher(s) and/or research literature (Austin & Carpenter, 2008).

Ricoeur's philosophy on narrative

Ricoeur's ideas about the nature of narrative and narrating as a meaning-making practice are influenced by philosophical hermeneutics. Ricoeur (1984) argues that the act of stringing together events into a narrative – called configuration or *mimesis*₂ – is a hermeneutic act. Ricoeur (1984) describes configuration as a mediating event in a dialogue between the author and the audience for which the author is writing. Ricoeur (1984) writes that people construct narratives of the events in their lives much like a historian constructs a narrative. "By narrating a life of which I am not the author as to existence, I make myself its coauthor as to its meaning" (Ricoeur, 1992, p. 162). Participants have access to events in their lives, actual events, but in putting them together in a coherent structure in an answer to a question, they are involved in configuring those events much like an author in attempting to create a unified meaning. Ricoeur (1984) writes, "every narrative explains itself, in the sense that to narrate what has happened is already to explain why it happened" (p. 154). When we choose which events to include or exclude in a narrative, which details are important or irrelevant, and how to convey to our listeners why or how events came to happen, we are presenting particular meanings about those events to our listeners. Therefore, in constructing a narrative, the participant gives meaning to the events in the explanation of *why* the events transpired, transpire, or will transpire.

The author, in configuration, must figure out how separate events fit together into a meaningful narrative. Narratives reveal how we think about events and their relationship to each other in time. Configuration shows our interpretations of our temporal experience. This act of *mimesis*, of configuration of a narrative, is

composed of three parts: prefiguration, configuration, and refiguration (Ricoeur, 1984). Prefiguration requires of the author a “preunderstanding of the world of action, its meaningful structures, its symbolic resources, and its temporal character. These features are described rather than deduced” (Ricoeur, 1984, p. 54). These preunderstandings that narrators draw upon in constructing their narratives give the listener, or reader as Ricoeur (1984) says, clues about the sociocultural and historical context in which the narrator is constructing their narrative, but also focus on how an author “reckons with time” (p. 62). Each of the three elements of prefiguration is discussed below.

Structural elements

The meanings that individuals attribute to events are not solely subjective. Ricoeur (1984) argues that narratives spring forth from cultural systems that have influences on the way in which narratives are authored. Authors have to work within contexts that influence how they configure their narratives and, based on his or her lived experience in a society, will construct narratives that reflect their knowledge of cultural meanings that exist amongst the members of that society. These cultural meanings Ricoeur (1984) refers to as preunderstandings, or practical understandings. Ricoeur (1984) discusses three major features of preunderstandings. The first involves the structural elements of a narrative: (1) goals, (2) motives, (3) agents, (4) circumstances, (5) interactions, and (6) outcomes (Ricoeur, 1984, p. 55). Ricoeur (1984) argues that a narrative is a plot, a stringing together of a set of events in a structure that gives meaning to those events. The structural elements of a narrative are examples of preunderstandings that reflect the cultural framework within which the narrative is authored. While these elements are pieces of any narrative, the possible goals, motives, etc., reflect a practical understanding of the types of goals, motives, etc., that are culturally meaningful or significant. For example, in the story of Cinderella, her stepsisters’ shared goal is to marry the prince. Because of this goal, they have a motive to keep Cinderella away from meeting the prince. A set of circumstances occur in the story which allow Cinderella to interact with the prince, and so the outcome of the story is that she marries the prince instead of either of her stepsisters. This fairy tale has all of the structural elements of a narrative and reflects possible goals, motives, and agents that were culturally meaningful in the society and time period in which it was written.

Symbolic elements

In addition to preunderstandings about structural elements of narratives, people draw on symbolic resources, or culturally available meanings, in explaining and evaluating the events in a narrative. These preunderstandings of symbolic resources relate to what Ricoeur (1984) describes as “signs, rules, and norms” which are cultural meanings used in constructing a narrative because of the “public character of any meaningful articulation” (p. 57). Symbolic resources, then, are meanings that are available within a context, as narratives are constructed within a cultural framework (Ricoeur, 1984). Cultural meanings are available within a context as interpretations, as they provide both literal and figurative understandings. People make judgments about people and events in making sense of their own experiences based on these cultural meanings. For example, in the

case of Cinderella, the goal of marriage and its importance to women reflect a cultural meaning that women were worth less if they were unmarried. In addition, the strong motive to marry not just any man, but a prince, reflects a cultural meaning that the status of a woman is dependent upon the status of her husband. These cultural meanings in the narrative of Cinderella reflect the culture of the society during the time period in which it was written.

