

DECONSTRUCTING NARRATIVE AUTHORITY IN CONTEMPORARY FICTION THROUGH A POSTSTRUCTURALIST LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE POWER OF SOUND AND DISCURSIVENESS

Oleh :

Yunus Laia¹⁾, Jumino Suhadi²⁾, M. Manugeran³⁾, Purwarno Siwi⁴⁾

^{1,2,3,4} Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara

¹email: yunuslaia21@gmail.com

Informasi Artikel

Riwayat Artikel :

Submit, 26 Juli 2026

Revisi, 28 September 2026

Diterima, 29 September 2026

Publish, 30 September 2026

Kata Kunci :

Narrative Authority,
Contemporary Fiction,
Poststructuralism,
Voice,
Discursive Power.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to deconstruct the concept of narrative authority in contemporary fiction through a critical synthesis of poststructuralist literature that discusses the relationship between sound and discursive power. Departing from a critique of the classical narrative paradigm that places the narrator at the center of epistemic meaning and authority, this study examines how contemporary literature conceptualizes narrative authority as a fragmented discursive construct. The method used is a non-Systematic Literature Review (non-SLR) literature review with a qualitative-theoretical approach to Scopus indexed journal articles relevant to issues of voice, narrative, discourse, and power. Data were analyzed through in-depth reading and thematical-critical analysis to identify conceptual patterns, theoretical tensions, as well as paradigm shifts in the understanding of narrative authority. The results show that narrative authority is not attached, but rather emerges as a relational effect of language practice, performativity, materiality, influence, and silence. Voices are positioned as the negotiating locus of discursive power, rather than as a stable source of narrative truth. This study concludes that the synthesis of poststructuralist literature allows for the formulation of deconstructive frameworks of narrative authority that go beyond traditional narrative approaches. The contribution of this research lies in strengthening the understanding of narrative as an arena of epistemic and political conflict in contemporary literary studies.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license



Corresponding Author:

Nama: Yunus Laia

Afiliasi: Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara

Email: yunuslaia21@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The In contemporary literary and humanities studies, the concept of narrative authority underwent a significant paradigmatic shift along with the development of poststructuralist thought that rejected the assumption of stability of meaning, subject, and language. The classical paradigm that places the narrator at the center of epistemic meaning and authority is now systematically questioned, especially through criticism of representationalism and subjective humanism. Poststructuralist literature

suggests that narrative voices never exist as direct expressions of autonomous subjects, but rather as an effect of power relations and complex discursive practices; In this context, fictional narratives are no longer understood as transparent mediums that reflect reality or inner experiences, but as an arena of knowledge production full of ideological interests. Narrative authority, thus, cannot be maintained as an inherent attribute of the narrator or author. Rather, it should be understood as a discursive construct that is always negotiated through language, narrative

structure, and reading. This shift marks a fundamental shift in the way contemporary fiction is understood and analyzed. Therefore, the deconstruction of narrative authority has become a central issue in modern literary studies (Kelly, 2019) (White & Drew, 2011)

This conceptual shift is reinforced by a wide range of cross-disciplinary research that consistently criticizes claims of authenticity and transparency of voice. affirms that voice, both in research and narrative, is always the result of discursive constructions that involve selection, framing, and interpretation. This view rejects the romanticization of sound as a pure and unmediated expression of interiority.) expands on this critique by pointing out that every practice of representation always contains ethical and political dimensions that shape who gets to speak and how those voices are legitimized. In a literary context, this criticism implies that the voice of the narrator is never neutral or value-free. Narrative authority thus arises as an effect of a particular discursive position recognized in a particular knowledge regime. This suggests that narrative truth claims are always contingent and prone to distractions. Therefore, understanding narrative authority as a discursive construct becomes an urgent theoretical need. (White & Drew, 2011) (Pickering & Kara, 2017)

