

# Disrupting Education: Which between technological innovations and the 'incredulity towards metanarratives' is disrupting education?

Jose D. Velez, Jr.

---

## **Abstract**

*According to Clayton Christensen's Disruptive Innovation Theory, upstarts eat up market share often with innovative and more affordable products and soon become the new market leader. Christensen sees its relevance in many aspects of human endeavor including in education. Cheaper online education is said to be disruptive of colleges offering expensive classroom-based modes of instruction. This concern was highlighted in a forum held in Russia and attended by education leaders around the globe. Other scholars, however, dispute this. For them, it is the interruptions to the totalizing attempt of most scholarships and not the impact of technological innovations that is disrupting education. This paper supports this view, especially from the standpoint of developing countries long shackled by western-oriented paradigms.*

*Keywords: disruptions, disruptive innovation, critical theory, pedagogy, OBE, post-modernism, post-structuralism*

---

## **1.0. Introduction**

This paper is about disruptions in education. There is much mention of disruption in recent years in western media. There is mention of disruption in the automobile industry, in business, in journalism, in technology, as well as in education. Taken from Harvard Professor Clayton Christensen's Disruptive Innovation Theory, one of the most celebrated theories of 21<sup>st</sup> Century, disruption has captured the attention of scholars and ordinary people the world over, especially in developed countries.

Around the globe, innovations are disrupting markets. Upstarts eat up market share often with innovative and more affordable products and soon become the new market leader. The education sector is said to be part of this phenomenon. Online courses are challenging traditional colleges

and their modes of instruction. This concern was highlighted in a forum held in Russia on November 21, 2014. Education leaders from various universities around the globe met in Moscow and exchanged ideas in a round table discussion titled, Dynamics in Education: New Players and Models of Disruption. This study analyzes the issue of disruption and its impact on education, as discussed by the experts.

Disruptions in education according to Clayton Christensen, author of Disruption in Education (2003) refers to innovations that could challenge the manner by which education is taught around the globe. The paper's ideas were obviously a spin-off from Christensen's own Disruptive Innovation Theory (1997) which holds that upstarts that eat up

market share with innovative and more affordable products can soon become the new market leader. The various speakers in the Moscow forum took turns in discussing global disruptions in education, citing new players and models, stressing mainly the disruptive impact of online instruction on Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). However, for others, like TK Coleman, "there is always another angle from which things can be seen. Every perspective, every paradigm is open to challenge," and this is what is disruptive to a university's "metanarrative apparatus," as Jean Francois Lyotard puts it.

This paper seeks to know which between the 'incredulity towards metanarratives' and technology is defining more the universities of the future. Is it the interruptions to the totalizing attempt of most scholarships or the impact of technological innovations on education?

## 2.0. Methodology

This is a theoretical article. According to the American Psychological Association (APA) Manual Sixth Edition, theoretical articles "trace the development of theory to expand and refine theoretical constructs or present a new theory or analyze existing theory, pointing out flaws or demonstrating the advantage of one theory over another."

To accomplish this task, literature on Christensen's Disruptive Innovation Theory and Disruption in Education as well as TK Coleman's thesis on disruptions are reviewed, discussed and analyzed. YouTube videos of the forum in Moscow and that of TK Coleman speaking in a separate forum were viewed and analyzed here as well.

This paper also explores post-structuralism tracing the concept as discussed mainly by Jacques Derrida during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

## Theoretical Framework

This discourse on disruption in education is viewed initially, from the standpoint of 20<sup>th</sup> Century philosopher Jean Francois Lyotard whose book, *The Postmodern Condition; A Report on Knowledge* (1979) first used the term postmodern. His views have been influenced by Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida who helped define post-structuralism; and to some extent, by Ferdinand de Saussure and Claude Levi Strauss whose ideas helped shape structuralism.

## Lyotard

Most disciplines have an interrelated body of theory by which, scholars unify their thinking. It is a very modern characteristic. Modernism which can be traced back to the European Age of Enlightenment tries to see the world from a rational, objective and empirical perspective. But it doesn't end there. Jean Francois Lyotard wrote in *The Postmodern Condition*, "science does not restrict itself to stating useful regularities and seeks the truth; it is obliged to legitimate the rules of its own game. It then produces a discourse of legitimation with respect to its own status, a discourse called philosophy..... I will use the term modern to designate any science that legitimates itself with reference to a metadiscourse of this kind making an explicit appeal to some grand narrative..."