Temporal elements

Ricoeur's (1984) third major feature of preunderstandings is that they are temporal in nature. Ricoeur (1984) discusses Augustine's assertion in *Confessions* that human souls experience time as a threefold present, rather than describing time as having to do with specific measurements relating to the movement of celestial bodies. The idea of the threefold present is about the soul experiencing the present not as the passive processing of impressions, but as actively attending to their experiences in a state of distended time, *distentio animi*. This experience of the present as distended (as including the past in the form of memories and the future in the form of expectations) is the threefold present: "by entrusting to memory the fate of things past, and to expectation that of things to come, we can include memory and expectation in an extended and dialectical present" (Ricoeur, 1984, p. 11). Ricoeur suggests that our experience of time is always in relation to things in our past and our future, to things that have happened in the past, and things that we expect to happen in the future. Therefore, in constructing narratives of lived experience, Ricoeur (1984) writes that we do not passively experience the present as the present alone, but are always comparing our present experiences to experiences that have come before and that we expect to come after. This experience of time as a threefold present Ricoeur (1984) relates to Heidegger's conception of within-time-ness. Ricoeur (1984) emphasizes that narrators "reckon with time" in constructing a narrative and that looking for evidence of reckoning with time gives the reader an idea of what meaning the narrator gives to events based on how they connect them in time (p. 62). For example, a narrative could be as short as: *I got in a boat. First, I leaned over the side of the boat. Then the boat tipped over.* The reader assumes that the person leaning over the side of the boat is the cause of the boat tipping over because of the order of the sentences, but also because of the use of temporal indicators, such as the words *first* and *then*. If another time word such as *next* was used in a sentence before the word *then*, the reader may choose to change the cause of the boat tipping over, as in: *I got in a boat. First, I leaned over the side of the boat. Next, I grabbed the edge of the boat to regain my balance. Then the boat tipped over.*

Therefore, in his explanations of how configuration, or *mimesis*₂, is a hermeneutic act, Ricoeur (1984) distinguishes his philosophy from others because of its purpose in addressing the meaning of text being mediated by both the author and readers in their attention to structural, symbolic, and temporal elements. "For a semiotic theory, the only operative concept is that of the literary text. Hermeneutics, however, is concerned with reconstructing the entire arc of operations by which practical experience provides itself with works, authors, and readers" (Ricoeur, 1984, p. 53). Ricoeur's (1984) inclusion of Heidegger's ideas about the experience of time as "within-time-ness" and Augustine's threefold present are what

Analysis example

As participants described events in their lives, they configured narratives in which they referred to symbolic preunderstandings – *cultural understandings* – that were available in the broader societal context to explain and evaluate their experiences. In this section, I present a narrative from one participant, Judy, as an example of how I used the data analysis questions in Table 1 to analyze a narrative from an interview transcript. In this article, to distinguish between Ricoeur’s preunderstandings, I used changes to the font, such as *structural elements in italics*, **symbolic elements/cultural understandings in bold**, and temporal elements underlined.

Judy’s narrative

Judy’s academic goal was to graduate from college and go to medical school. There were no high school graduates in Judy’s family and her parents worked in low-wage jobs in construction and food service. Judy told narratives about being positioned as someone who would not graduate and would not go to medical school because of her family background. She talked about feeling “empowered” because she had proven other people’s expectations wrong in graduating from high school and being about to graduate from college, but she also struggled as she got closer to her college graduation and closer to applying to medical school. Judy said that these struggles made her feel empowered by moving beyond the doubters’ expectations, but she continued to explain her struggles in terms of resisting something else that she was supposed to be (i.e. reproducing her born-into social position).

In this data example from Judy, she discussed why she did not feel strong because she felt as if she was struggling to meet her academic goals, while her peers seemed to succeed more easily than she did. Judy’s family members supported her persistence toward her academic goals, even though they could not help her financially or with advice. Judy admitted that they did provide her with much needed encouragement:

