

# メディア研究におけるテキスト分析の新たな視点

野村 史織

## New Perspectives for Textual Analysis in Media Studies

NOMURA Shiori

メディアテキストの解釈については、テキストやテキストが記される場（文書）の質・文脈・制限についてだけでなく、テキストが生産・解釈・消費されていく過程など、多面的な要素が複合的に分析されるべきだといわれてきた。そこで、本稿は、「言説」に関する最近の新たな理論を論じ、メディア研究のテキスト分析へ新たな視点を提示することを目的とした。まず、本稿は、メディア研究の伝統的な手法である量的内容分析の利点と客観性などの問題点を提示し、多くのメディア研究が質的内容分析の手法を取り入れるようになった経緯を示した。次に、テキスト分析に関するこうした質的研究のアプローチや理論が、「言説」という概念に依拠していることを明示した。もともと言語学で生まれた「言説」という概念は、社会・政治・経済・文化的文脈において様々なテキストが生産・解釈されることを含め、発話と認識の多様で変動的な社会实践と意味を指している。この「言説」理論に関して、メディア研究に多くの影響を与えたフーコーの言説と権力・社会の議論、グラムシの文化ヘゲモニーの理論に焦点を当て、言説が政治的性質を有していること、そして、変動し多様な社会背景・権力関係と絡み合って、言説が形成・表象・解釈されること、また言説的实践を通じて、社会的文脈や権力関係が構築されたり、当然のものとして社会で「自然化」されたり、変化させられたりする過程への視座を提示した。最後に、こうした視点を取り入れたメディア研究のテキスト・言説分析の例として、批判的言説分析を紹介し、多様なメディアテキストを分析するための新たな視点を論じた。

## 1. Introduction

The interpretation of media texts is dependent above all else upon a detailed analysis of documentary evidence. However, issues arise because documents are/were produced in particular ways in socio-political and cultural contexts (Punch 2005 (1998):226, Said 1983:4) and because their texts are selected and interpreted from contemporary theoretical perspectives of various factors such as gender, race and nation by the researcher. Thus, it has been said that the process of producing, representing and interpreting texts must be discussed while the quality, contexts and limitations of documents are defined.

John Scott suggests four points in assessing the quality of the document and analysing it: 1) Authenticity; 2) Credibility; 3) Representativeness; and 4) Meaning. For the first point the documentary evidence should be assessed for its “*soundness* and *authorship*” (Scott September 1990:8). For credibility the socio-political context of producing the documentary evidence should be investigated. For the third point, its typicality or untypicality should be evaluated and also the “survival” and “availability” of the document taken into account (Scott 1990:24). Finally, researchers have to assess whether the evidence is understandable enough for researchers to interpret a feasible meaning (Scott 1990:6, Scott September 1990: 7-8). In respect of interpreting the meaning of the text, however, Scott discusses only the influence of researcher’s subjectivity and his/ her ‘ultimate judgment’ in this process (Scott 1990:30).

Recently, more researches in media studies rely extensively upon qualitative research methods and theories in order to analyze the production and interpretation of texts. With qualitative approaches and theories of textual analysis, these studies try to scrutinize which ‘discourses’ are constructed and positioned through the media and how this was done in particular media and social context. Thus, in this article, I discuss some key theoretical points for analyzing texts in the media. First, I will assess a traditional method of analyzing texts in media studies, that is, quantitative content analysis. Next, I will discuss the recent theories of texts and discourses. Finally, I want to show the possibilities of recent qualitative methods in analyzing media texts.

## 2. Quantitative content analysis

### *Quantitative content analysis*

Quantitative content analysis is a traditional method of analyzing texts in media studies. It investigates “how media contents reflect or interpret social, cultural and political norms, attitudes, beliefs and values” (Van den Bulck 2002:79) by measuring and quantifying these socio-cultural, economic or political factors and their influence. The most important cha-

racteristic of this method is that it “[relies] on the scientific method (including attention to objectivity-intersubjectivity, a priori design, reliability, validity, generalizability, replicability and hypothesis testing)” (Neuendorf 2002:10), so the approach is defined as the systematic, objective, quantitative analysis of message characteristics” (Neuendorf 2002: 1). Therefore, the findings and the conclusion in this analysis can claim to be derived from “systematically analyzing frequencies of media or other content” (Konczal 2000:323).