This grand narrative or metanarrative however, is deemed passé. Lyotard said, "To the obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation corresponds; most notably, the crisis of metaphysical philosophy and of the university institution, which in the past relied on it. The narrative function is losing its functors, its great hero, its great dangers, its great voyages, and its

great goal.”

To trace the roots of Lyotard’s ideas, one has to go back to the structuralism of Saussure and Levi Strauss and the post-structuralism of Derrida and Foucault.

### **Saussure**

Empiricism, the philosophical foundation upon which modernism is built, is inadequate. Applying it in the study of language, Ferdinand de Saussure pointed out that some words do not stand for something tangible or empirical. For Saussure, language is a system of signs in which the only essential thing is the union of meanings and sound-images. A sign is a diadic whole that is made up of the signifier (the sound-image) and the signified (the concept). He held that signs are arbitrary and differentiated and meaning is to be found within the structure of a whole language rather than in the analysis of individual words. He also held that “signs do not refer directly to reality but to a representation of reality which is part of a system of signs that is language” (Velez, 2014). Jacques Derrida said in *Structure, Sign and Play* (1970): “Structuralism justly claims to be the critique of empiricism.”

### **Levi Strauss**

Claude Levi Strauss saw in culture the reverberation of Saussure’s language ideas regarding binary opposites and system of signs with an underlying structure independent of the organization of reality and ideas (Velez, 2014). Levi-Strauss modified Saussure’s idea of a ‘system’ into the idea of ‘structure’ (Rasinski, 2011).

### **Derrida**

Saussure held that a sign does not refer directly

to reality but to a system of signs that is language (Velez, 2014). For Jacques Derrida, this separates discourse from the central signified, the original or transcendental signified, thereby extending the signification infinitely. This is true both in a textual and philosophical sense. (Derrida’s writings have literary and philosophical aspects. The literary aspect dealt with textual analysis where it is essential to find hidden, alternative meanings in a text. Philosophically, he highlighted the dualistic hierarchies that western philosophies conceal.)

Derrida talked of disruption of signification resulting in the “central presence which was never itself, which has always already been transported outside itself in its surrogate” (Derrida, 1967). According to Derrida, this decentering makes communication ambiguous, rendering complete interpretation difficult. Derrida declared: “All communication is miscommunication.” Language privileges and differentiates “and those that have been suppressed and deemphasized could be what are actually signified. Thus, the need to deconstruct text, consider the multiple meanings to show the contradictions that may be present in it” (Velez, 2014).

With regards structures, Derrida wrote: “The event I called a rupture, the disruption I alluded to at the beginning of this paper, would presumably have come about when the structurality of structure had to begin to be thought, that is to say, repeated, and this is why I said that this disruption was repetition in all of the senses of this word” (Derrida, 1970).

Consequently, Derrida’s critical view of structuralism and the theory of structure, according to Rasinski (2011) questioned the concept of ‘totality’ and ‘closure’ as suggested by Saussure’s system. He said the structure’s closure which

resulted “from the effort to ‘totalize’ and exhaust the field of identity” left no space for any entry from the outside. This is untenable due to “the infinite richness of the reality which cannot be bound into one, finite and cohesive discourse” (Rasinski, 2011).

Unlike his predecessors, Derrida didn’t offer any new grand theory or metanarrative but saw in discourse a “system of differences within which the play of signification extends infinitely in the absence of the transcendental signified” (Rasinski, 2011).

### **Foucault**

For Foucault “the question of the functioning of language intertwines with questions concerning its relations with the social and institutional environment that governs the production of statements in a given time and place” (Rasinski, 2011).

Like Derrida, Foucault refused to offer another metatheory. Instead, he emphasized the historicity of the discursive process. He posited In *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), that concepts and ideas are often not mainstreamed right away. They first linger in the fringes and peripheries of knowledge. He wrote: “Beneath the great continuities of thought, beneath the solid, homogeneous manifestations of a single mind or of a collective mentality, beneath the stubborn development of a science striving to exist and to reach completion at the very outset, beneath the persistence of a particular genre, form, discipline, or theoretical activity, one is now trying to detect the incidence of interruptions. Interruptions whose status and nature vary considerably...”