*My mom and my brother because even though they don't know what college is about or anything about what I'm doing educational wise, like **they wouldn't know anything about what I'm doing**, but as a person they know me and they know I'm not a quitter and they push me and push me and push me and push me to do better. And I tell them, I go to them and complain and tell them what's going on, you know “**I can't do this**” and “**it's just too hard**” and they push me and they say, “You know what? **You've been through** harder just in life's journeys, you know? **You've been through more than a 50 year-old woman has. Don't sit here and say that this stupid class is holding you back from your life, from your dreams that you've been dreaming about since you were a little girl.**” And that is what motivates me and pushes me to go on and no matter, even if I do fail the class, I feel I know in my self **I tried and I worked my hardest to keep going**. And you know I might not have a 3.0 or 3.5 or whatever, but I know that the grades that I have, the grades that are on my transcripts, **I worked my ass off for, and coming from where I came from that's fantastic**. So a lot of times I don't remember that and I don't think about that and they help me to remember like, “Don't compare yourself to them because **they haven't been through the stuff that you've been through, and if they ever were to go through it, they wouldn't survive, they wouldn't make it**” and I guess that's kind of like what keeps me going, like just motivates me to just keep going one day at a time. Even if it is one day at a time, might have 20 tests coming up but it's one day at a time, you know, and I can only do as much as I try to do in one day ... I mean it's just feels like a lot of times I put in my head, I'm like okay I need that B, I just need the B, I mean not even an A, just give me*

a B, just the B, just the B, you know? And I don't get it. And then in my mind I'm like, why? Like I can't even get a B, and it's just like...it's really hard for me as a person to set a goal and not achieve it. It's so hard 'cause I'm just like such a goal oriented person...I'm just like this is my goal and I'm going to reach it and by God I will die trying to reach that goal, you know what I'm saying? And so for me to give up any goal, you know, any thing from a little "I'm going to run a mile" to like "I'm going to be the president," you know what I'm saying? Like anything, it's hard...it literally puts me into depressed mode like, why am I even here? **I might as well just give up.** Why do I still live if I can't even do this? You know what I'm saying? Like why did you give me the motivation to be a doctor if **I'm too stupid to even get this freakin' test?** Like it puts me like down, like very down to the point where I'm like ... I'm done, like I'm done with trying, I'm done with **working my ass off** to get where I need to be and it doesn't work, like it's that **hard** for me: to set a goal and not reach it. (Judy, 1-2)

Structural elements

In this paper, the whole narrative passage is in italics because it all represents the structural (linguistic) elements of a narrative. In practice, I highlighted the different structural elements in different colors for a more nuanced analysis in order to distinguish between the different structural elements of Judy's and others' narratives. In this paper, I will use the language of the structural elements in describing how I went about the analysis. Judy's *goal* is to graduate from college and apply to medical school to become a doctor. Ultimately, her goal is to be happy, and she equates her goal to graduate from college, go to medical school, and become a doctor as the only way in which she will be happy. There are three different groups of people, or *agents*, in this narrative: Judy, her family (mother and brother), and her peers in college. Her family encourages her to stay persistent in pursuing her academic goals (dreams) and to not compare herself with others, but to remember what she has had to overcome to reach her current position (on the eve of her college graduation). The *circumstances* and *interactions* that Judy describes in this narrative are that she feels emotionally supported by her family to stay persistent, but her lower grades (in comparison to her peers) remind her that even if she is working hard toward her goals, she may not end up being accepted into medical school. The *outcome* of the narrative is this impending feeling of not reaching her goals, which leaves Judy feeling depressed and like her happiness (tied to reaching her goals) is out of her reach.

Temporal elements

When analyzing narratives for temporal elements, I looked at both verb tense and time-related words that participants used. In terms of verb tense, some of Judy's narrative includes references to things that have happened in the past – "I tried and I worked my hardest" and "I worked my ass off" – as indicated by the past tense of the verbs *try* and *work*. Both phrases – "You've been through harder" and "they haven't been through the stuff that you've been through" – indicate that Judy experienced something in the past that she is no longer experiencing in the present. "Your dreams that you've been dreaming about since you were a little girl" is a phrase that contains a time-related word (since) and indicates that her dreams existed in the past and continue to exist in the present.

Judy's discussion of past events in her use of past tense verbs does not dominate the narrative, however; her use of present tense verbs does. She describes the

support that her family gives her and the results of that support as an on-going context in the present tense: “they push me,” “I tell them,” “I go to them,” “I complain,” “they push me,” and their support “motivates me and pushes me to go on.” Judy discusses her grades in the present tense: “I might not have a 3.0 or 3.5 or whatever, but I know the grades that I have,” and how she wants “just the B, you know? And I don’t get it.” She describes her present conditions: “it’s really hard for me as a person to set a goal and not achieve it” and “it literally puts me into depressed mode.” She describes herself in the present tense: “I’m not a quitter” and “I’m such a goal-oriented person,” but also “I’m too stupid.”

