別紙様式３（第３条関係）

論　文　要　旨

氏　名　　　　ハーン　アーロン

論文題目（外国語の場合は、和訳を併記すること。）

A Critical Discourse Analysis of a “My Share”English Lesson Plan

Corpus: Exploring Beliefs, Identity, and Power

（「マイシェア」英語レッスンプラン・コーパスの批判的談話分析:

信念、アイデンティティ、力の探索的研究）

論文要旨（別様に記載すること。）

（注）１．論文要旨は、A4 版とする。

２．和文の場合は、４０００字から８０００字程度、外国語の場合は、２０００語から４０００語程度とする。

３．「論文要旨」は、ＣＤ等の電子媒体（１枚）を併せて提出すること。
（氏名及びソフト名を記入したラベルを張付すること。）

Part 1 Introduction (Chapters 1-3)

1. Introduction

This project utilizes a critical discourse analysis (CDA) stance, which is a way of doing social research that examines how discourse is a product and producer of systemic inequalities. CDA is used to analyze the discourse of a professional genre of language teaching in Japan, examining how that discourse is connected to teacher beliefs, the identities of teachers and students, the power relationship between teachers and students, and the connection to wider educational and linguistic discourses in Japan.

2. Historical Background

CDA requires that discourse be interpreted in relationship to the sociohistorical context in which it is produced and consumed. As such, Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of the history of language learning in Japan. It focuses on secondary and tertiary language education—especially developments in the last 30 years. The highlights are a discussion of the relationships between *yakudoku*, *juken eigo*, entrance exams, and communicative language learning; the changing relationship between Japan and "the foreign," especially as found in *kokusaika* policies; and the recent trend towards educational deregulation, which is a product of neoliberalism.

3. Literature Review

This chapter reviews the three main fields in which this research falls (critical discourse analysis, teacher belief/identity research, and corpora-based analysis). It provides a theoretical background of each field, and then discusses research from that field relevant to the present project.

CDA is a stance towards research (not a methodology, as per Van Dijk (2013)) that investigates the links between discourse and social problems. It is methodologically diverse (including the use of non-linguistic methodologies and data), looks at both macro- and micro-linguistic aspects of texts, and requires researcher reflexivity. The research review discusses studies on educational policies, classroom talk, classroom texts (textbooks, syllabi, and lesson plans), and teacher identity. While the latter two topics resemble the research done in this project, the only prior CDA of lesson plans focused on content rather than linguistic analysis and the two teacher identity studies looked only at how identities were manifested in spontaneous speech rather than in professional publications.

Teacher belief and identity research focuses on the importance of teacher cognition on classroom practice and student learning outcomes. Significant research has been conducted on language teachers' beliefs/identities, including in Japan, but almost all such research was conducted by asking teachers directly in interviews and questionnaires. However, Ainsworth and Hardy (2004) argued that identity researchers need to add a discursive component to their work so that we can see how identities develop and are perpetuated across communities.

Corpus-based research is work which examines language use in actual practice. Most corpus-based research uses computational tools to analyze collections of texts that are too large to analyze by hand. TESOL research utilizing corpus-based tools has usually studied the structure of actual language use (with the intent of making recommendations for better language teaching), rather than, as in this project, the professional discourse of language teachers.

Thus, the present research project addresses a significant gap in the literature by using corpus-based tools on an unresearched genre, and combines CDA and the teacher cognition fields to understand the links between professional discourse and teacher belief/identity.

Part 2 Method (Chapter 4)

4. Methodology

The professional discourse this project analyzes are articles from the "My Share" section of *The Language Teacher*, a journal of one of Japan's largest professional associations of language teachers. Each article contains a short description of a successful language learning activity accompanied by explanations for why the author believes the activity to be successful/useful/beneficial. I chose to examine the My Share articles because they represent a highly focused discourse community that holds beliefs and identities closely connected to a specific set of sociohistorical circumstances and educational conditions. In addition, My Share articles contain not only a description of the activities themselves, but also introductory and concluding discussion about what makes the activities beneficial, thus making it possible to more directly interpret the beliefs, identities, and power relationships held by the community and constructed by this discourse.