He further said, “...they show that the history of a concept is not wholly and entirely that of its progressive refinement, its continuously increasing

rationality, its abstraction gradient, but that of its various fields of constitution and validity, that of its successive rules of use, that of the many theoretical contexts in which it developed and matured.”

Christensen’s Disruption in Education and Disruptive Innovation Theory and TK Coleman’s ideas will be analyzed from the philosophical standpoints stated here.

### **3.0. Results**

The Moscow forum’s focus on disruptions in education attests to the huge influence of Clayton Christensen’s Disruptive Innovation Theory on the discourses in education. Christensen first wrote about the disruptive effects of new technological innovations in the book, “The Innovators Dilemma (1997). Since then, he has found applications of his theory in various fields.

#### **Disruptive innovations**

Considering the impact of Christensen’s theory, this paper discusses first the concept of disruptive innovations. According to the Disruptive Innovations Theory there are two types of disruptions: Type 1 and Type 2 disruptions. Type 1 disruption gives a group of customers a relatively simple product or service that allows them to do something they could not do in the past because of lack of skills or money. Type 2 disruption involves establishing a beachhead in the over-served low end of the incumbent’s market. Here, a company takes existing technologies and turns them into a lower-cost business model that allows them to offer a new value proposition to customers who do not need all of the “extras” provided by the leading firms.

In an interview posted in his website, [claytonchristensen.com](http://claytonchristensen.com), Christensen said

Disruptive Innovation “transforms a product that was historically so expensive and complicated that only a few people have access to it. It is made so much more affordable and accessible that a much larger population have access to it.”

The theory applies to various facets of 21<sup>st</sup> Century living. It can be cited in the call center phenomenon brought about by the decrease in the cost of long distance calls due to VoiP technology. The innovation allowed for the transfer of call center companies from the US to countries where there are many proficient English speakers, thereby benefitting underdeveloped economies like the Philippines and India.

It also was manifested in Apple’s introduction of the personal computer, the iPod and the iPhone: all game changers in their respective fields. Steve Jobs with Apple 2 personal computers made computing within reach of ordinary people from merely the affair of big corporations and governments. With the iPod he legitimized online soft copy distribution and with the iPhone, placed on people’s hands the personal computer, converging various gadgets and media in one smart phone.

Innovations can topple market leaders regardless of how big they are in the industry should they fail to recognize what could be disruptive innovations as in the case of Nokia in the face of innovations made by Apple and Google. Nokia itself was disruptive of the old order when as a little-known Finnish firm, it became the world’s number one cellular phone company with its smaller, sleeker SMS-capable cellular phones.

According to Christensen, et al, market leaders often focus their attention on ‘higher margin customers,’ neglecting customers at the low end of their markets as they are the least profitable to serve, ceding ‘market share to the encroaching

innovation coming from below’ (Christensen, et al, 2003, p24).

### **Creative destruction**

The theory of disruptive innovations has similarities to the theory of creative destruction by Joseph Schumpeter. Schumpeter wrote in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1942): “The opening up of new markets, foreign or domestic, and the organizational development from the craft shop and factory to such concerns as U.S. Steel illustrate the same process of industrial mutation— if I may use that biological term—that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one. This process of Creative Destruction is the essential fact about capitalism. It is what capitalism consists in and what every capitalist concern has got to live in...”

While Schumpeter confined his concepts and ideas to economics, Christensen pushes the relevance of his theory outside its original focus on technological disruptions.

### **Disruptions in education**

Disruptive innovations, according to Christensen, are not only felt in technology firms. Christensen extended the reach of his theories by using it to explain some phenomena in journalism, business, and education as due to disruptive innovations.

Writing on education in the United States, Christensen together with Sally Aaron and William Clark in *Disruptions in Education* published on Jan. 1, 2003, wrote:

“Over the past 20 years, tuition at our country’s four year colleges and universities has increased at a rate of almost 8 percent annually, more than

double the rate of inflation over the same period. Enrolment in four-year programs has grown at a snail-like rate of one-half percent over the past decade. The United States' world-renowned higher education system faces a severe budgetary crisis at both the state and federal levels, and more than 500 institutions have closed their doors in the past decade. Meanwhile, distance learning and corporate universities are growing at meteoric rates. Enrolment in distance learning is growing at three times the pace of classroom-based programs and is expected to reach five million by 2005."