When Judy discusses her expectations for the future, she says: “this is my goal and I’m going to reach it and by God I will die trying to reach that goal.” Yet, she describes her present state of mind that contradicts what she refers to happening in the future: “I’m done” and “I’m done with working my ass off to get where I need to be and it doesn’t work.” Judy’s narration of her experiences indicates that while she is thinking about the influence of the past (memories) and her future expectations, she is clearly focused on her experience of the present.

Symbolic elements

In this narrative, Judy makes evaluative statements about herself, others, and events in her experience that helped me to identify the foundation for these statements, which would represent the symbolic elements. For example, when she evaluates herself, she uses the present tense: “I’m not a quitter” and “I’m such a goal-oriented person,” but also “I’m too stupid.” She evaluates her mother and brother – “they wouldn’t know anything about what I’m doing” – using the foundation for this evaluation that neither her mother nor her brother have graduated from high school or attend college.

She also reiterates or retells her mother’s and/or brother’s evaluations of her peers, peers who are not the first in their families to go to college: “Don’t compare yourself to them because they haven’t been through the stuff that you’ve been through, and if they ever were to go through it, they wouldn’t survive, they wouldn’t make it.” This retelling of the evaluation of her peers is significant because this evaluation (and the implicit foundation for the evaluation) is what “motivates” Judy to be persistent in working toward her goals. So what is the foundation – or cultural understanding – that Judy is implicitly using to evaluate her peers as successful but not as strong as she is? Looking at other evaluative comments and the foundations for those can be helpful in analyzing this statement, such as “I worked my ass off for, and coming from where I came from that’s fantastic.” Where she came from is a family of low socioeconomic means with little education. How is she not still where she came from? She worked hard. Judy reiterates this in different sections of the narrative: “I tried,” “I worked my hardest,” and “working my ass off.”

Developing interpretations

After using the data analysis questions from Ricoeur to analyze narratives in this way, I wrote initial interpretations of the narratives by participant. I analyzed all of Judy’s narratives first, wrote each initial interpretation as I analyzed it, comparing the symbolic resources, or cultural meanings, that she was using as foundations for her evaluations. Then I compiled and compared the cultural meanings in use by all

participants and chose the ones most prevalently used. I then used the most prevalent cultural meanings across participants (*school as a competition*, *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps*, and *school as a meritocracy*) in reinterpreting each participant's narratives (e.g. see Wilson & Kittleson, 2013).

For example, in the narrative above, Judy's insistence on her effort (hard work) was the foundation she was using to evaluate her experience of needing to stay motivated when she did not compete well with her peers academically. If her hard work was not helping her reach her goals of college graduation and attendance to medical school, then the *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps* cultural understanding – academic success through individual hard work – that was helping her to feel persistent stopped becoming useful. Judy was left with feeling as if she did not have merit (*school as a meritocracy*) to compete with her peers (*school as a competition*). This was the conclusion due to a reinterpretation from this narrative based on the data analysis questions in Table 1 and using the common cultural meanings across participants.

Discussion

While there is no room for more examples to demonstrate the usefulness of this method of data analysis of narratives, I will use my own experience with this method to discuss how it is useful (1) in identifying cultural meanings that become resources for participants' positioning work, (2) in grounding the identified cultural meanings in participants' experiences, and (3) in understanding participants' interpretations of constraint and agency within that context.

Identifying cultural meanings across participants

In looking for how the participants' narratives were constructed and the interactions between the three major elements of preunderstandings, I was able to tease out the symbolic resources from the temporal and structural elements of their narratives. By identifying their evaluative comments of the structural elements (goals, agents, circumstances, outcomes, etc.), I then could look for the ideas they were using to support their evaluations and see if the participants were using similar ideas in other narratives. If these ideas used for evaluations were consistently referred to within their narratives and were ideas used to explain their experiences as students and science majors, they were listed as a possibility for a cultural meaning. The list of possible cultural meanings compiled after initial interpretations of all participants' narratives was then analyzed to look for common cultural meanings that could be considered as available in their 'figured world' (cultural context) and used for interpretation. For example, in the larger study, there were three cultural meanings in use by all participants: *school as a competition*, *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps*, and *school as a meritocracy*. These cultural meanings were then used as foundations for reinterpreting participants' narratives to look for explicit and implicit uses by participants (Wilson & Kittleson, 2013).

