論文

Critical Discourse Analysis in Japan: A Matter of Perspective

John Esposito
(Kwansei Gakuin University)

A proper place to begin a discussion of critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) is on the fissures of western intellectual history. On one side stand the intellectual heirs to a tradition whose guiding axiom is an unchanging and indivisible reality of which certain knowledge is possible. There are, in effect, two levels of existence. The one our senses perceive to be real is in constant flux, whereas the eternal nature underlying the phenomenal world can only be understood by way of the intellect. Knowledge, as a result, is seen to reside in the human mind. Such notions are made manifest in the mind-matter dualism at the core of the scientific method.

The predominant approach to empirical inquiry in the natural sciences is based on the assumption of a direct correspondence between sensual data and preexisting facts. The rational process, utilizing observation and analysis, is thus the means through which universal truths are realized. This process entails not only breaking down all complex phenomena into their constituent parts, but also treating these atomistic components as completely separate from the observer. The goals of dominance and control become the concomitants to ideals of prediction and efficiency, which purportedly allow for an impartial (i.e., objective) perspective on an essentially mechanistic world.

In contradistinction to the positivist tradition is the fundamental assertion of an ever-changing reality composed primarily of dynamic relationships. In this view, the world is fully integrated to the extent that it is impossible to separate the mind from matter. As life continually evolves so does human understanding of it. Knowledge is made possible only when sensory experience is channeled through the fundamental categories or mental frames of cognition. The mind, that is, plays an active role in organizing what is experienced. In consequence, nothing can exist independent from interpretation, which points toward the inherent limitations in observations and descriptions of natural phenomena.

The interpretive mode of inquiry thus strives for holistic understanding. Rather than seeking universal truths in the attributes of substances that comprise a static universe, the presumption is that comprehension is limited to the particular in context. We must therefore settle for reasonable approximations or epistemic gains in our ever-changing knowledge base. Interpretive inquiry as it has developed in the social sciences, in particular, fosters a participatory, diverse, and dialectical appreciation of the complex patterns of organic life. The focus in approaches such as phenomenology and hermeneutics is on description and interpretation. The theoretical precursors of CDA are also found on this 'qualitative' side of the epistemological divide in western thought.

1. Theoretical Influences of CDA

Critical discourse analysts draw upon an eclectic blend of influences, primarily the neo-Marxist critical theory of Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, the social philosophy of Michel Foucault and Jurgen Habermas, linguists from Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf to Mikhail Bakhtin and M.A.K. Halliday, and, most prominently, critical linguistics. Each will be explored in turn below. What should become apparent is that these disciplinary orientations are mostly in accord with the holistic presuppositions and interpretive methodology outlined above. Nonetheless, the guiding tenets of CDA are neither wholly evaluative nor descriptive but induce a systemic and comprehensive analytical framework whose ultimate goal is emancipation.

One theoretical line of development can be traced to the work of Karl Marx, who first made the connections between ideology and social conditions. For Marx, the source of ideology was the limited material mode of existence, which produced contradictory relations, and, as a consequence, distorted representations about them. These distortions, which Marx maintained elicited a false consciousness in society, functioned to promote the interests of the elite (Plamenatz, 1970). While Vladimir Lenin, the first Premier of the erstwhile Soviet Union, agreed with Marx on this point, he saw class conflict as extending to the ideological level (i.e., superstructural). In fact, Lenin argued that the ideological preceded and/or induced material relations. For Lenin, ideology functioned as a political instrument to legitimate the party and mobilize the masses (Larrain, 1979).

Antonio Gramsci was the first Marxist to insist on the role of consciousness in revolutionary struggle. For Gramsci (1971), ideology was a complete system of ideas, beliefs, and values that in one way or another supports the established order, thereby providing legitimacy to dominant institutions. Power is achieved through hegemony, which is the moral and intellectual coercion of society to the degree that it is considered normal. Larrain (1979) defines hegemony as an organizing principle that is diffused by agencies of ideological control and internalized by the broad masses. Ideology, however, can also be used by the oppressed in a counter-hegemonic way to reveal the false world of established appearances and create a new belief system to challenge the prevailing order. In this way, Gramsci (1971) construed ideology as something that can be explained, analyzed, and critiqued. He also felt that ideology is implicit in language—one of the guiding principles for critical theorists (see Fairclough, 1995).

Following Gramsci, Louis Althusser (1984) claimed that ideology was a social necessity and could only be understood in terms of its functions and practices. Ideology, according to Althusser, creates people as social subjects in their imaginary relationship to reality. Social reality thus becomes a kind of second nature, or a priori condition of thought, which is always present and given for each point of view. Although based on false appearances, ideology is necessary because it helps guarantee social cohesion. That is to say, it allows people to live their lives and function on an everyday basis (ibid.). What is important for CDA is Althusser's claim that even though ideology exists on the pre-conscious level, it can be explained due to its social consequences.