The study of contemporary literature in particular shows how fiction reflects and explores the instability of narrative authority. and shows that the re-emergence of omniscient narrators in contemporary fiction does not signal a return to classical epistemic authority, but rather functions reflexively and ironically. Omniscience is no longer understood as an inherent trait of the narrator, but as a rhetorical strategy that relies on the reader's interpretive context. Thus, narrative authority emerges as an illusion that is realized and played by the text. Through the concept (Phelan, 2025)(Sternberg, 2007) (*T0_8i_fortiermercier*, n.d.) of *Capitatio*, *Illusionis* shows how contemporary fiction builds readers' trust precisely by revealing the illusory construction of the narrative itself. The narrative does not erase authority, but it makes it fragile and temporary. This phenomenon confirms that contemporary fiction operates in a logic of ambivalence, in which the claim of meaning is always accompanied by an awareness of its unreliability. Therefore, the analysis of narrative authority can no longer stop at the typology of the narrator alone.

In the poststructuralist framework, the problematization of narrative authority is increasingly complex through critiques of subjects and agencies. shows that Foucauldian thought does not abolish agency, but rather decentralizes it from individual subjects to power relations and discursive practices. The implication of this view for the study of literature is the collapse of the figure of the

narrator as an autonomous agent who holds complete control over meaning. reinforcing this critique through the concept (Caldwell, 2007) (Broeckmeyer & Van Goidsenhoven, 2024) of *a subjectless voice*, which rejects the assumption that sound must always be rooted in the subject's interiority. Sound is understood as a discursive and aesthetic event that does not require an ontological foundation in the form of a stable subject. Thus, narrative authority loses its humanistic basis and shifts into a relational phenomenon. This perspective opens up the possibility of reading narrative as a network of sounds that cannot be reduced to a single center of meaning. In this context, contemporary fiction becomes a space for experimentation over the fragmentation of voices and the decentralization of authority.

Conceptual tensions regarding sound are increasingly prominent as poststructuralist literature discusses its relationship to performativity, materiality, and silence. It shows that (Birke & Hauthal, 2024) *we-narration* not only represents collectivity, but produces it performatively. Thus, voice does not describe an existing identity, but rather shapes it through discursive practices. and rejects the view that language is immaterial and completely controlled by the human subject, emphasizing the materiality of sound as it relates to the body, technology, and the environment. In addition, it emphasizes that silence is not just the absence of sound, but the result of active discursive exclusion mechanisms. This tension between articulation and absence suggests that narrative authority is not only built through what is said, but also through what is silenced. Therefore, the legitimacy of narrative authority is always problematic and never stable. (Mazzei & Jackson, 2017) (Pennycook, 2024) (Slemon, 2025)

Although the literature shows rich theoretical developments, the synthesis of previous research reveals significant conceptual fragmentation. Many studies focus on a single dimension of voice and authority—such as methodological reflexivity, representational ethics, intertextuality, affectivity, or digital media—without integrating them into one comprehensive deconstructive framework. In addition, a number of cross-disciplinary studies relevant to sound and discursive power have not been systematically applied to the analysis of contemporary fiction as a literary object. As a result, the understanding of narrative authority is often fragmented and partial. This research gap shows the need for a critical synthesis that is able to connect the various poststructuralist traditions within a coherent analytical framework. Thus, the need for integrative and theoretical literature research is becoming increasingly urgent. (White & Drew, 2011), (Yardley, 2008) (Burzyński, 2020) (Demeyer, n.d.) (Yeates, 2020)

Based on this background, this research aims to deconstruct the concept of narrative authority in contemporary fiction through a critical synthesis of poststructuralist literature on the power of sound and discursiveness. This research does not focus on the analysis of a single text, but rather on tracing conceptual evolution and theoretical tensions in the relevant literature. Specifically, this study aims to show how narrative authority is understood as a fragmented discursive construct, how tensions in the concept of sound affect narrative legitimacy, and how literary synthesis enables the formulation of deconstructive frameworks that go beyond traditional narrative approaches. By placing voice as the negotiating locus of discursive power, this study seeks to shift narrative understanding from the source of truth to the arena of epistemic conflict. This approach is expected to make a theoretical contribution to the study of contemporary literature. Therefore, this research positions itself as a reflective and critical conceptual synthesis effort.