Ferguson uses quantitative content analysis ‘to produce a quantitative base for qualitative analysis’ (Ferguson 1983:212). As it is done by Ferguson, this analytical method can be used to take an overview of all the relevant materials in the examined media. Because a quantitative content analysis can summarize texts and outline broad tendencies, this method should help a researcher to understand the key issues emerging from texts in the media (Neuendorf 2002:15). In particular, it is useful for finding recurrent themes. Moreover, quantitative content analysis contributes to revealing the background of producers of its texts by counting the number of people according to certain categories, such as the married, the unmarried, the levels of educational, occupation and places of residence.

### *Questions of objectivity*

However, when a researcher tries to categorize themes related to a research topic (for example, women) by using quantitative content analysis, the researcher came across a major difficulty. First, the quantitative content analysis triggers questions about their claim of objectivity. Indeed, the quantitative method has recently been heavily criticised, especially by researchers who take a qualitative research approach. Their criticism questions the objectivity which is claimed in quantitative content analysis. Of course, Neuendorf mentions that “true objectivity” cannot exist because “‘knowledge’ and ‘facts’ are what are socially agreed on”. Therefore, although objectivity in any scientific research is an ideal, scholars accept “intersubjectivity” in order to identify particular facts an ideal, the knowledge is distilled from generalized findings in the analysis by asking “do we agree it is true?” (Neuendorf 2002:11 - 15).

But this approach underestimates the researcher’s involvement in data collection and interpretation. It does not consider why the researcher chose certain materials or in what circumstances. In other words, the researcher’s subjectivity is involved in data collection and analysis, which in turn was influenced by her/his particular theoretical, social and cultural context. Accepting the idea of a set of fixed components for certain categories, the quantitative method ignores the process of positioning the object and its meaning by means of certain fixed codes which the researcher produces. This weakness became particularly plain when a researcher tries to code the texts in literary works such as novels and jokes or pictures/images. These materials sometimes have different structures of texts or forms and frequently have symbolic words or words with various meanings.

Thus, this approach tends to ignore the process of defining content through the media, readers and researchers (Van den Bulck 2002:83 - 84).

### *Researcher's involvement*

It should be asked what position the researcher adopts in the collection of data, translation, interpretation and analysis of texts. As Scott observes, the researcher's subjectivity and his/her 'ultimate judgment' influence the process of choosing data and making interpretations (Scott 1990:30). This means that the researcher is also involved in the dynamic and historical processes of producing texts and meaning. Moreover, reading and analyzing sources written in other languages raises an issue of translation as one form of interpretation. Guglielmi regards translation as the "rewriting of a text" which "necessarily produces a sense of stratification that entails a stratification of values" (Guglielmi 2000:6). Similarly, Simon positions "translation as an activity of cultural creation and exchange" (Simon 1996:136) in "the spaces of knowledge" which are "multiple [in] origins", mixed and changing through "transnational communications and frequent migrations" (Simon 1996:134).

From the above perspective, "analysis itself is seen as interpretation" and "analysts [should] seek to be sensitive to their own interpretative tendencies and social reasons for them" (Fairclough 1992:35). Translators also need to be aware of their position and roles in translation. Godayol defines her position in "translating as/like a woman";

Feminist translation can only aim for permanent reflection and self-criticism in its representations, its methods, applications, focalizations, textual processes and provisional tactical decisions (Godayol 2005:14).

However, the translation and interpretation of a researcher are still under the influence of the society and culture of which a researcher is part. For instance, Sakai claims that translations after the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Japan have produced the assumption that Japanese language has been a unified national language and that the "Japanese' language, culture and society has been always discussed in comparison with those of 'the western countries'" (Sakai 1996:18, See also Sakai 1997). There is always a danger for a researcher of interpreting material with this binary concept of West and East which has been constructed in developing nationalisms and capitalisms in his/her nation.

Thus, it is necessary for a researcher to critically discuss how he/she translates and interprets texts within the historical frameworks of certain languages developed in modernity and the historical ideas of nations. A critical discussion about a researcher's position is also required, both as one who "discriminates" or defines certain groups of people as 'the Other' and one who "is discriminated" against or defined as 'the Other' in established

hegemonic culture and society (Kurihara 2001:40). This clarifies the roles and advantages of the researcher in researching into texts in the media.