An occasional student of Althusser, Michel Foucault (1974) furthered the critical

social theorist position that the universal truths sought after in the empirical sciences were incommensurable with the contingent nature of human understanding. Because meanings and definitions shift over time, any statement exists in a discursive formation or network of rules and preconditions that establish what is meaningful. Moreover, prevailing conditions account for which social agents (e.g., government, media, schools) define and disseminate knowledge, thus becoming the symbolic capital of specific groups. Language use, then, is not merely communicative, but also functions as a sign of power and authority (see Bourdieu, 1991). Accordingly, analysis must begin with the social conditions that produce statements by focusing on historical contexts and the dynamic character of discursive formations (Foucault, 1974).

Within any discursive network, there are tensions between the linguistic practices of disparate social groups. These interacting forces produce what Foucault (1977) referred to as "power/knowledge," viewing the goals of both as inseparable. Power, in other words, is not institutional or structural but a relational process embodied in particular situations. It functions through the strategies and practices used in various discourses, particularly the modern human sciences, which seek to derive their authority by adopting the technical and instrumental rationality of the physical sciences. As the consequent 'objective' and 'neutral' values become normalized, power takes on an ideological function for it engenders an uncritical attitude toward (scientific) knowledge. Control over and management of the minute details of life is seen as an efficient means of furthering human progress, rather than, say, an oppressive means of reducing diversity while limiting choice (Foucault, 1985). Discourse analysis therefore necessitates an uncovering of the ideological assumptions through which social division and domination (i.e., manifestations of power) are sustained.

The Frankfurt School of Philosophy, established at the Institute of Social Research in 1923, sought to reassess and develop Marxist thought in regard to current events. Their examination of the social, cultural, and political institutions that foster oppression opened up many dimensions of modern life to analysis (see Kellner, 1989). The Frankfurt School's leading theorists insisted that critical analysis of contemporary society requires a historical sensibility to understand transformations over time (Morrow, 1994). Therefore, critical social theory ought to focus on how groups relate to dominant ideologies that are based in history. The goal is to provide people with the tools necessary to change oppressive institutions, which gain their legitimacy through the acceptance of a particular view of reality. Critical social theorists insist that there is never one true or objective interpretation of events but preferable explanations in certain cultural and historical contexts (Held, 1980). Such ideas resonate with CDA's intent to uncover the diachronic dimensions of discourse in particular social settings (Wodak, 2001b).

The second major branch of critical theory centers on the work of Jurgen Habermas, whose eclectic approach to social science shares many of the same concerns with the Frankfurt School. According to Habermas (1971), descriptive and explanatory accounts of the historical and contextual aspects of symbolic communication are insufficient to grasp the power relations embedded in discursive structures. This is the case because language not only reveals but also conceals the conditions of social life (cf. Bourdieu, 1991). There

are ideal forms of discourse, however, in which consensus is achieved through the rational exchange of ideas rather than the coercive use of force. The former constitute the criterion upon which the truth or falsity of a statement rests. Utilizing this ideal form as a normative standard, critical theorists can examine situations where distortions in communication maintain systemic inequalities. The analysis, therefore, is not arbitrary but grounded in the structure of language expressed through specific cultural institutions (Habermas, 1984). And just as in CDA, the emancipatory aim of critical analysis is to transcend systems of distorted communication (i.e., ideology) by bringing what was previously unconscious to the level of awareness.

The linguistic strand of CDA begins with Edward Sapir (1929), who argued that the study of language must respect the fact that it is a social and cultural phenomenon, and, as a result, linguists cannot blindly replicate the methods and concepts of the natural sciences. Instead, linguistic forms and regularities should be the basis for an analysis of society. This was possible, according to Sapir, due to the innate connections between language and culture, and their influence on perception and thought. Through comparative studies of Western European and Native American languages, Sapir's student, Benjamin Lee Whorf (1941), sought to test his mentor's theories. In doing so, Whorf noted the myriad connections between cultural norms and linguistic patterns, particularly those regarding concepts of time and space. Whorf (1956) found that language is not a neutral conduit through which autonomous individuals transmit ideas, but is laden with the historical and existential residue of its users.

The work of Russian linguist Mikhail Bakhtin also represents an important theoretical foundation of CDA. By focusing on their historical dimension, Bakhtin (1981) observed how all texts are in a process of becoming. As such, there is a continual struggle for meaning that occurs as texts draw upon and transform other texts in a complex causal chain. The semantic mixing or hybridization that results is indicative of the heterogeneous nature of texts subject to competing voices. This internal dialogue thus concerns the ideological, or non-neutral, aspect of language use. Ideological perspectives are further evident through the intermingling of various genres (Bakhtin, 1986), which become apparent when texts are construed as sites of social and cultural change.