In line with this goal, the formulation of this research problem is focused on three main questions. First, how contemporary poststructuralist literature conceptualizes narrative authority in fiction as a fragmented discursive construct through the relationship between sound, power, and language, and how this conceptualization revises the classical understanding of the narrator as central to epistemic meaning and authority. Second, what theoretical tensions are identified in the poststructuralist literature regarding the concept of sound—particularly between representation, performativity, materiality, and silence—and how these tensions affect the legitimacy and stability of narrative authority in contemporary fictional readings. Third, how the critical synthesis of poststructuralist literature allows for the formulation of a deconstructive framework of narrative authority that goes beyond traditional narrativeological approaches, by positioning voice as a negotiating locus of discursive power rather than as a source of narrative truth. Thus, this introduction affirms the conceptual foundation and urgency of the research being conducted, while positioning this research in a critical dialogue with the existing literature.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

In This study uses a non-Systematic Literature Review (non-SLR) literature review design with a qualitative-theoretical approach to critically analyze the conceptualization of narrative authority in contemporary fiction through a poststructuralist perspective on the power of sound and discursiveness. The non-SLR design was chosen because the purpose of the research is not to map the quantity of findings or measure empirical effects, but rather to conduct conceptual synthesis, theoretical deconstruction, and epistemic tension analysis in the relevant literature; The subject of this research is not

an individual or single literary text, but a (Kelly, 2019), (Glynos et al., 2021) corpus of scientific journal articles that discuss voices, narratives, authority, and discursive power in the context of literature, qualitative methodology, and discourse theory. A literature sample was deliberately selected from Scopus indexed journal articles that explicitly examined the concepts of sound, narrative authority, discourse, performativity, language materiality, silence, and power relations, as reflected in the works and The selection of articles is based on their conceptual relevance, theoretical contribution, and relevance to the poststructuralist tradition, rather than on a time period or uniform methodological design(Phelan, n.d.) (Sternberg, 2007) (White & Drew, 2011) (Mazzei & Jackson, 2017) (Broeckmeyer & Van Goidsenhoven, 2024) (Pennycook, 2024)

The research instruments in this study are an analytical-deconstructive reading framework developed from the synthesis of poststructuralist literature, especially the concept of discourse, power relations, subject fragmentation, and instability of meaning; The data collection procedure is carried out through a careful reading of the selected articles, by extracting key concepts, epistemic assumptions, theoretical positions, and internal tensions in the discussion of voice and narrative authority. The conceptual data collected were then analyzed using (Caldwell, 2007) (Kelly, 2019) thematical-critical analysis to identify conceptual patterns, theoretical contradictions, and paradigm shifts, particularly related to the relationship between representation, performativity, materiality, and silence; The final stage of analysis is carried out through (Birke & Hauthal, 2024) (Slemon, 2025) deconstructive synthesis, i.e. connecting and reconfiguring conceptual findings across the literature to formulate an analytical framework of narrative authority that goes beyond traditional narrative approaches, by positioning voice as a locus of discursive power negotiation, rather than as a stable source of narrative truth; (Glynos et al., 2021) (Demeyer, n.d.)

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the main results of the research in the form of a synthesis of conceptual findings from the reviewed literature. The presentation is conducted without interpretation or discussion, and contains only patterns, categories, and conceptual configurations that consistently appear in the articles being analyzed. Results are presented in the form of numbered subtopics to clarify the structure of the findings.

1. Narrative Authority as an Inherently Discursive Construct

The literature reviewed consistently shows that narrative authority is not understood as an inherent attribute of the narrator or author. Authority arises as an effect of discursive relationships formed

through language, narrative conventions, and the reader's interpretive framework; No literature has been found that maintains the position of narrative authority as a single, stable epistemic center. Instead, the entire article asserts that the claims of authority are always contingent and can be undermined. The narrator is positioned as a discursive node, not a source of final meaning. Narrative authority arises through certain mechanisms of legitimacy, such as genre conventions, rhetorical strategies, or institutional recognition. Thus, authority is generated, not owned. This pattern appears in various theoretical traditions in the literature. (Kelly, 2019) (Phelan, n.d.) (Caldwell, 2007)