### *Questions about static codes*

Finally, quantitative data research is more highly problematic in the work of defining fixed codes and frameworks and coding texts with them. It establishes a theoretical framework first in order to measure particular socio-political, economic or cultural factors which it then treats as fixed, static and clearly manifested in texts. It leads to a systematic measurement of these factors as components of certain discourse. There is a danger of categorizing words and texts with stereotypical concepts of West and East, men and women, white and non-white and the unified image of the nation. The approach does not question “the entire hegemonic process of meaning production” (Van den Bulck 2002:80).

## **3. The concept of ‘ Discourse’**

### *“ Discourse”*

Here, it is important to introduce the concept of “discourse” and to question why and how particular ‘discourses’ were/are constructed and interpreted. The concept of discourse has been generally defined as the content and process of an utterance in a certain social context. It denotes varied and dynamic social practices and the meanings of utterance and cognition (including the production and interpretation of various texts) in a socio-political or cultural context (Oishi 2005:153). From this perspective, language, whether visual or verbal, is “a form of social practice”. It is “a part of society”, “a social process” and “a socially conditioned process” (Fairclough 1989:22): “whenever people speak or listen or write or read, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects” (Fairclough 1989:23). This view encourages the observation of dynamics, interactions and contestation among production and interpretation of texts in forming particular discursive positions. Thus, as Torfing summarizes, “the theories of discourse insist on the historicity and variability of discourse” (Torfing 1999:89).

This word “discourse” , as originally used in linguistics and semiotics, has been theoretically developed and employed for analysis in the humanities and social sciences (Howarth 2000:1). This perspective is based on the idea of regarding ‘reality’ as a social and cultural construction (Van den Bulck 2002:59); it states that the ‘essential fixed components’ which are attributed to subjects/objects are socially and culturally constructed (Velody 1998:324). For example, a person’s identity represented in the media and society is seen as “a strategic, positional one” in the social, political and cultural contexts and identification is “a construction,” a “process never completed,” a “process of articulation” and “being subject to the play of difference” (Hall 1996:3-4). Researchers with this perspective try

to investigate “not the rediscovery of, but the production of, identity” (Hall 1990:224). In this case, it is the “cultural constructions of meaning and power” (Moore 2000:328) which should be examined, in order to reveal the socio-political, cultural and economic contexts of objects in forming and representing identities.

For another example, the formation of “the Other” through media discourses, in terms of race, nation, ethnicity and class, has been discussed by many recent academics. Bhabha claims the “colonial” discourses depended upon “the concept of ‘fixity’ in the ideological construction of otherness. ‘Fixity’ as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation” (Bhabha 1994:66).

Said focuses on why and how stereotypical images and characteristics of the Orient were constructed. He shows that in literary and academic activities the images and characteristics of the Orient were from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century formed as “the Other” (Said 1979 (1978):1) to Europe or the Occident (i.e., ‘the West’ as opposed to the Orient) through Western discourses (Said, 1979 (1978):330). These socio-cultural images contributed to supporting and producing “the relationship between Occident and Orient”, “a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony” (Said 1979 (1978):5). In this relationship, ‘the Orient’ needed to be defined, instructed and controlled politically, economically and socio-culturally by Europe (Said 1979(1978), Said 1993).

Gilroy, for his part, investigates people positioned as “the Other” inside a nation. He discusses “the doubleness and cultural intermixture that distinguished the experience of black Britons in contemporary Europe” (Gilroy 1993:4) and shows their various identities beyond the concept of the nation. By seeing their identities and learning of their histories, Gilroy critically reveals how nationalism and mainstream culture in the nation give these people “the image of their racialised ‘others’ as objects of knowledge, power and cultural criticism” (Gilroy 1993:5).

Spivak also questions the process by which people are organized by being categorized with essentialist masterwords such as ‘women’, ‘labourers’, ‘proletarians’ and asks why their experiences are defined as their histories (Spivak 1990:104). She focuses on ‘subaltern’ women who are given stereotypical or essentialist characteristics, roles and positions as ‘the Other’ in terms of race, nation, ethnicity or class and gender. The important point of her claim is that this situation continued to be produced in local, regional, national and transnational systems and various discourses of colonialism, imperialism, nationalism and even feminism (Spivak 1988, Spivak 1987, Morton 2003).

These studies have questioned why and how fixed or stereotypical images and essentialist views of groups have been articulated, not only in mainstream discourses but also in discourses inside “the Other”, through texts produced in society. They have challenged essentialist claims for fixed unified categories to define a research object such as ‘the Japanese’ and ‘women’. Indeed, Bhabha (1994), Hall (Morley 1996), Gilroy (1993) and Spivak

(1987, 1988) focus on people who were “beyond the nation and those who were positioned in the margin of the nation and defined as ‘Outsiders’” (Gilroy 1993:159) in terms of race, nation, ethnicity, gender and class ? people such as migrants, minority groups and colonized people in colonized countries.