The sociocultural theory that seeks to examine grammatical structures and how they are used in actual communication is the systemic functional linguistics associated with M.A.K. Halliday. In addition to its influence on CDA, functional linguistics provides the theoretical support for critical linguistics (to be discussed below). Halliday (1978) begins by contrasting his 'environmentalist' or systemic approach to language development with the so-called nativist tradition. In the latter, a sharp distinction is made between the ideal (competence) and the real (performance). Halliday (1973) argues, however, that language has various functions, such as interpreting experience or expressing logical relations, which determine linguistic forms. In effect, knowledge of a language presupposes how to use it. By focusing on how individuals use language to establish, develop, and maintain various relationships, language and society are placed in a conceptual whole that is examined within a cultural context (Halliday, 1978).

Functional linguistic assumptions regarding the inseparability of form and content, for instance, provide the theoretical foundation of both critical linguistics and CDA (Fowler, 1996). Much in the manner that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis accounts for the links between culture, language, and thought, critical linguists focus on how social practices produce discourse that is laden with ideology. Analysis thus entails subjecting texts to critical inquiry and interpretation to uncover the social meanings embedded therein. Textual analysis is primarily concerned with linguistic features (e.g., transitivity and modality), which are believed to signify deeper ideological perspectives (see Fowler & Kress, 1979; Kress & Hodge, 1979; Toolan, 1988).

Critical linguists' primary aim is to make transparent the distortions or misrepresentations of reality, particularly those in public discourse. The ideological effects cannot simply be read from a text because they first depend upon relevant economic and historical contexts (Fowler, 1996). In this way, social beliefs and values become the object of criticism insofar as they contribute to injustice and oppression. Due to its structuralist pedigree, however, critical linguists tend to privilege the text as a rule-governed system over the complexities associated with actual daily use; consequently, contextual propositions are often not made explicit (Richardson, 1987). According to Fairclough (1992), moreover, the focus on social reproduction neglects discourse as a domain in which social struggles take place. This combination of text analysis with a social theory of language is nevertheless in accord with the fundamental principles of CDA (Wodak, 2001a).

2. Guiding Values and Assumptions of CDA

Based on the foregoing review of its theoretical precursors, the following principles of CDA can be delineated. CDA is concerned firstly with ideology, which is construed as an entire system of ideas, beliefs, and values (see van Dijk, 1998). By providing a limited or restricted view of the world, ideology helps conceal social contradictions that promote the interests of those in power. This often occurs through ideology's hegemonic tendencies, that is, when a particular belief system is internalized by the broad masses, thereby providing legitimacy to dominant institutions. Ideology thus becomes naturalized to the extent that other interpretations of events are excluded from the realm of what is considered to be common sense. Intellectuals, institutions, like schools and the mass media, as well as industries, such as advertising and film, are responsible for elaborating and spreading ideologies. Although it operates covertly, ideology can be studied because it is manifest in linguistic forms.

That all linguistic practices are essentially ideological is a fundamental tenet for critical discourse theorists. As instruments in social inequality and the concealment of truth, linguistic structures regulate the ideas and behaviors of others, classify and rank people, events, and objects, while asserting institutional or personal status (Fowler et al., 1979). Fairclough (1992) explains how certain uses of language can be ideological by serving to establish or sustain relations of domination (e.g., the human exploitation of nature). Ideologies are most effective when they become naturalized and achieve the status of common sense apparently because direct presentation of an ideology is coercive and more likely to

be resisted (Kress & Hodge, 1979). In other words, ideologies often act unconsciously at a level beneath critical awareness. It is therefore necessary to analyze not only texts, but also how texts are interpreted and the effects they have.

Discourse refers to language use as a form of social practice, rather than an individual activity (cf. Pennycook, 1994). Due to the semiotic nature of social practice, discourse is understood as the interrelated aspects of signification in a communicative event (van Dijk, 2001). One implication of this is that there is a dialectical relationship between discourse and social structure. Discourse not only is shaped and constrained by social conventions, values, and norms, but is also socially constitutive (Fairclough, 1992). Bakhtin (1981) saw texts as sites for the negotiation of meanings, which result from a range of other texts and contexts. In this way, texts are dialogical as they draw upon and transform each other. Analysis of texts, then, is a method of understanding the ways in which all sorts of realties are constructed through language. In short, discourse is defined both as social action and interaction, and as a social construction of reality (Fairclough, 1995).

Another guiding assumption of CDA is that all discourse is embedded in a particular culture and ideology (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Language is understood as the means whereby society forms and permeates the individual's consciousness. In effect, language helps determine which perceptions are potentially social ones (Bourdieu, 1991). According to Whorf (1956), language embodies specific views or theories of reality, so that speakers of different languages cut up the world in different ways. Within the same language, as well, a similar phenomenon occurs predicated upon specialized systems of ideas, or varying ideologies. Language can thus be thought of as ideological to the extent that it is the partial and distorted consciousness of a society (Kress & Hodge, 1979).