1.Sound Fragmentation as the Dominant Feature of Contemporary Fiction

The results of the synthesis show that sound fragmentation is a recurring conceptual characteristic in contemporary fiction discussions. Literature notes the blurring of the boundaries between author, narrator, and character, so that no single voice serves as the center of meaning; Narrative voices come in the form of polyphony, shifts in perspective, and internal inconsistencies. No narrative model has been found that maintains intact sound coherence without interruption. This fragmentation is understood as a structural condition, not a technical deviation. Sound is distributed in textual and intertextual networks. These results are consistent in literature studies and cross-disciplinary narrative methodology studies. (Aldemir, 2022) ((Phelan, n.d.) (Burzyński, 2020)

2. Rejection of Voice Authenticity

The entire literature reviewed shows an explicit rejection of the idea of sound as an authentic representation of the subject's experience. Sound is understood as the result of a discursive construct that always involves the selection, framing, and negotiation of meaning; There are no findings to support the assumption that sound can be presented transparently. Claims of authenticity are treated as representational illusions. Sound is always tied to a certain epistemic position. This is true both in the context of literature and qualitative research. Thus, the legitimacy of the vote does not come from subjective honesty, but from the discursive mechanisms that validate it. This pattern appears consistently across the articles analyzed. (White & Drew, 2011), (Pickering & Kara, 2017)

3. The Tension between Representation and Performativity

The literature identifies conceptual tensions between sound as representation and sound as performative. In a performative framework, sound does not describe an existing identity or reality, but generates it through narrative practice; Deflected (2019). Collective voices, such as (Birke & Hauthal, 2024) *we-narration*, serve to form discursive communities, rather than represent them. No theoretical position has been found that stably unites

these two functions. These tensions are structural and repetitive. Representation and performativity emerge as two colliding logics. As a result, narrative authority cannot consistently rely on a single logic.

4.Language Materiality and Agency Spread

The results of the synthesis show that the literature consistently emphasizes the materiality of language and sound. Language is not understood as an immaterial medium that is completely controlled by the human subject; Sound arises through intra-action of the body, technology, environment, and institutions. Narrative agents are distributed, not centralized. No stable single agency concept was found. The narrator does not function as the full controller of the production of meaning. The authority of narrative thus loses its humanistic foundation. This pattern appears both in the study of posthumanism and in the analysis of critical discourse. (Mazzei & Jackson, 2017) (Pennycook, 2024)

5. Silence as a Productive Element of Narrative

The literature identifies silence as an active component in the production of narrative meaning. Silence is understood as the result of a discursive exclusion mechanism, not just the absence of sound. What is not spoken has an epistemic weight equivalent to what is articulated. There is no approach that views silence as a neutral element. Silence serves to limit, direct, and regulate possible meanings. In contemporary fiction, silence appears in the form of the absence of perspective, disconnected narratives, and the uncertainty of viewpoints. Thus, narrative authority is constructed as well as disturbed through silence. (Slemon, 2025)

6. Narrative Authority as an Affective Effect

The results of the study show that some literature positions narrative authority not as an epistemic claim, but as an affective effect. Narratives gain power through emotional resonance, not representational truth. Authority arises through the intensity of the reading experience. No completely rational and objective model of authority has been found. Affective function as an alternative legitimacy mechanism. Thus, narrative authority becomes situational and unstable. This pattern is consistent in the study of contemporary literature that emphasizes the fragmentation of experience. (Demeyer, n.d.)

7. Intertextuality and Decentralization of Meaning

The literature shows that intertextuality plays an important role in decentralizing narrative authority. Meaning is not produced by a single text, but through the relationship between texts that are constantly moving; Narrative authority is thus inseparable from the broader discursive network. No claim of final meaning is found in a single text. Each narrative is in a state of (Burzyński, 2020)(Truman et al., 2022) *statu nascendi*. The authority becomes temporary and can be revised. This pattern appears

consistently in literature reviews and discourse analysis.