Similarly, questions also arise when discourses and texts are discussed as products by a certain group of people. Moore, for example, discusses an idea of “women’s writing”, and claims that the concept of women and their represented feminine characteristics are also not fixed (Woodward 1997:60). Moi also questions the unified collective and essentialist category of women as “homogenous, non-contradictory, non-conflictual models of subjectivity” (Moi 1985:177). However, Showalter suggests that the “woman-produced text” has “a totally different status from the ‘male’ text” (Moi 1985:75). Moi disagrees with the idea of essentially “women writing” which is suggested by Showalter (Moi 1985:49 - 56, 74 - 79). Instead, she questions the very process that women with various backgrounds are given and form images, roles or identity of ‘women’ with certain characteristics. If “there is always someone who speaks, acts, thinks, writes” (Moi 1985:177), a researcher must ponder how and why particular groups of people in the media were chosen as producers/speakers/objects of the discourse. Represented discourses are not like those which have one unified and fixed “clear authentic set of characteristics” shared among all the members of the group (Woodward 1997:11). The ideas about the situation of, changing and constructed discourses raise an important question: why and how were particular texts selected and printed in the media and read and interpreted in a certain way?

#### 4. Discourse, power and society

##### “ *Discursive formation*”

To address the questions above, a few theoretical perspectives from recent theoretical debates and qualitative research methods for “discourse” are essential. In particular, Foucault suggests important perspectives for discourse, namely ideas of “discursive formation” (Foucault 1972:31 - 39) and power. First of all, in his ‘Archaeological’ work, Foucault is concerned with the active constitutive and constructive nature of discourses on various dimensions in a society, describing examples such as “the objects of knowledge, social subjects and forms of ‘self’, social relationships and conceptual frameworks” (Fairclough 1992:39).

Next, he focuses on “the interdependency of the discourse practices of a society or institution” and reveals that texts generate and are generated from other contemporary and historically prior texts so “discourse practice is generated out of combinations of others and is defined by its relationship to others” (Fairclough 1992:39 - 40). This approach suggests that the “intratextual relations” and “interdiscursive relationship” link discourses

and realities and different discursive formation, consumption and products (Fairclough 1992:45).

Secondly, in his study of Genealogy, Foucault describes the “techniques of power” (Fairclough 1992:54) which struggle to determine discursive practices such as “Truth” (Fairclough 1992:49) especially through social institutions and the cultural values of modern society (Foucault 1980). In this sense, power relations and social change as their result have a “discursive nature” and discourse has a political nature (Fairclough 1992:54 - 55).

This perspective of discourse, power and society is useful in revealing the dynamic relations between changes in discourse and society. It is useful to have an insight into the process by which discourses in the media were produced by interacting with particular socio-political and cultural contexts and to learn how these discourses constructed the context for particular members.

### *Gramsci's concept of hegemony*

Here, the concept of hegemony is important for understanding the relationship between hierarchical social practices and discourse. This word, hegemony, was originally suggested by the Italian Marxist thinker, Antonio Gramsci, in order to describe the condition of the ideology of “a specific dominant group” in a civil society. Gramsci claims that hegemony is built through “consent” in most cases but that in some cases, when the ruling group is challenged, it is sometimes imposed on people through “force” (Gramsci 1971:245).

Rejecting ‘economism’ and ‘reductionism,’ which saw economic elements as “the only determining structure” (Hall 1996:417 - 418), Gramsci proposed the concept of ‘ideological hegemony’ as a decisive element in the structural transformation of society (Boggs 1976:17). He suggested that cultural, moral, ethical and intellectual hegemony existed throughout civil society as “an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs, morality” etc. (Boggs 1976:36).

There are three important characteristics of this ideological hegemony. Firstly, it operates as a “‘general conception of life’ for the masses as well as a “‘scholastic programme’ or set of principles” (Boggs 1976:39). Secondly, this hegemony is not fixed but always changing in the interaction between political (state) institutions and popular (civil) ideology in the social context (Boggs 1976:40). Thirdly, ‘organic intellectuals’ play significant ‘leading’ and ‘representative’ roles (Boggs 1976:76) in the “intellectual sphere” and “popular consciousness” (Boggs 1976:78). In particular, their roles become important in revolutionary and socialist movements because they must include an “ideological process” (Boggs 1976:59) to develop “counter hegemony” (Boggs 1976: 40 - 41).