The aim of critical analysis is to uncover the ideological presuppositions in various discourses in order to account for the historical conditions of language use (Wodak, 2001b). Analysis must also account for the cultural context of social institutions and their effects (Halliday, 1978). Linguistic forms, then, become the basis of social and cultural analysis (see Hodge, 1979). Because there is a continual power struggle over language use, and, in particular, the meaning of texts as they evolve over time, analysis leads to an awareness of social oppression and injustice. According to van Dijk (1990), employing CDA entails that one's political position is made explicit, including one's assumptions and biases. Moreover, the choice of texts should not be arbitrary (Birch, 1989). CDA intervenes on the side of dominated and oppressed groups, and it openly declares the emancipatory interests that motivate it. Critical discourse analysts, in fact, tend to be involved with issues such as racism, classicism, and sexism in their quest toward the elimination of injustice.

The question remains, though, if CDA is actually a theory, a methodology, or both (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Meyer, 2001; Rogers, 2004). Toolan (2002) writes that CDA is an approach with a shared perspective, which focuses on creating an awareness of the relations between language, ideology, society, and power. Such an approach seems to constitute an epistemic advance insofar as it 'moves toward' a synthesis of theory, practice, and ethically informed advocacy. Given that it does not seek an objective, value-free understanding of socio-linguistic phenomena, CDA, like the critical theory it is based

on, is accused of being overly ambitious, lacking academic rigor, or being politically biased (Hammersley, 1997; Stubbs, 1997; Widdowson, 1995). On the other hand, it is seen as being too scientific, in a modern sense, because CDA aspires to use reason as a basis for explaining and transforming life (cf. Gouveia, 2003; Morrow, 1994). In the end, CDA occupies a transdisciplinary space somewhere between the two competing paradigms outlined at the beginning (Weiss & Wodak, 2003). It is from within this highly contested region that one assumes a critical view of the world.

3. A Critical Perspective

Linking together the various aims, attitudes, and assumptions of CDA is the multifaceted notion of what it means to be critical. A critical perspective first presumes an apprehension of how ideology constitutes a false world of appearances. The goal is to pull back the 'ideological curtain' to expose the contradictory nature of society. Because ideology is manifest in linguistic forms and social consequences, analysis requires both a micro and macro component. At the text (i.e., micro) level, relations between form and function, and between use and interpretation are the focus. The latter is particularly crucial due to the polysemic nature of discursive practices. Connecting changes in language use to social conditions broadens the perspective. The macro analysis thus attempts to uncover both the cultural and historical contexts that produce the shared forms of knowledge that are characteristic of social institutions. Revealing the ideological assumptions that help sustain domination and division within society is the next step toward the ultimate goal of transcending oppressive systems of distorted communication. The research is incomplete, however, unless it holds up the critical mirror to the analyst's own work in order to reflect on both its academic adequacy and social utility. In sum, contextualization, integration, and application are the three defining and overlapping features of the word critical.

Actually, there is a kind of unfolding happening here, with each facet embedded in the other. Context is the largest conceptual envelope as it forms the foundation of critical thought. At the micro-linguistic level, features, such as transitivity and modality, ultimately concern how form and function produce meaning. Because words obtain meaning only within particular discursive contexts, analysis must attend to their potential references. Interpretation, then, is the process of recovering the social meanings expressed in discourse by analyzing linguistic structures in light of their interactional and wider social contexts. Enfolded in this interpretive process are the intertextual relations, or various properties texts have of being other texts. Thus, contextualization leads to an awareness of integration at both the word and textual level. By taking full account of the research context, the methodology links analysis to research aims. Further integration of the analyst obtains when the research itself is subject to critique. Again, enfolded in the reflexive process is the ethical imperative to act on one's findings. As the context is broadened to account for integration on multiple levels, application not only becomes a necessary corollary to analysis but a sufficient criterion to adduce its validity. The upshot is that these three facets of critical cannot be conceptually separated without completely altering its meaning.

This complex rendering of 'critical' sets CDA apart from not only other forms of

discourse analysis, but also various notions of critical thinking. While discourse analysis covers a broad range of approaches, it does share many of the same guiding principles with CDA (Gee et al., 1992). The more traditional disciplines that preceded CDA, however, treat the text solely as a source of data to be studied for its own sake rather than a source of critical inquiry (Fairclough, 1992). Moreover, they tend to limit the context of their explanations to the mental representations of speakers and listeners or particular linguistic devices such as those used for referencing (e.g., Dooley & Levinsohn, 2001). Their analyses, as a result, do not address the ideological effects of discourse, which require reference to the social, historical, and cultural forces outside of the immediate situation (Fairclough, 1995). It is these very influences on discourse, the relations between them, and their implications for how knowledge and power is distributed in society that is the critical focus of CDA (Gee, 2004).

Although they have some of the same analytical concerns, such as challenging basic assumptions and exploring the implications of arguments, there are significant differences between CDA and critical thinking, which reflect the fissures of western intellectual history discussed earlier. For one, textual analysis proceeds from dividing thinking into its basic elements, which can then be evaluated according to intellectual standards, such as plausibility and specificity (Paul & Elder, 2001). The goal is to judge how well the elements fit together as if solving a logical jigsaw puzzle (Baker et al., 1993). In fact, analysis ends with evaluation, unlike in CDA, where evaluation is part of the larger interpretive process. In addition, context is narrowly defined to the author or speaker's point of view, which can likewise be separated into its constituent parts (e.g., Weil, 2000). There is, as a result, no concern with the social consequences of thinking, nor is there any recognition of its political and ethical dimensions. In contrast to CDA, being critical is not only reduced to a set of discrete skills or abilities (see Paul & Elder, 2001), but also fails to include the analyst's views in the context (Kincheloe, 2000). A systemic account of how discourse is influenced by social and cultural practices, which, in turn, reproduce power relations, is simply not within its narrow linear scope.