8. Distribution of Authority in Collective and Participatory Practice

Some literature shows a shift in narrative authority toward collective and participatory practices. Voices are no longer monopolized by a single agent, but are negotiated through dialogue; Narrative authority arises as a result of social interaction. No single, stable hierarchical model was found. This practice shows a redistribution of narrative power. Authority becomes fluid and open to intervention. This pattern marks a structural change in the production of contemporary narratives. (Yeates, 2020)(Allegrettia & Magalhães, 2022)

9. Synthesis of Key Findings

Overall, the results of the study suggest that narrative authority in poststructuralist literature is understood as a fragmented discursive construct. Sound operates in a tension between representation, performativity, materiality, influence, and silence. No stable epistemic foundation for narrative authority has been found. Authority emerges as a relational effect that is always negotiated. These findings are consistent across the theoretical traditions analyzed. The entire literature rejects the centralization of voice. Thus, the results of this study map the main conceptual configurations without further interpretation.

This discussion section systematically links research findings to the literature that has been reviewed, answers each research question (RQ1–RQ3) in detail, and explains the significance, scientific contributions, implications, and limitations of the research. The entire discussion strictly refers only to the references that have been given, without adding new literature.

Research Question Discussion 1 (RQ1)

Conceptualizing Narrative Authority as a Fragmented Discursive Construct

The research findings suggest that contemporary poststructuralist literature consistently conceptualizes narrative authority in fiction as a fragmented discursive construct, rather than as an inherent attribute of the narrator or author. This result is in line with the epistemological argument that rejects the representationalism of language, as put forward by , which asserts that language never represents reality directly, but rather shapes it through certain discursive practices. Thus, the claim of narrative authority cannot be detached from the knowledge regime that allows certain voices to be recognized as legitimate. These findings confirm that the narrator can no longer be positioned as the sole epistemic center of meaning or authority. Instead, authority emerges as a relational effect that depends on language, narrative structure, and reading. It fundamentally revises the classical understanding of narrative that places the narrator as a stable source of meaning. (Kelly, 2019)

This discussion is reinforced by the assertive thinking that in the Foucauldian tradition, agency is not eliminated but decentralized from individual subjects toward discursive practices and power relations. The findings of the study suggest that this concept is implicitly adopted in contemporary literary studies, where the narrator is understood as a node in a network of discourse, rather than as an autonomous agent. and shows that even the most authoritative forms of narrative—such as omniscience—actually operate as functional and reflexive constructs. Narrative authority is used to expose the limitations of knowledge, not to assert it. Thus, the findings of this study confirm that contemporary fiction actively practices the deconstruction of classical narrator figures.(Caldwell, 2007), (Phelan, 2025), (Sternberg, 2007)

Furthermore, the results of the study show that the literature not only revises the position of the narrator, but also dismantles humanistic assumptions about healthy subjects. The concept of *a voice without a directly* stated subject resonates with the finding that narrative voice does not require a stable subject foundation. Sound is understood as a discursive and aesthetic event produced by the relationship of language, influence, and materiality. Thus, narrative authority loses its ontological foundation as belonging to the subject. These findings are significant because they show that the deconstruction of narrative authority is not only technical-narrative, but also epistemological and ontological. In the context of literary studies, it shifts the focus of analysis from who speaks to how voices are produced and legitimized. (Broeckmeyer & Van Goidsenhoven, 2024)

The significance of RQ1's findings lies in the statement that narrative authority should be understood as a field of discursive conflict, not as a source of narrative truth. This research contributes to the field of literary studies by consolidating various previously fragmented poststructuralist positions into one coherent conceptual understanding. Thus, this research expands the horizon of narrative analysis from structural and typological approaches towards an epistemic critique of claims of meaning and truth in contemporary fiction.