Traditional college education in the US are declining as compared to non-traditional mode of instructions like distance learning and corporate universities. According to Christensen, "disruption is quietly changing the landscape of the education marketplace across the entire spectrum of undergraduate and graduate programs ... innovators are unlocking the gates to accessibility and affordability in education through disruptive innovations" (Christensen, et al, 2003, p.27-28).

### **Contrary views**

Few scholars disagree with Christensen's ideas on disruptive innovations. It would take a fellow Harvard professor and another scholar to write dissenting opinions.

### **Lepore's criticism**

Commenting on the idea of disruptive innovations, Jill Lepore, Harvard's History professor wrote a scathing article for the New Yorker. Being a historian and having worked previously with start-ups that failed, Lepore had a first-hand view of why some start-ups fail and why others succeed. As opposed to Christensen's view of innovations from the standpoint of business, Lepore offers a more

detailed and human picture of the people behind innovative products and inventions.

According to Lepore, most innovators are not exactly good businessmen but inventive, creative and non-conformist geeks who have passion for cutting edge ideas in their fields of interest. Lepore wrote: "The upstarts who work at start-ups don't often stay at any one place for very long. (Three out of four start-ups fail. More than nine out of ten never earn a return.) They work a year here, a few months there—zany hours everywhere. They wear jeans and sneakers and ride scooters and share offices and sprawl on couches like Great Danes. Their coffee machines look like dollhouse-size factories."

Commenting on Christensen's theory, Lepore wrote tersely in the popular magazine: "Disruptive innovation is a theory about why businesses fail. It's not more than that. It doesn't explain change. It's not a law of nature. It's an artifact of history, an idea, forged in time; it's the manufacture of a moment of upsetting and edgy uncertainty. Transfixed by change, it's blind to continuity. It makes a very poor prophet."

When asked for reactions to Lepore's article, Christensen replied that it is wrong for Lepore to judge his theory based on *The Innovator's Dilemma*, the first book he wrote about disruptive innovation, because he has since updated, revised, improved his ideas in the subsequent books and articles that he wrote in relation to his theory. Furthermore, he justified the inconsistencies in his book with the idea that disruptions take time. But what doesn't?

### **Markides: Christensen's mistake**

Unlike the brouhaha generated by Lepore's criticism of *Disruptive Innovation* in the New

Yorker, a journal article by Constantinos Markides didn't get as much attention. Writing for the *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, he said that Disruptive Innovation Theory originally referred to technological innovations and how they eventually surpassed market leaders. Christensen however, "widened the application of the term to include not only technologies but also products and business models" (Markides, 2006).

Christensen asserted on his theory's applicability outside its original scope and education is among the fields that he included. Markides said, "Christensen and Raynor (2003) list as disruptive innovations such disparate things as discount department stores; low price, point-to-point airlines; cheap, mass-market products such as power tools, copiers, and motorcycles; and online businesses such as bookselling, education, brokerage, and travel agents and the supposed disruption that innovation brings to education, the more fundamental concern is on the significance of technological advancement to education..."

He added, "Although I agree that all of these innovations are disruptive to incumbents, treating them all as one and the same has actually confused matters considerably. A disruptive technological innovation is a fundamentally different phenomenon from a disruptive business-model innovation as well as a disruptive product innovation: These innovations arise in different ways, have different competitive effects, and require different responses from incumbents" (Markides, 2006).

For Markides, Christensen's original theory "... has been used to explain all kinds of disruptive innovations. This is a mistake. Different kinds of innovations have different competitive effects and produce different kinds of markets. They should be

treated as distinct phenomena" (Markides, 2006).

### **Models of Disruptions in Higher Education**

Despite the questions raised against them, Christensen's Disruptive Innovation Theory and Disruptions in Education remain popular. His influence is obvious in the Moscow forum joined by educators.

Education is where innovations, after being mainstreamed, eventually become one of the courses taught like in the case of Google's android technology and Microsoft's operating systems and application. Although made eventually the authority on current innovations, the education sector itself is not immune to innovations.

The Moscow dialog among leaders in education highlighted the trends and models of disruptions in higher education. In terms of markets, Yinn Cheong who hails from Hongkong has an optimistic view. He said there is high demand for higher education, and that is projected to increase by 100%. In terms of the product, there are universities offering the content but it is projected to be overwhelmed by the increase of demand.