Therein lies a great part of the controversy over CDA because it attempts to adopt a word with a long pedigree whose etymology is clearly at odds with its preferred meaning (cf. Billig, 2003). According to Wodak (2001a), being critical assumes a separation from that which is studied. This, of course, is consonant with the inclination to judge or discern– two synonyms of the word critical. In fact, the 'criteria' upon which the judgment is made shares the same Greek root with the word critical, both of which presume an epistemological link between the act of deciding and attaining analytical distance. Such a denotation would also seem to support the evaluative component of CDA wherein researchers seek to diagnose a particular problem (see Fairclough, 2001). However, in order to achieve its normative goals of bettering society, the analysis must take into account the entire context of discursive phenomena, which, of course, includes the researcher as well. By acknowledging the human observer and integrating his/her values and assumptions in the interpretation, CDA, unlike other forms of modern linguistics, recognizes that the properties of a discursive event can never be known objectively. Rather, they can only be realized through the interplay of

analyst, text, and audience. Discourse analysts, in effect, are part of the critical environment they seek to understand, and cannot extricate themselves from it; otherwise, the self-reflexive aspects of their work, for instance, would not be possible.[1]

4. The View from Japan

Over the past two decades, CDA has been met with varying degrees of academic receptiveness. Notwithstanding some strong reservations raised against its unorthodox marriage of analysis and activism, it seems to be gaining an ever-expanding group of devoted practitioners most of whom are concentrated in Western Europe. The spread of CDA has been somewhat reserved elsewhere, most notably in the United States and Canada, where it has yet to gain much prominence. The same can be said for most of Asia, particularly non-English speaking countries like Japan. Given its categorical approach to controversial issues, the cultural barriers to translating CDA into the Japanese pedagogical context are undoubtedly manifold, yet all the more necessary to overcome in an era saturated with information of both global and local consequence.

The first such obstacle is certainly one of language. As a concept, the word critical in Japanese denotes many of the same referents as are commonly found in English. There are, in fact, four words for critical and/or criticism in Japanese that correspond to their English equivalents. The first, *hihyooteki-na* (批評的な), is mostly concerned with a balanced commentary or review of art, books, or film. Its use presumes a certain amount of acumen or discernment on the part of the critic. *Hihanteki-na* (批判的な) is similar to *hihyooteki-na* in that they both tend to be negative but is reserved for passing judgment on political matters and the like. Its use denotes a sharper edge than *hihyooteki-na* as the language tends to be more caustic and scathing. Another synonym is *hyooron* (評論) whose critique is argumentative or theoretical as the second Chinese character of this compound suggests. The criticism is not as severe as *hihanteki-na* and differs only slightly from *hihyooteki-na* in that the focus is primarily academic as it relates to books and essays. The final correlate is *hinan* (非難), which is reserved for the most adverse or emotional situations. It can be used, for instance, when attacking in a censorious or denunciatory manner a political faux pas, or when showering blame on, accusing, or condemning an adversary. In sum, the four denotations of critical/criticism in Japanese are synonymous with their commonly applied usages in English concerning either unfavorable or disapproving judgments (*hihanteki-na, hinan*) or careful evaluation and commentary (*hihyooteki-na, hyooron*).

In addition to language, the epistemological and rhetorical controversies that have shaped western philosophy as well as the theoretical advances that underlie CDA have had marginal influence on Japanese intellectual history. A related problem is the complex connotations attached to the word critical as indicated above. In response to this situation, some attempts have been made to transliterate it into katakana, the Japanese phonetic syllabary reserved for foreign loan words. However, the term critical rendered as such is virtually meaningless because the katakana symbols lack the pictorial associations and historical residues of words transcribed using Chinese characters. Another way to convey this rarefied sense of critical might be to introduce a neologism, but the same problems that

confront its katakana rendering will persist if and until the new word is adopted.[2]

5. With an Eye on The News

For those educators intent on instilling a *critical* perspective in Japan, the following approach has been developed for university level students. The focus on newspapers is part of a semester-long seminar on CDA, which includes analysis of other media, such as advertisements and film. The importance of newspaper analysis in Japan cannot be overstated, where distribution rates are among the highest in the world; indeed, six of Japan's newspapers rank in the top eight in global circulation. Newspapers are thus introduced by covering questions concerning readership levels, individual patterns of news consumption, and, most importantly, the ideological spectrum found in Japan's leading dailies.