Research Question Discussion 2 (RQ2)

The Theoretical Tension of the Concept of Sound and Its Impact on the Legitimacy of Narrative Authority

The research findings suggest that the poststructuralist literature identifies **persistent conceptual tensions** in the concept of sound, particularly between representation, performativity, materiality, and silence. This discussion emphasizes that these tensions are not incidental but structural and constitutive to the way voices are understood. and show that sound is never present as an authentic representation of the subject's experience, as it is always generated through the process of selection

and framing. The findings of this study confirm that criticism of the authenticity of voices applies across contexts, both literary and qualitative research methodologies. Thus, the legitimacy of narrative authority that rests on representational claims becomes fragile. (White & Drew, 2011) (Pickering & Kara, 2017))

The tension between representation and the performability of sound also appears consistently in the literature. This suggests that (Birke & Hauthal, 2024) *we-narratives* do not describe existing collectivities, but create them through performative practices. The findings of the study suggest that this logic of formivity shifts the source of narrative authority from representational truth to performative effectiveness. affirms that sound is a political practice that shapes social relationships, not a mirror of experience. Thus, narrative authority becomes dependent on the performative success of the voice in building understanding, rather than on the accuracy of representation. This tension directly affects the stability of narrative authority, as performability is always temporary and contextual. (Nugroho et al., 2025; Parry, n.d.)

The materiality aspect of sound further deepens this tension. and rejects the view that sound and language are immaterial and completely controlled by human subjects. The research findings suggest that the materiality of language—which involves the body, technology, and the environment—distributes narrative agents to a wide range of human and non-human actors. As a result, narrative authority can no longer be attributed to the narrator's intentions or consciousness. Authority emerges as a complex material-discursive configuration effect. This discussion suggests that the legitimacy of the narrator as the center of meaning control becomes theoretically untenable. (Mazzei & Jackson, 2017) (Pennycook, 2024)

The dimension of silence identified by) also plays an important role in disrupting narrative authority. The findings of the study suggest that silence is not just the absence of sound, but an active discursive exclusion mechanism. What is silenced in the narrative has epistemic implications as strong as what is said. Thus, narrative authority is built through deletion as well as articulation. This tension between voice and silence suggests that claims of authority are always built on a certain absence, which opens up space for critical reading. This undermines the legitimacy of the narrator as a transparent center of meaning. (Slemon, 2025)

The significance of RQ2's findings lies in the revelation that narrative authority is never stable because the concept of sound itself is problematic and contradictory. This research contributes by systematically mapping internal tensions in sound theory that are often discussed separately in the literature. By linking representation, performativity, materiality, and silence in a single analytical

configuration, this research shows that narrative authority is always in a state of crisis of negotiation and legitimacy. This contribution is important to the study of literature because it encourages a more reflective reading of narratives against the claims of voice and truth.

Research Question Discussion 3 (RQ3)

Critical Synthesis and Formulation of the Deconstructive Framework of Narrative Authority

The research findings suggest that the critical synthesis of poststructuralist literature allows for the formulation of a deconstructive framework of narrative authority that goes beyond traditional narrative approaches. Classical approaches tend to categorize narrators based on type and reliability, without questioning the epistemic foundations of authority itself. Instead, the results suggest that the poststructuralist literature shifts the focus of analysis from who speaks to how voices are produced, negotiated, and legitimized. Through the (Glynos et al., 2021) *framework of Critical Explanatory Logic*, it provides a conceptual basis for understanding narrative as a discursive practice that stabilizes temporal meaning through social, political, and phantasmatic logic. The findings of the study suggest that this framework is compatible with literary analysis that views narrative authority as the result of hegemonic articulation.

This synthesis also integrates the affective dimension identified by , which suggests that contemporary fiction is increasingly shifting its focus from knowledge to affective experience. The findings of the study suggest that narrative authority in this context no longer comes from claims of truth, but from the emotional resonance that the text produces. Thus, sound serves as a negotiating locus of discursive and affective power, rather than as a source of final meaning. This approach broadens the understanding of how power works in narratives, not only through logical structure, but also through the intensity of experience.(Demeyer, n.d.)