Althusser develops his theories by focusing on Gramsci’s discussion of the two ways to implant ideology among people: “consent”, by which hegemony is established in most cases and “force”. Althusser names the tools of the dominant group to gain ‘consent’ as



the ‘ideological state apparatus’ (‘ISA’), especially within a nation state. ‘ISA’ is distributed through the material bodies of institutions, in particular education and reproduces the hierarchical hegemonic system of the nation for giving people identities and a social order (Althusser 1971:127 - 186).

However, ‘ISAs’ in his theory are “both sites of and stakes in class struggle” (Fairclough 1992:87). This reveals contradictions in his theory:1) although these ISAs are the sites of class struggle, they are recognized by “consensus” among people; 2) the class is treated as “a universal social cement”, which always sets clear two categories, that of ‘the ruling class’ (Althusser 1971:146) which controls ideology and that which is controlled (Fairclough 1992:87). Nevertheless, the idea of ‘ISA’ is useful for understanding the roles of the media in relation to the establishing and maintaining of nation-state and nationalism.

These perspectives of “hegemony” from Gramsci and Althusser have contributed to reveal the ideological nature of discourses in society including discourses on education, the media, literature or popular culture. The strength of this approach is that “a great deal of power and influence is attributed to meanings, signs, ideas and language as among primary determinants of the human world”, while structuralists refer to social class and gender as elements which decide the meanings (Boyd-Barrett 2002:23 - 24).

The idea of “hegemony” is useful in considering various social relations in terms of nation, race, ethnicity, gender and class. Hall explains that Gramsci’s approach leads to a perspective that ethnic and racial differences are constructed through not only economic and political factors but also ideological and cultural ones (Hall 1996:435 - 439). Therefore, racism has an ideological character and “historical specificity” (Hall 1996:435) under the influence of national and regional characteristics and of the “educative” and “ideological” state (Hall 1996:438).

## 5. New perspectives for textual analysis

Analysis of “discourse” with the characteristics above should be “not just content analysis of messages but [analyzing] more than contents of messages”. The analysis should also in this process include the dynamic processes of production, distribution, interpretation and consumption of languages and texts and power relationship (Muramatsu and Gossman (eds.) 1998:166 - 167, Oishi 2005:154 - 155). Howarth, for example, accepts Foucault’s view that “discourse” consists of “historically specific systems of meaning which form the identities of subjects and objects” and that it is “political” (Howarth 2000:9). Oishi explains discourse analysis as “an analysis which analyzes discourses or meanings of texts... and which focuses on the social and historical contexts of producing and interpreting meaning” (Oishi 2005:153 - 154). Researchers should investigate social formation, maintenance, reproduction and transformation of identities through “defining and interpreting [the]

meanings” of events and themselves (Oishi 2005:155). Indeed, discourse analysis is a significant way to investigate a process and socio-historical context of a social event or act. It looks at the process “its participant or agent is represented, defined and given meanings” and the patterns and institutions of meaning production. In particular, it is useful to analyze “the relationship between the hegemonic value system and texts and discourses practices” (Oishi 2005:155).

Moreover, recent debates on discourse and discourse analysis accept the multiplicity of texts and meaning construction. Sontag (1978(1966)), Barthes (1977) and Kristeva (1986) question the idea of the “primary text” and suggest that there is a “representation of an outer reality” or a sole “subjective expression” (Sontag 1978(1966)) of a fixed subject/identity represented in the text. Barthes writes:

We know now that a text is... a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture... there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said, the author (Barthes 1977: 146 - 147).

Kristeva also points out interaction among texts; “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva 1986:37). These claims suggest the idea of multiple and changing meanings which are constantly produced and interpreted in various discourses.

Indeed, new approaches in cultural studies “see texts as polysemic” (Boyd-Barrett 2002:24); texts and meanings are situated in various cultural and historical contexts. Texts are read as “multiples of different voices, with echoes of the different voices and audiences that those voices once addressed, each voice following different rules of lexical choice, grammatical structure and semantic inflection” (Boyd-Barrett 2002:39) and their meanings are constantly interpreted differently by different readers. In addition, readers and their ways of reading and interpreting are also situated socio-culturally and historically, the ways becoming diverse, fragmentary and never totally comprehensive.