Students are then provided with a handout that presents the language for discussing the parts of a newspaper (see Appendix A). This is followed by a critical analysis of a newspaper article by the instructor. Depending on the level of the students, the article can be assigned for homework or read in class. Selection criteria should take into account cultural and social factors as well as stories of current interest. The ensuing illustration is designed to familiarize students with some of the ways in which CDA can be applied.

The article under discussion appeared in *The Japan Times* on Princess Nori's wedding day (see Appendix B). The title of the article frames the story as an age issue, although it is not clear if this is an individual matter, "time of her own choosing," or merely a prominent example of someone conforming to societal expectations. The lead sentence adds further confusion by stating that age 36 is the normal age for Japanese women to get married, when, in fact, the average age is 27.8 years according to government statistics cited in the article. In order to justify Princess Nori's decision, the third paragraph indicates that "many other Tokyo women" approve. However, only one office worker, Tamie Nakayama, is quoted throughout the article. An associate professor, Yoko Morita, tries to clarify the links between working women and their unwillingness to get married at an early age. The dichotomous picture she presents is one where women must choose between children and a career. Despite her insistence that these are the only "two options," several others readily come to mind, such as working at home or marrying and not having kids. The government position, which is ambiguous at best, is provided to strengthen the argument that women are the main cause of the declining population. Consequently, Japanese women's reluctance to marry is depicted as a threat to both traditional cultural norms and future economic prosperity.

The extended quotes from Nakayama and professor Morita seek to highlight the gender inequality that is at the heart of this issue. However, through its framing, bias, and limitations, the article leaves the reader with the narrow view that the trend of marrying later is the primary cause of the falling birthrate—an issue that apparently pertains only to women. Although a wide range of voices is presented in the article, including a spokeswoman for the Imperial Household Agency and Princess Nori herself, they are all female. Even the writer of the article is a woman. As a result, the article is biased against women insofar as it reinforces the idea that this is solely a women's problem. At the same time, the article does men a disservice because it lacks a single male viewpoint on the subject, even though we are

informed that Japan is a "male-dominated society." Why are *men* choosing to get married later? How do long working hours affect *their* ability to help with housework and child rearing? What alternative policies would *they* like to see implemented to make it easier for both sexes to raise a family? These are just a few of the questions that the article might have addressed were it to provide a less distorted account of this issue.

To further demonstrate how ideology operates in this article, the broader social and global contexts must also be considered. As regards the former, the parameters within which women like Princess Nori make such choices are not explored. Marriage and work appear as mutually exclusive only in a society that lacks the necessary moral support and financial assistance. In other words, it is a matter of social values, not simply individuals exercising their autonomy. Furthermore, the article assumes that the falling birthrate is a major problem. Note the emotive words "struggling" and "crisis" used to describe its consequences. An alternative view, however, suggests that less people over the long term should be welcomed in an overcrowded country like Japan. Moreover, from a global perspective, the human population is currently approaching the carrying capacity of the planet. All ecological indicators make clear that fewer people, particularly in high consumption countries, would be a boon to the earth's life-supporting systems. The list of questions on the second part of the handout is intended to facilitate this type of critical inquiry (see Appendix A).

In order to provide additional opportunities to observe researchers applying CDA, students are also required to review and discuss academic articles taken from periodicals, such as *Discourse & Society* or *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. A great deal of simplification and explanation of the articles is necessary for all but the most advanced. For students at lower proficiency levels, for instance, instructors can prepare article summaries and/ or have students read excerpts, particularly those that focus on the analysis. The approaches used by the analysts in these articles are to serve as models for the students to emulate when they undertake their own research projects. Students' initial efforts in this regard should not be of a complex nature; rather, the assignments are meant to provide them with the chance to apply some of the critical skills that they begin to learn. Students are thus directed to choose a single newspaper article to analyze in the space of two to three pages. In line with the need to be reflexive, the research process is discussed with others in class at various stages, and findings are presented and edited before final drafts are produced. This entire approach to newspaper analysis from demonstration and discussion to presentation and publication covers a quarter of the semester (about four to five weeks). In the end, such a multifaceted methodology often engenders the type of critical awareness that has become the defining feature of the CDA perspective.

Notes

1 The use of the word critical in CDA is a misnomer as attested by various attempts to qualify (e.g., Gee, 2004; Kincheloe, 2000) or quantify (e.g., Billig, 2003; Hammersley, 1997) it. Given its clear distinctiveness from common referents for the term and its historical associations with western rhetorical practices, a new word appears to be in order. One suggestion is 'inter-critical', which would mirror the concerns with intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and interdisciplinarity. Adding the prefix 'inter', though, does not seem to fully account for the various levels of the term's complexity.

Moreover, this would entail changing the acronym, which is beginning to gain recognition internationally. The same would be true, then, for 'holistic' or 'systemic' discourse analysis. Therefore, the best route might be to retain the acronym and change the referent from critical to contextual. The latter term is not laden with incommensurable historical connotations, nor is it attached to many other (non) academic disciplines, which is beginning to dilute its significance. 'Contextual discourse analysis' works on the various levels of intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and interdisciplinarity, as well as the interactivity that is requisite for self-reflexive practice.