Grounding cultural meanings in participants' experiences

As an interpretive researcher, I consistently reflected on the basis for my interpretations – am I pulling ideas from my subjectivities, from the research literature, or are

these interpretations really grounded in the lives of my participants and what is meaningful to them? In developing data analysis questions using Ricoeur's (1984) preunderstandings, I was able to create a heuristic that helped me to keep my interpretations grounded in the participants' narratives. These data analysis questions aided me in thinking about the cultural understandings that the participants were using in their narratives to make sense of the events they described. As a tool for data analysis, these questions helped me to focus on the participants' interpretation of the events in the narratives alongside my interpretations of their experiences. As a result, I felt better able to create a situation for data analysis in which as a researcher, I was in a dialogue between my interpretations and the participants' interpretations about their persistence and the positioning events they described. The questions as a heuristic helped me to keep track of how I was analyzing participants' narratives so that when I stepped away from analysis and came back to it at a later time, I could better keep track of what data I was using in my interpretations of narratives. In addition, the questions as a heuristic aided my reflections of how my interpretations were grounded (in the data, in research literature, and/or my subjectivities).

For example, the participants consistently referred to the idea that if someone works hard, no matter what part of society they come from, they should be able to accomplish their goals. While I named this cultural meaning *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps*, what it meant for participants is based on their discussion of their experiences as first-generation college students and science majors. I did not begin analysis looking for this idea, but in analyzing their narratives, found the idea of independent hard work to be a significant influence and consistently used by participants in evaluating their own and others' persistence.

Understanding participants' interpretations of constraint and agency

Ricoeur's ideas about narrative construction helped me to think about the use of cultural meanings in how the narrator positions him/herself and others and the impact on feelings of structure and agency. After compiling the common cultural meanings in use, I was able to compare the uses of these *preunderstandings* across participants. For example, the *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps* meaning helped many of the participants feel in control of their persistence toward their goals because the idea is based on independent hard work or effort. In contrast, however, Judy was consistently unable to use the cultural meaning of *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps* to explain her experience. When Judy felt that *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps* had failed to explain her lack of academic success, then her "failure" to persist or to feel persistent was equated to her lack of merit. She referred to other possibilities, such as the cultural meaning of *school as a meritocracy*, which when she used alone, left her feeling "stupid."

Thinking about the alternative meanings that participants use or refer to when the prevailing cultural meaning in use by other participants fails them, allows us to think about how participants assent to or resist certain cultural ideas. If you position yourself as a non-competitor due to lack of merit, then your agency to change your position is constrained. In contrast, if you position yourself as a competitor (or non-competitor) based on your effort (or lack of effort), then your agency to change your position is in your control. While Judy has used *pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps* to explain some of her experiences, and thus assents to this idea as a way to evaluate

her experience, in other instances, she finds that its explanatory power is lacking. Thus, in her narrative she can use her experience to contradict this meaning, and, even if it is just in the telling of her narrative, resist its significance.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to show how Ricoeur's (1984, 1988, 1992) writings on the configuration of narratives and the implications for positioning and narrative identity are useful to qualitative researchers (1) in identifying cultural meanings that become resources for participants' positioning work, (2) in grounding the identified cultural meanings in participants' lived experiences, and (3) in understanding participants' interpretations of constraint and agency within that context. By starting with the consistency between the philosophical hermeneutics of Ricoeur (1984, 1992) and sociocultural theorists interested in positioning events and identity (Holland et al., 1998; Holland & Leander, 2004; Levinson & Holland, 1996; Sfard & Prusak, 2005; Verhesschen, 2003), I provided an argument for their conceptual consistency. In addition, I discussed how I developed a data analysis heuristic from Ricoeur's (1984) preunderstandings in the configuration of narratives to answer research questions aimed at understanding participants' use of cultural resources in their interpretations of their experiences. In describing my data analysis process with an example narrative, I aimed to be transparent about how I moved from the data to my interpretations and conclusions about the power of these cultural meanings for participants, as well as how they position themselves on the basis of those interpretations. Therefore, this paper is meant to provide other researchers with narrative data with a strategy to explore cultural meanings within their participants' contexts.