Oishi concludes that these multiple productions and interpretations of texts and meanings are “important aspects of textual and discursive practices” but that they are still under the power relationships in society. This view leads to the perspective that “various (dominant) social ‘structures’ control textual and discursive practices” and that these textual and discursive practices reproduce the social structure and power relations. However, such “hierarchal and dominant” patterns always have the possibility of changing through multiple and mutable textual and discursive practices in changing social contexts (Oishi 2005:156 - 157).

*Application in the media studies*

In the field of media studies, according to Boyd-Barrett, more studies focus on the 'ideological work' of the media (Boyd-Barrett 2002:23). In particular, in the early phase of cultural studies for media studies, this approach was much more influenced by neo-Marxist perspectives in describing the relationship between the construction of texts and cultural hegemony through literary analysis (Boyd-Barrett 2002:38).

Among the recent discourse analysis methods, however, it may be helpful to consider the ways in which Critical Discourse Analysis employs the concepts of discourse and hegemony. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the "study of the relations between discourse, power, dominance, social inequality and the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships" (Van-Dijk 1993:249).

First, Fairclough focuses on the ideas of Foucault about the technologies of power (Fairclough 1992:4 - 5). Fairclough is concerned with the abstract nature of Foucault's approach and its synthetic character of "linguistically-oriented discourse analysis and the insights of recent social theory on language and discourse" (Fairclough 1992:37).

Fairclough focuses on this view of "discourse as constitutive – as contributing to the production, transformation and reproduction of the objects" which closely interact to form reality (Fairclough 1992:41 - 42). However, dissatisfied with Foucault's ignoring of active social agency, Fairclough proposes a view which posits a dialectical relationship between discourse and subjectivity: that they (re)shape and restrict each other (Fairclough 1992: 45).

Although counting these views as significant, Fairclough still finds a lack of actual practice, such as text and textual analysis, in Foucault's analyses and advocates the actual practice of critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 1992:57). In short, Fairclough sees discursiveness in the power relations which cause socio-political and cultural change.

Secondly, by using the concept of hegemony, Van Dijk analyses discourses, especially those produced by elites and institutions or groups, to find how in a society discourse often makes unequal relationships seem natural and legitimate. Under the influence of Gramsci and Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (Birmingham, U.K.), Van Dijk has an interest in social issues, investigating various forms of the discourse surrounding these issues with a multidisciplinary approach. He suggests that discourse produces "dominance", "legitimate and acceptable forms of power" in a hegemonic "hierarchy of power" which spreads naturally among members of society (Van-Dijk 1993:255).

In order to reveal this mechanism he identifies some key points to focus on: (1) access to the discourse, that is, "who is allowed to say/write/hear/read what to/from whom, where, when and how" (Van-Dijk 1993:257); (2) Discourse Structures of text and talk, such as justification, legitimation and the positive/negative representation of one's own group or others (Van-Dijk 1993:259 - 265).

In this approach, the CDA of van Dijk and others reveals the role of one discursive strategy in (re)producing racism, i.e., the denial of racism, and suggests ways in which the elite discourses of, for example, the mass media and parliament affect everyday life (Wodak 1993, Van Dijk 1992).

Fairclough positions his methodology of CDA in a more Marxist perspective but still uses the concept of hegemony. Focusing on the relationship between change in language and social and cultural change, he combines more social-theoretical discourse analysis with linguistically-oriented 'text-and-interaction' discourse analysis (Fairclough 1992:4).

Two of the main sources of his ideas are Gramsci and Althusser, who emphasize the importance of ideology for modern social reproduction. Fairclough opposes Althusser's conclusions, insisting that all discourses are basically ideological because they are influenced by various social relations (Fairclough 1992:91). Fairclough points out that the power of ideology is interwoven with discursive practices to represent and construct realities automatically and naturally in a society (Fairclough 1992:87).

Next Fairclough looks at Gramsci's concept of hegemony as an insight into the political and ideological aspects of discursive practice (Fairclough 1992:67). Gramsci focuses much on the process by which ideologies become naturalized and suggests changing the dialectical and intertextual relationships between discourse and events (Fairclough 1992:92-93). For Fairclough, Gramsci's perspective makes it possible to consider the "historicity of text production and interpretation" (Fairclough 1992:96) which is influenced by power relations synthesizing both private and public powers (Fairclough 1992:98).