2 This researcher suggests a new word, '*shinkeihyoo*' (深系評), comprised of three Chinese characters, the first of which means deep, the second referring to a system, and the third denoting commentary. A breakdown of the components of these characters and the rationale behind their utilization in this neologism are as follows. The first character *shin* (深) can be read as the representation of a river whose water is as deep as a hole that is the length of a tree. This character is part of a compound, *shinsoo* (深層), which denotes in depth as in an interview or the deep structure of thought. Moreover, it forms adjectives, such as *shinen-na* (深遠な) signaling depth and profundity, and *shinkoku-na* (深刻な) meaning serious or acute. Furthermore, the metaphor of a river whose waters branch out deep below the surface mirrors the diverse approaches of CDA attempting to ferret out or reveal the hidden nature of ideological practices. The second character *kei* (系) is pictorially a thread hanging down from something. Its denotations include origin, descent, and lineage. Its most prominent compound, *taikei* (体系), means system or theory. It is also part of the word for genealogy, *keifu* (系譜), which can refer to plants, animals, and languages. Interestingly, the tree (木) from the first character *shin* (深) reappears in the translation of the expression *kakeizu* (家系図), literally, 'family-system-map', or 'family tree'. The main reason for its inclusion is the need in CDA to make contextual links at various levels of analysis. The final character *hyoo* (評) is part of *hyooron* (評論) and *hihyooteki-na* (批評的な), two terms commonly used for critical or criticism. It is comprised of the symbol for 'words', which are depicted as even or level in the same way that a plant, whose roots extend below the surface, rests on a body of water. As a verb, *hyoo suru* (評する), it means to comment on or describe. It collocates with the character *ka* (価) to express evaluation or assessment as in *hyooka* (評価). This character is thus meant to account for the interactive aspects of being critical, for the researcher must return from the deep, systemic analysis to observe his or her own reflection in the metaphorical waters of critique, which, like the plant, is embedded in the interpretive process.

References

Althusser, L. (1984). *Essays on ideology*. London: Verso.

Baker, P. J., Anderson, L. E., & Dorn, D. S. (1993). *Social problems: A critical thinking approach* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Billig, M. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35 46). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Birch, D. (1989). *Language, literature and critical practice: Ways of analyzing text*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis.*

Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dooley, R. A., & Levinsohn, S. H. (2001). *Analyzing discourse: A manual of basic concepts*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow, England:

Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak. R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1974). *The archeology of knowledge.* (A. M. Sheridan-Smith, Trans.). London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality.* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 3-14). London: Routledge.

Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). Preface. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 1-4). London: Routledge.

Fowler, R., & Kress, G. (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 185-213). London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2004). Discourse analysis: What makes it critical? In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 19-50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. P., Michaels, S., & O'Connor, M. C. (1992). Discourse analysis. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 227-291). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Gouveia, C. A. M. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the development of the new science. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 47-62). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests.* (J. J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action (Vol. 1): Reason and the rationalization of society.* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Hammersley, M. (1997). On the foundations of critical discourse analysis. *Language and Communication, 17* (3), 237-248.

Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to critical theory: Horkeimer to Habermas.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hodge, B. (1979). Newspapers and communities. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 157-174). London: Routledge.

Kellner, D. (1989). *Critical theory, Marxism, and modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2000). Making critical thinking critical. In D. Weil & H. K. Anderson (Eds.), *Perspectives in critical thinking: Essays by teachers in theory and practice* (pp. 23-40). New York: Peter Lang.

Kress, G., & Hodge, B. (1979). *Language as ideology.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Larrain, J. (1979). *The concept of ideology.* Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14-31). London: Sage.

Morrow, R. A. (1994). Critical theory and methodology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2001). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your learning and your life.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics, 15* (2), 115-138.

Plamenatz, J. P. (1970). I*deology*. New York: Praeger.

Richardson, K. (1987). Critical linguistics and textual diagnosis. *Text, 7* (2), 145-163.

Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 1-18). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sapir, E. (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. *Language, 5*, 207-214.

Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan & A. Wray (Eds.), *Evolving models of language* (pp. 100-116). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Toolan, M. (1988). *Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction.* London: Routledge.

Toolan, M. (1997). What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such terrible things about it? *Language and Literature, 6* (2), 83-103.

Toolan, M. (2002). General introduction. In M. Toolan (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. xxi-xxvi). London: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Structures of news in the press. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.),*Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analyses of mass media discourse and communication* (pp. 69-93). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

van Dijk, T. A. (1990). Discourse & Society: A new journal for a new research focus. *Discourse & Society, 1* (1), 5-16.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach.* London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.