The feminist, poststructuralist, and posthumanist perspectives integrated in this synthesis further reinforce the deconstruction of narrative authority. suggests that fragmentation and polyphony can serve as strategies of resistance to dominant narrative authority. and emphasizes that sound is always entangled in technological and institutional networks. The research findings suggest that this integration of perspectives allows for the reading of narrative authority as a distributed phenomenon and is never final. The resulting deconstructive framework positions voice as a discursive practice that is constantly confronted with failures, limitations, and contingencies. (Arzaghi et al., 2023) (Muhur & Rehn, 2015) (Mazzei & Jackson, 2017)

The significance of RQ3's findings lies in the conceptual contribution of this study in formulating a

synthetic and cross-theoretical narrative authority analysis model. This research not only reconstructs the literature but also reconfigures it to produce a reading framework that can be applied to contemporary fiction. This contribution is important to the field of literary studies because it offers an alternative to traditional narratives that often ignore the dimensions of power and discourse. Thus, this study enriches analytical tools for reading narratives as epistemic and political practices.

Research Implications

The theoretical implications of this research lie in the strengthening of the poststructuralist paradigm in literary studies, especially in understanding narrative as an arena for negotiating discursive power. This research encourages literary researchers to no longer focus their analysis on the stability of the narrator, but on the discursive processes that shape voice. The methodological implication is the need for a reflective and deconstructive analytical approach to reading fictional texts. Pedagogically, this research has implications for the way literature is taught, by emphasizing the instability of meaning and criticism of narrative truth claims. This research also opens up a space for dialogue between literature review and cross-disciplinary qualitative methodology. Thus, the implications are cross-field and enrich scientific practice.

Research Limitations

Despite making significant conceptual contributions, this study has some limitations. First, as a review of the non-SLR literature, this study does not aim to cover all existing literature, but rather focuses on conceptual relevance. Second, this study did not conduct an analysis of empirical literary texts, so the findings were theoretical and synthetic. Third, the focus on the poststructuralist tradition limits dialogue to other approaches outside that framework. These limitations open up opportunities for further research to test and apply this deconstructive framework to specific corpus of fiction. Thus, the limitations of this research also mark the direction of future research development

4. CONCLUSION

Conclusion This study concludes that narrative authority in contemporary fiction, as conceptualized in poststructuralist literature, can no longer be understood as an inherent attribute of the narrator or author, but rather as a fragmented and always negotiated discursive construct. Key findings suggest that narrative voices operate in constitutive tensions between representation, performativity, materiality, influence, and silence, so that the legitimacy of narrative authority is unstable and contingent. Authority emerges as a relational effect of language practices, narrative structures, and discursive power configurations, rather than as a source of final epistemic truth. By synthesizing

poststructuralist literature across traditions—including literary studies, qualitative methodology, poststructuralist feminism, and posthumanism—the study succeeded in formulating a deconstructive framework that goes beyond traditional narrative approaches. The main contribution of this research lies in the shift of the focus of analysis from the narrator figure to the discursive process that produces and disrupts sound. Thus, this research enriches the field of contemporary literary studies through epistemological contributions that place narrative as an arena of power conflict and negotiation of meaning, rather than as a medium of stable truth transmission.

Based on these findings, the study suggests several development directions for future research. First, the deconstructive framework of narrative authority formulated in this study can be applied empirically to the analysis of a particular contemporary fictional corpus to test its operationality and limitations in textual reading practice. This application allows the enrichment of the dialogue between theoretical synthesis and concrete literary analysis. Second, advanced research can explore how sound configurations and narrative authority change in non-print narrative media, such as digital fiction, audio, or participatory narrative forms, without abandoning pre-formulated poststructuralist frameworks. Third, comparative studies across theoretical traditions—for example, by bringing together poststructuralist approaches with cognitive narratives or reception studies—can be conducted to test the extent to which deconstructions of narrative authority interact with the reader's experience. Fourth, future research can also deepen the ethical and political dimensions of narrative voice, especially related to the mechanisms of exclusion, silence, and legitimacy in literary representation. Thus, this suggestion not only expands the scope of research, but also confirms that the deconstruction of narrative authority is an open, dynamic and continuously relevant field of study for the development of contemporary literature and humanities.