The reason for this can probably be gleaned from what Leah Rosovsky, VP of Harvard presented when it was her turn to speak. She noted that college education has economic benefits, and a person can get \$1 million more in a lifetime over those that did not have one. It is considered one of the drivers of economic growth, and for a democracy like the US, an educated population is good.

Acknowledging disruptions, she said that the challenge is how to reshape, design opportunities for people over time. She said there are innovations being made like Harvard's open lab and MITs open course ware, bringing courses online, and free

online education.

She also mentioned of research-based pedagogy being used where students and school children are mixed together in a business case study or research. It is a non-linear project with 300 work hours and given 12 credits.

Hannis Klopper, the European representative of the round table discussion said online courses ought to complement higher education. Personalizing education is the thing of the future. He said European universities are encouraged to offer courses online in order to reach a global market, allowing students to earn certificates regardless of where they are in the globe.

Valery Katkalo representing corporate universities in the US highlighted the gap between companies and universities, hence, the relevance of corporate universities in meeting demands of the industry.

### **Disrupting education**

What are referred to as disruptions in education by education leaders in the Moscow forum are not only technological innovations but also business models. This gives credit to criticisms made by Markides. It is also clear that the discussants see online education as the major disruption with most of them citing it as a disruptive innovation.

However, for TK Coleman, it is not technological innovations that are disrupting education. Speaking in a separate forum, he said, "...the most valuable and exciting aspect of this whole conversation about disruptive education, to me is not about how emerging technologies are allowing us to do the same things we've always done at a faster or in a cheaper way or in a way that is more efficient or convenient... the most exciting aspect of this is that these emerging technologies are forcing

us to revisit, re-examine our assumptions on why we pursue education in the first place. What is the value of education?" ([www.voiceandexit.com](http://www.voiceandexit.com)).

Coleman put it aptly what happens with how one may view things. He said: "No matter how accurately or definitively we take our perceptions of reality to be, there is always another angle from which things can be seen. Every perspective, every paradigm is open to challenge. And all our familiar ways of doing things, knowing things and seeing things, going about things, all of that can be interrupted at any moment by an experience, or by an epiphany that challenges us or forces us to broaden our horizons" ([www.voiceandexit.com](http://www.voiceandexit.com)).

### **4.0. Discussion**

Taken from Harvard Professor Clayton Christensen's Disruptive Innovation Theory, one of the most celebrated theories of 21<sup>st</sup> Century, disruption has captured the attention of scholars and ordinary people the world over, especially in developed countries. Other scholars however, hold a different view on the subject.

#### **Mainstreaming disruption**

Disruptive Innovation Theory describes a business phenomenon. It takes a more optimistic view of innovation as compared to Lepore's pessimistic stance and Schumpeter's paradoxical view. It tries to be predictive as a theory, but considering that only few of the many innovative ideas make it as successful business enterprises, the theory has not been helpful in predicting which innovation will work and which won't, as Lepore cited. It makes for a good commentary on an existing phenomenon though.

The concept of disruption is not originally Christensen's yet, the term has been mainstreamed

courtesy of his theory. Lately, the term has been loosely used to mean a change in the usual way we do things. Disruption signifies a departure from the norm and innovations have a way of doing that, interrupting traditional practices.

Christensen's attempt to make Disruptive Innovation Theory explain for different phenomena far from its original focus on technological innovations extends the theory's claims beyond its scope and limits. It smacks of grand theory formation. It attempts to become a theory of theories or a metanarrative ignoring incongruous details that don't submit to his totalizing attempts. However, it is well within the discourse on disruption.

### **Incredulity towards metanarratives**

Metanarratives attempt to provide a framework to see the world. Yet, as Coleman said, "there is always another angle from which things can be seen. Every perspective, every paradigm is open to challenge. And all our familiar ways of doing things, knowing things and seeing things, going about things, all of that can be interrupted at any moment..."

This idea is disruptive to education. In the context of this concept, how does one teach? Does one teach with the same old certitude of seeing things from a discipline's confident yet limited view and interpretation of the world, or by acknowledging the various perspectives from where one may view things? And teaching these various perspectives instead and the process by which, one gets there.

Poststructuralism disrupts philosophy and consequently, education, as Lyotard pointed out. Lyotard highlighted the impact of the crisis of metaphysical philosophy on education.