These cultural meanings, while interpretively powerful, were true only in as much as they helped participants, and myself, explain or evaluate their life experiences. Using ideas from the philosophical hermeneutics of Ricoeur allowed me to explore how context shapes the narratives of participants of their lived experiences by looking at how they made meaning and responded to cultural meanings:

When we are in the role of hearers or readers of the narrative experiences – the creations – of others, we understand the stories through the linguistic processes we use in constructing our own narratives. We call this kind of understanding – of hearing the meaning of a story – hermeneutic understanding. (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 160)

Hermeneutic understanding is a product of a research process that shapes not only the readers' understanding, but the researchers' understanding of themselves (Schwandt, 2004). Therefore, my research process of interviewing and analyzing the narratives of female first-generation students has resulted in my presentation of the interpretations of meanings that are salient for these women, interpretations that I – as the researcher – find meaningful when thinking about cultural issues that are considered important in analyzing personal learning experiences in science education, as well as a new understanding of the figured world of academic science and myself.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks go to Melissa Freeman for her encouragement and help in conceptualizing this manuscript. Thanks also to the members of my writing group who have helped me through the process of preparing this manuscript.

Notes on contributor

Rachel E. Wilson is an assistant professor at the Reich College of Education, Appalachian State University, USA. Her research interests are in cultural influences on learning and personal learning experiences, with specific emphasis on science learning. In addition to studies of the persistence of undergraduate female science majors, her current research examines pre-service teachers' experiences learning science through service-learning experiences.

References

- Austin, H., & Carpenter, L. (2008). Troubled, troublesome, troubling mothers: The dilemma of different in women's personal motherhood narratives. *Narrative Inquiry, 18*, 378–392.
- Bartlett, L. (2007). Literacy, speech and shame: The cultural politics of literacy and language in Brazil. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*, 547–563.
- Carlone, H. B. (2004). The cultural production of science in reform-based physics: Girls' access, participation, and resistance. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*, 392–414.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Eisenhart, M. (2001). Educational ethnography past, present, and future: Ideas to think with. *Educational Researcher, 30*(8), 16–27.
- Ezzy, D. (1998a). Theorizing narrative identity: Symbolic interactionism and hermeneutics. *The Sociological Quarterly, 39*, 239–252.
- Ezzy, D. (1998b). Lived experience and interpretation in narrative theory: Experiences of living with HIV/AIDS. *Qualitative Sociology, 21*, 169–179.
- Ezzy, D. (2000). Fate and agency in job loss narratives. *Qualitative Sociology, 23*, 121–134.
- Freeman, M. (2007). Performing the event of understanding in hermeneutic conversations with narrative texts. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*, 925–944.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education, 25*, 99–125.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Grondin, J. (1994). *Introduction to philosophical hermeneutics*. (J. Weinsheimer, Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hole, R. (2007). Narratives of identity: A poststructural analysis of three deaf women's life stories. *Narrative Inquiry, 17*, 259–278.
- Holland, D. C., Lachicotte, W. J., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holland, D., & Leander, K. (2004). Ethnographic studies of positioning and subjectivity: An introduction. *Ethos, 32*, 127–139.
- Johnson, A. (2007). Unintended consequences: How science professors discourage women of color. *Science & Education, 91*, 805–821.
- Jupp, J. C., & Slattery, P. (2010). White male teachers on difference: Narratives of contact and tensions. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23*, 199–215.
- Levinson, B. A., & Holland, D. (1996). The cultural production of the educated person: An introduction. In B. A. Levinson, D. E. Foley, & D. C. Holland (Eds.), *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practices* (pp. 1–54). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Niesz, T. (2008). Professional movements, local appropriations, and the limits of educational critique: The cultural production of mixed messages at an urban middle school. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 21*, 327–346.
- Orbe, M. P. (2004). Negotiating multiple identities within multiple frames: An analysis of first-generation college students. *Communication Education, 53*, 131–149.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In R. Wisniewski & J. A. Hatch (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 5–23). Washington, DC: Falmer.

- Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Time and narrative*, Vol. I. (K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer, Trans.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1988). *Time and narrative*, Vol. III. (K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer, Trans.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as another*. (K. Blamey, Trans.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2004). Hermeneutics: A poetics of inquiry versus a methodology for research. In H. Piper & I. Stronach (Eds.), *Educational research: Difference and diversity* (pp. 31–44). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sfard, A., & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as culturally shaped activity. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4), 14–22.
- Stuber, J. M. (2011). Integrated, marginal, and resilient: Race, class, and the diverse experiences of white first-generation college students. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24, 117–136.
- Verhesschen, P. (2003). ‘The poem’s invitation’: Ricoeur’s concept of mimesis and its consequences for narrative educational research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37, 449–465.
- Wilson, R. E., & Kittleson, J. M. (2013). Science as a classed and gendered endeavor: Persistence of two white female first-generation college students within an undergraduate science context. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 50, 802–825.