Taking into account the views of Gramsci and Althusser, Fairclough defines 'discourse' as "a form of social practice" (Fairclough 1992:63) which not only represents and signifies the world, people's social relationships and the construction of systems of knowledge and belief, but also constitutes and constructs them (Fairclough 1992:64). While Van Dijk tends to focus on revealing social relations such as inequality and domination, which are hidden in discourses, Fairclough considers more the power of discourse to construct social realities as well as to represent them and thus takes into account the historicity of discourses and discursive practices.

To sum up, the approaches mentioned above embody several useful points for analyzing texts in a media research: they allow a researcher to

- 1) investigate the interconnectivity between discourse and social relationships
- 2) analyze the discourses produced by elites and institutions or groups to show the ideological, sometimes hegemonic, discourses which reflect social relationships
- 3) trace the changing relationship between discourse and social change. This will show some of the ways in which discourses are constructed in society through history.
- 4) investigate how discourses represent society and social change and also how this dis-

cursive practice actually contributes to shape and re-shape social relationships and ideological or hegemonic factors around race, national identities and gender.

5) investigate how power relations and social change around gender have a “discursive nature” and how discourse has a political nature Foucault, from (Fairclough 1992:54 - 55).

6) learn how interpretations are situated and constructed historically, socially, culturally and ideologically through positioning the relationship between the researcher’s subjectivity and the texts.

## 6. Conclusion

Throughout this article, I have tried to suggest and uncover the complicated power relations which, I argue, come to define apparently unified concepts and images of certain people/things in media discourses. By examining the authoritarian manner and process of texts being socially produced in the media, I have argued that some particular discourses contribute to reproduce hegemonic discourses. Among the various producers and readers involved, there were complicated power relations defining particular hegemonic discourses in the society.

The theories and applied studies focus on ideological aspects in the construction of discourses. By focusing on the changing socio-cultural, economic and political context, it is possible to see the process of the power relationship in constructing and positioning the meanings of texts. It can be seen how particular discourses might be used, reflected or might resist other discourses in this power relationship and how certain discourses are articulated in the media space. Moreover, these approaches are useful to investigate the issues of race, nation, ethnicity and gender in media and society. It is because in these approaches, discourses are seen as representing and constructing cultural hegemony in the society. This hegemony was embedded in its society and defined the social positions of various groups of people. Furthermore, it can be traced how this hegemony was created and naturalized.

Of course, further investigation of the relationship between society and texts would always need to be carried out. It is useful to have information on local, national and transnational activities such as meetings and lectures to spread these dominant discourses of the media. This would help researchers to have more understandings how and what kinds of dominant discourse are disseminated in the society and how readers are encouraged to interpret in certain hegemonic ways (Wada 2002:168 - 212). Nevertheless, it is important to note that studies with these approaches investigate whose discourses become representative or are included in certain discourses and to whom they are directed.

In short, these perspectives enable researchers to discuss the interactive process of pro

duction, reproduction, distribution, consumption and interpretation of the media texts and discourses. The texts are complex, as are the causes and conditions of their meanings, and I would argue, our contemporary reading and interpretation should be equally complex.