Writing about this dilemma, Lyotard wrote in *The Postmodern Condition* (1984), "To the obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation corresponds; most notably, the crisis of metaphysical philosophy and of the university institution which in the past relied on it. The narrative function is losing its functors, its great hero, its great dangers, its great voyages, and its great goal." Lyotard defines postmodernism as the "the incredulity towards metanarratives."

With this "incredulity towards metanarratives," how does one teach? For Derrida, all totalizing attempts are inadequate and mere constructs given "the infinite richness of the reality which cannot be bound into one, finite and cohesive discourse" (Rasinski, 2011).

### **Interruptions to knowledge**

A look at the history of human thought attests to the changes in human perspectives, with worldviews discarded in the process and new ones adopted. Foucault said in *Archaeology of Knowledge*, "Interruptions ... suspend the continuous accumulation of knowledge, interrupt its slow development, and force it to enter a new time, cut it off from its empirical origin and its original motivations, cleanse it of its imaginary complicities..." (Foucault, 1969, p4).

A good illustration of Foucault's thesis is Paulo Freire's critical approach to education as discussed in his book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. It has become popular in recent years as educators rethink and re-evaluate higher education. From being a favourite mainly among Marxist ideologues and critical theorists, it has gone mainstream. It has influenced Henry Giroux's *Critical Pedagogy*, *Dialog Based Education*, *Inquiry Based Education*, and *Output Based Education (OBE)*. This validates

Foucault's thesis on the initial marginalization of knowledge before it is eventually mainstreamed.

OBE and the other non-traditional approaches to education reflect many of the critical ideas of Freire such as student-centered instruction where the teacher ceases to be the sole person responsible for passing on knowledge and the success of the whole learning experience. The teacher becomes mainly a facilitator of learning. Students instead of being mere passive learners become active seekers of knowledge themselves. The teaching process ceases to be a mere narration of the disciplinary narrative spoon-fed to a classroom full of passive listeners. Instead, it encourages critical thinking by students and acknowledges the variety of perspectives on a given topic.

It also acknowledges the fact that learning does not happen only inside the classroom and limited to the confines of the school curriculum. Outside Industry experience, for instance, can be credited as source of knowledge.

Freire's ideas are most relevant in post-colonial, underdeveloped countries (such as the Philippines), which are reeling from the consequences of colonialism and now, of globalization.

### **The role of innovative technology**

TK Coleman said, emerging technologies help in making us rethink why we pursue education in the first place. This prompts the question: what then is the role of technology in education? How are we supposed to teach?

Technological innovations can be a tool in pursuing new directions universities may take. Online education, modular learning, focused teaching, personalized education, etc. become means and not ends in themselves (as suggested by Disruptive Innovation Theory) in achieving

the goals of higher learning institutions. OBE, for instance, with its less emphasis on facts and information and more on meaning-making, output and performance allow for flexibility of instruction as opposed to traditional classroom-based, four year curriculum education. The change is troubling for many who are used to traditional mode of teaching. Ideas disrupt and universities have to make the paradigm shift now or lose out for being unable to adapt and make the necessary adjustments.

### **Third World Disregard**

Christensen said dwindling enrollment in traditional college education in the US reflect the disruptive effect of online education. This is not the case in developing countries. Despite its popularity in the west, technological disruptions in education is still not that widespread in many developing countries.

In 2011, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) came up with a report titled, Higher Education in Asia: Issues and Strategies. The publication reported on the status of HEIs in the continent. According to the ADB Report, online enrollees in the Philippines number only 2,834 students, the lowest in Asia. A lot of it has to do with the country's slow internet access. In global e-Readiness and e-Learning Readiness rankings, out of 70 countries, India and the Philippines only placed 54th and 55th, respectively while Malaysia placed 34th overall. Malaysia seems poised to take off. It ranked high in Internet usage and penetration with 59% penetration rate as compared to India (5.2%) and the Philippines (15.1%) according to the ADB.

The Moscow forum on education cited new players and models. Yet, the forum was silent on disruptions in education in developing countries

which were not represented in that event. The speeches made during the forum are varied and revealing of the speakers' understanding of education. However, most of them were from First World economies in Asia, Europe, and North America and their speeches showed not only their views on education but also their frames of reference.