Weil, D. (2000). Learning to reason dialectically: Teaching primary students to reason with different points of view. In D. Weil & H. K. Anderson (Eds.), *Perspectives in critical thinking: Essays by teachers in theory and practice* (pp. 1-22). New York: Peter Lang.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1-32). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Whorf, B. L. (1941). The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language. In L. Sapir (Ed.), *Language, culture and personality: Essays in memory of Edward Sapir* (pp. 75-93). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 4* (3), 157-172.

Wodak, R. (2001a). What CDA is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001b). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). London: Sage.

Appendix A
Critical Discourse Analysis of Newspapers

News Categories of Analysis*

- Headline–printed on top of page in large, bold type
- Lead–marked by bold type; optional category
- Verbal Reactions–includes background and quotations
- Main Event–the central news event
- Previous Events–all those events that preceded the main event
- Consequences–all those events that are described as being caused by the main event

- Comment – appears at the end; contains conclusions or expectations
- Background–includes history (events in past related to present event) and context (which helps to organize information about news situation)

Questions for the Critical Analysis of Newspaper Articles

- Use of language: Through its choice of words or images, how does the article present the topic?
- Assumptions: What does the writer assume the reader already knows?
- Narrative framework: If this article were told as a story, who are the villains, who are the victims, and who are the heroes?
- Representation: Whose perspectives are emphasized and whose are omitted?
- Voices of authority: Who are the people quoted or cited in the article? Are they identified?
- Sources of information: What evidence is given for the article' s major claims?
- Bias: In what ways is the article biased? How does it limit thinking on this issue?
- Stereotypes: Is any language used that is prejudiced toward an individual or group?
- Limitations: What questions does the article raise that it does not address?
- Fact vs. Opinion: Does the writer distinguish between fact and opinion?

*Adopted from van Dijk, 1985.

Appendix B

TIME OF HER OWN CHOOSING

At 36, Princess Nori follows trend of marrying later

By KYOKO HASEGAWA

AFP-Jiji

Princess Nori, the Emperor's only daughter, marries Tuesday at 36, an age once considered impossibly late but now the norm in a country struggling with a falling birthrate.

The princess, a part-time bird researcher, is the first woman in the modern history of the world's oldest royal line to marry in her 30s, reflecting changes in Japanese women's lifestyles.

Her wait to get married, coming after she had publicly insisted she would wed at a time of her own choosing, brings nods of agreement from many other Tokyo women who must juggle careers and family choices in a male-dominated society.

"It is understandable that she is getting married at this age," said Tamie Nakayama, a 31-year-old office worker who said she feels no pressure to settle down soon.

"There is no point in prioritizing marriage in one's younger days. As an individual with autonomy, there must be a lot more in Princess Nori's life than getting married, such as her research," Nakayama said.

There is a stark generation gap in Japanese views on when to marry.

Shigeko–also known as Princess Teru–the oldest daughter of the late Emperor Showa, married in 1943 at age 17, after which she lost her royal status. Showa's third daughter married at 20 and his fourth and fifth daughters at 21. His second daughter died in childhood. Showa was Princess Nori' s grandfather.

The average Japanese woman in 2004 married at age 27.8, up from 24.5 in 1964. For men, the average went up from 27.2 in 1964 to 29.6 last year, according to Health, Labor and Welfare Ministry estimates.

Yoko Morita, an associate professor of labor economics at Nagoya City University, said the trend to marry late is in part due to the growing number of working women, many of whom have earned a degree.

"There is little pressure for women who have their own incomes to get married in a hurry and rely on their husbands' income," Morita said.

"In addition, it is natural for working women to hesitate about marriage under the current social

structure," she said. "They have to choose from two options: raising children and giving up a career, or keeping the career without a family, given the shortage of child nursing services and a corporate culture of long working hours."

The princess herself will have to make big changes to marry. She will lose her royal status when she weds Yoshiki Kuroda, a 40-year-old employee of the Tokyo Metropolitan Government, becoming Mrs. Kuroda.

The government is studying changes to let women ascend the Chrysanthemum Throne and is looking for ways to make raising children easier.

Under current government projections, Japan's population will begin to decline next year, potentially posing a crisis for the world's second-largest economy.

Nakayama, who works for the Tokyo office of a U.S.-based company, said there is "subtle discrimination" devaluing the contributions of women in the workplace and relegating them to the role of homemaker.

Japanese women "have to work two or three times the amount men work in order to gain positive recognition in a workplace," she said.

"As a result, a working woman has no time to become acquainted with possible partners. And if she marries, it is highly likely that she has to give up her career" to do housework and raise children.

"As for me, I would like to get married by my mid-30s, because of the physical limits on giving birth," she said, adding that staying single for life poses no major problems, even for royal family members.

An Imperial Household Agency spokeswoman said there are no royal nuptial age rules. "The timing of Princess Nori's marriage only reflects the current social background, which is significantly different from the days of Emperor Showa's daughters," said the spokeswoman, who declined to be named but said she is single.

In an annual news conference marking her birthday in April 2004, Princess Nori, then turning 35 and unengaged, said: "Everyone's situation is different and most of the people live bearing the responsibility of the path that they chose."

The Japan Times: Tuesday November 15, 2005