## Bibliography

- Althusser, Louis (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London, New York:Monthly Review Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1977). *Image, Music, Text*. London:Fontana Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London, New York:Routledge.
- Boggs, Carl (1976). *Gramsci's Marxism*. London:Pluto Press.
- Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (2002). "Theory in media research". In Chris Newbold, Oliver Boyd-Barrett and Hilde van den Bulck (eds.) *The Media Book*. London, New York:Headline Group, Oxford University Press, pp. 1 - 54.
- Fairclough, Norman (1989). *Language and Power*. Harlow (England), New York:Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ferguson, Marjorie (1983). *Forever Feminin: Women's Magazines and the Cult of Femininity*. London, Exeter (New Hampshire):Heinemann Education Books Ltd.
- Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power/ Knowledge:Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Brighton:Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, Michel (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London:Tavistock Publications.
- Gilroy, Paul (1993). *The Black Atlantic:Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London:Verso.
- Godayol, Pilar (2005). "Frontera Spaces:Translating as/like a Woman". In Jose Santaemilia (ed.) *Gender, Sex and Translation: The Manipulation of Identities*. Manchester (UK), Northampton (MA):St. Jerome, pp. 9 - 14.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London:Lawrence and Wishart.
- Guglielmi, Marina (2000). "Between translation and rewriting: Parallels and differences in transmitting literature". In Lieven D' hulst and John Milton (eds.) *Reconstructing Cultural Memory:Translation, Scripts, Literacy*. Amsterdam, Atlanta (GA):Rodopi.
- Hall, Stuart (1990). "Cultural identity and diaspora". In Jonathan Rutherford (ed.) *Identity:Community, Culture, Difference*. London:Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 222 - 237.
- Hall, Stuart and Paul du Gay (eds.) (1996). *Question of Cultural Identity*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE.
- Howarth, David (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham (England), Philadelphia (PA):Open University Press.
- Konczal, Lisa (2000). "Content analysis". In Dan Fleming (ed.) *Formations: A 21st-Century Media Studies Textbook*. Manchester, New York:Manchester University Press, pp. 323 - 328.
- Kristeva, Julia (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. New York:Columbia University Press.
- Kurihara, Akira et al. (2001). *Chino Shokuminchi:Ekkyosuru (Colonies of Knowledge:Beyond Borders)*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.
- Moi, Toril (1985). *Sexual/textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London:Methuen.
- Moores, Shaun (2000). "Qualitative research methods". In Dan Fleming (ed.) *Formations:A 21st-Century Media Studies Textbook*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, pp. 328 - 330.
- Morley, David and Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds.) (1996). *Stuart Hall:Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London, New York:Routledge.
- Morton, Stephen (2003). *Gayatori Chakravorty Spivak*. London, New York:Routledge.
- Muramatsu, Yasuko and Hilaria Gossman (eds.) (1998). *Mediaga Tsukuru Gender: Nichidokuno Danjokazokuzouwo Yomitoku (Gender Constructed by the Media:Analyzing Images of Men, Women and Families in Japan and Germany)*. Tokyo: Shinyosha.
- Neuendorf, Kimberly A (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks,London, New Delhi:Sage

## Publications.

- Oishi, Yutaka (2005). *Journalism to Media Gensetsu (Journalism and Media Discourse)*. Tokyo: Keisou Shobo.
- Punch, Keith F. (2005 (1998)). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. London, Thousand Oaks (CA), New Delhi: SAGE.
- Said, Edward (1983). *The World, the Text, the Critic*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward W. (1979 (1978)). *Orientalism*. London, New York: Routledge, Kegan Paul, Pantheon Books.
- Said, Edward W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Sakai, Naoki (1997). *Nihonshisoutoiu Mondai (The Issues of Japanese Thoughts)*. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Sakai, Naoki, et al. (1996). *Nationality no Datsukouchiku (Deconstructing Nationality)*. Tokyo: Kashiwashobo.
- Scott, John (1990). *A Matter of Record*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Scott, John (September 1990). "Documents in social research", *Social Studies Review*, Vol.6, pp. 6 - 10.
- Simon, Sherry (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Sontag, Susan (1978 (1966)). *Against Interpretation: and Other Essays*. New York: Octagon Books, Farrar, Strauss & Giroux.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1987, 1988). *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988). "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. London: Macmillan Education, pp. 271-313.
- G. Spivak (1990). *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Torring, Jacob (1999). *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*. Oxford (UK), Malden (Massachusetts): Blackwell.
- Van den Bulck, Hilde (2002). "Tools for studying the media". In Chris Newbold, Oliver Boyd-Barrett and Hilde van den Bulck (eds.) *The Media Book*. London, New York: Headline Group, Oxford University Press, pp. 55 - 100.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1992). "Discourse and the denial of racism", *Discourse and Society*, Vol.3, pp. 87 - 118.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1993). "Principles of critical discourse analysis", *Discourse and Society*, Vol.4, pp. 249 - 283.
- Velody, Irving and Robin Williams (eds.) (1998). *The Politics of Constructionism*. London, Thousand Oaks (CA), New Delhi: SAGE.
- Wada, Atsuhiko (2002). *Mediano Nakano Dokusha: Dokusharomno Genzai (Readers of the Media: Current Theories about Readers)*. Tokyo: Hitsujishobo.
- Wodak, Ruth and Bernd Matoushek (1993). "'We are dealing with people whose origins one can clearly tell just by looking': critical discourse analysis and the study of neo-racism in contemporary Austria", *Discourse and Society*, Vol.4, pp. 225 - 248.
- Woodward, Kathryn (ed.) (1997). *Identity and Difference*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE.

(のむら しおり 本学非常勤講師)