### 5.0. Conclusion

From a business standpoint, online instruction may be disruptive. If a college or university is mainly concerned with its economic viability, then a cheaper online education is disruptive. However, that's not all that HEIs aim for. They are supposed to strive for a higher purpose, seek the creation and discovery of new knowledge and explore a more meaningful approach to instruction. Thus, online instruction ought to be more of a tool in the pursuance of an educational paradigm and not an end in itself.

### Disrupting the disruption

Ultimately, however, one asks this question: if there is always another angle from which things can be seen, from what standpoint does one make a choice and proceeds? The answer lies in what Derrida has to say about disruption.

The disruption discussed in this paper could also mean the disruption of the disruption referred to by Derrida. What is being disrupted actually is the repetition of the "structurality of the structure," which was "repetition in all of the senses of this word." Disruption for Derrida is an alteration to the natural and if some idea or practice results in a dichotomy for man, a split from what is natural, it becomes a disruption. And this disruption has to be disrupted. For Derrida, to deconstruct is to "not

naturalize what is not natural, to not assume what is conditioned by history, institutions, or society as natural..."

Disrupting the disruption discontinues the dominant narrative, unsettles the old configuration and order of things and frees people from the hegemony of totalizing ideas that demand consistency and abhors disruption.

### Discourse vs. totalization

Lyotard's postmodernism traces its roots to post-structuralism which has disrupted philosophy and consequently, education as one not only re-examines how one thinks and sees things, but also how one teaches and passes on knowledge. Not offering any worldview, Derrida however sees future in discourse and teaching can be a form of discourse. One can teach with the same old narrative instruction or engage in an intelligent discussion with students that acknowledges and believes in their capacities to think, analyze and learn as Freire espoused. Derrida sees in discourse the "assumption that every human thought, perception or activity depends on the structuration of the field of signification which precedes the immediacy of the facts" (Rasinski, 2011).

Discourse runs contrary to totalization. With no determined center, discourse "extends the process of signification ad infinitum. Thus understood structure becomes a field of signification in which a temporary order is established by the presence of many mutually substituting centers" (Rasinsky, 2011).

### Third World relevance

Post-structuralist Ideas are disruptive especially in developing countries as they allow for exploration of various paradigms instead of

just the same old western-oriented perspective. It allows for the exploration in developing countries of indigenous approaches to education such as the use of mother tongue (now introduced in the Philippines) as medium of instruction in early basic education. It encourages sifting through the plethora of western ideas and testing their validity in the context of one's reality. It allows for the inward realizations, self-knowledge, awareness of one's unique identity and cultural diversity.

## 6.0 References

### Books

- Christensen, C. M. (1997) *The innovator's dilemma: when new technologies cause great firms to fail*, Brighton, MA : Harvard Business School Press.
- Christensen, C. M., Horn, M. B., Caldera, L., Soares, L. (2011) *Disrupting College: How Disruptive Innovation Can Deliver Quality and Affordability to Postsecondary Education*, Mountain View, CA : Innosight Institute.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*, Chicago, IL : University of Chicago
- Foucault, M. (1989) . *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Routledge, London : Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970) . *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Continuum International Publishing : London.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota

### Journal articles

- Christensen, C. M., Aaron, S., & William, C. (2003) Disruption in Education, *Educause Review*, 38 (1), 44-55
- Markides, C. (2005, December). Disruptive Innovation: In Need of Better Theory. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23 (1), 19-25.
- Rasiński, L. (2011). The idea of discourse in poststructuralism: Derrida, Lacan and Foucault. *Teraźniejszość– Człowiek– Edukacja: A quarterly of social and educational ideas*, 7-22.
- Velez, J. Jr. (2014). To Construct or Deconstruct a Grand Theory of Communication, *CNU Journal of Higher Education*.
- Lepore, J. (2014, Jun 23). The Disruption Machine. *The New Yorker*, 90, 30-n/a. Retrieved from [www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/06/23/the-disruption-machine](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/06/23/the-disruption-machine)

### Article in a Magazine (Online)

### Report

- Asian Development Bank. (2011) *Higher Education across Asia: an overview of issues and Strategies*. Manila : Author.

### Internet References

- Bloomberg. (2015, October). Is the theory of disruption dead wrong? Retrived from <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-10-05/did-clay-christensen-get-disruption-wrong>