5. REFERENCES

- Aldemir, N. (2022). The author on the stage with multiple hats in J. M. Coetzee's Elisabeth Costello. *NALANS: Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 10(20), 238–256. <https://doi.org/10.59045/nls.2023.1>
- Allegretia, M., & Magalhães, L. (2022). A mosaic of experiences and narratives about collective practices in occupational therapy: methodological considerations. *Brazilian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2526-8910.ctoAO2426316302>
- Arzaghi, M., Fahimkalam, M., & Mohseni, M. R. (2023). A Poststructuralist Feminist Reading

- of Assia Djebar's *Fantasia: An Algerian Cavalcade* Based on Hélène Cixous' and Luce Irigaray's Theories. *Research in Contemporary World Literature/ Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-Ye Khareji*, 27(2), 674–696. <https://doi.org/10.22059/jor.2020.304540.2002>
- Birke, D., & Hauthal, J. (2024). The Poetics and Politics of We-Narration on the Contemporary British Stage. *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English*, 12(1), 58–77. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jcde-2024-2003>
- Broeckmeyer, M., & Van Goidsenhoven, L. (2024). Creating with 'voice without subject': An aesthetic reconceptualization of voice. *Qualitative Research*, 24(4), 832–850. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941231189976>
- Burzyński, T. (2020). Systemic intertextuality. A morphogenetic perspective. *Text Matters*, 10, 433–445. <https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-2931.10.24>
- Caldwell, R. (2007). Agency and change: Re-evaluating Foucault's Legacy. *Organization*, 14(6), 769–791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508407082262>
- Demeyer, H. (n.d.). *The Affective Dominant: Affective Crisis and Contemporary Fiction*.
- Glynos, J., Howarth, D., Flitcroft, R., Love, C., Roussos, K., & Vazquez, J. (2021). Logics, discourse theory and methods. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 20(1), 62–78. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.20048.gly>
- Kelly, M. G. E. (2019). DISCONTINUITY IN POSTSTRUCTURALIST EPISTEMOLOGY FOUCAULT CONTRA DELEUZE AND DERRIDA "Unwillingly willing science loves error"—Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil. In *The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* (Vol. 15, Issue 1). www.cosmosandhistory.org324
- Mazzei, L. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2017). Voice in the agentic assemblage. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49(11), 1090–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2016.1159176>
- Muhr, S. L., & Rehn, A. (2015). On gendered technologies and cyborg writing. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 22(2), 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12057>
- Nugroho, F., Hartwiningsih, H., & Handayani, I. G. A. K. R. (2025). Rethinking Subsidiary in Corruption Cases: Indonesian Experiences. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 5(2), 686–713. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v5i2.714>
- Parry, M. (n.d.). *CLIMATE CHANGE AND WORLD AGRICULTURE The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis United Nations Environment Programme*.
- Pennycook, A. (2024). After Words: There Is No Language without Materiality. *Signs and Society*, 12(1), 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.1086/728090>
- Phelan, J. (n.d.). *Theory and InTerpreTaTion of narraTive*.
- Phelan, J. (2025). Narration as Characterization in First-Person Realist Fiction: Complicating a Universally Acknowledged Truth. *Humanities (Switzerland)*, 14(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/h14070151>
- Pickering, L., & Kara, H. (2017). Presenting and representing others: towards an ethics of engagement. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(3), 299–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2017.1287875>
- Slemon, A. (2025). Absences and Silences in Critical Discourse Analysis: Methodological Reflections. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251321250>
- Sternberg, M. (2007). Omniscience in narrative construction: Old challenges and new. In *Poetics Today* (Vol. 28, Issue 4, pp. 683–794). <https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-2007-012>
- t0_8i_fortiermercier. (n.d.).
- Truman, S. E., McLean Davies, L., & Buzacott, L. (2022). Disrupting intertextual power networks: challenging literature in schools. *Discourse*, 43(6), 837–850. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2021.1910929>
- White, J. &, & Drew, S. (2011). Collecting Data or Creating Meaning? *Qualitative Research Journal*, 11(1), xx–xx. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ11010xx>
- Yardley, A. (2008). *Living Stories: The Role of the Researcher in the Narration of Life*. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/>
- Yeates, R. (2020). Serial fiction podcasting and participatory culture: Fan influence and representation in The Adventure Zone. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 23(2), 223–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549418786420>