My corpus includes most of the My Share articles published between 2011 and 2016. To focus the analysis on a specific sociohistorical context, articles written by authors at institutions outside of Japan and those containing activities designed only for young learners were excluded. The final corpus contains 177 articles by 160 authors, with a total of just over 100,000 words. The articles were downloaded from the journal's online archive, and formatted in plain text and special formats used by the linguistic analysis software tools I used—mostly, KHCoder (Higuchi, 2015) and AntConc (Anthony, 2014). Two additional forms of data were collected: an online survey of the corpus's authors and semi-structured interviews of four of the journal's editors.

The project sought answers to four research questions, shortened versions of which are as follows:

1. What are the rules of the My Share genre?
2. What teacher and student beliefs and identities are manifested in the My Share genre?
3. How does power operate in the My Share genre?

4. How is the My Share genre linked to larger ideologies and other aspects of the Japanese language teaching/learning?

My approach to answering these questions has been guided by five principles of CDA that I felt represented widely held practices of CDA researchers, as follows: CDA should be socially committed, be flexible and diverse in methods and approach, include analysis of both micro- and macro-linguistic issues, examine non-linguistic matters in addition to linguistic ones, and include researcher self-reflexivity. These principles shaped the research design, with the second principle playing a particularly important role in that it led me to a multimethodological approach organized under three main lenses of analysis: corpus-based approaches, genre analysis, and text/discourse analysis. Corpus-based approaches are those which, as described above, treat large groups of texts like the My Share corpus holistically, looking for broad trends (usually quantitative in nature), and generally using computational tools to find these trends. Genre analysis starts from the presumption that genre are collections of texts with similar traits and rules, but, more importantly, that they exist to do social work in specific discourse communities. Note that while this paper calls on some of the tools and ideas of Critical Genre Analysis (CGA) as formulated by Bhatia (2012, 2015), I do so only as part of my multimethodological borrowing—this research remains firmly aligned with CDA. This work places discourse, power, and ideology at the center while CGA centralizes the idea of social practice. In addition, Bhatia described CGA as being more analytically rigorous, while my project, as with much CDA work, borrows from a wide variety of analytical tools since the primary goal is understanding how beliefs, identities, and ideologies are represented in the text, and thus it is more important to bring all possible methodological tools to bear, even when they are potentially inconsistent. Finally, text analysis is a component of discourse analysis, and refers to the interpretation of linguistic aspects of texts to understand what discursive work those texts are doing in the contexts in which they are employed by particular discourse communities (Fairclough, 2003). Methodologies and concepts from each of these lenses are used to examine seven aspects of the My Share discourse (structure, moves, argument, lexicogrammar, activities, special topics, and interviews and questionnaires) each of which is discussed in one of the seven results chapters in the dissertation. As I reported the results, I engaged, where possible, in self-reflexive analysis (the fifth of the CDA principles mentioned above) by attempting to make my interpretative processes transparent and laying out some of the biases and personal history that influenced my interpretations.

Part 3 Results & Discussion (Chapters 5-12)

5. Structure Analysis

The analysis of the articles' structure, which operates through the genre lens, looks at how the articles are organized and displayed. First, it examines the sections of the articles. Three sections are obligatory: the Quick Guide (basic information listed in bullet points), an introduction (background information), and a Procedure section (describing the steps for

how to do the lesson). In addition, a Conclusion section (containing a variety of information) is included in all but one article, and slightly less than 90% of articles contain a Preparation section (usually describing what teachers do to get ready for class). Finally, there are several optional sections, with the most common being References, Appendices, Alternatives, and Extensions. Thus, the genre has a stable core usually containing five sections, plus a layer of flexibility when additional parts are needed.

By surveying the history of the My Share genre back to 1990, it is possible to see that the genre was much more flexible in the past. The number of articles per issue, word counts, and included sections all varied much more in the past. More importantly, the genre previously allowed a wider range of topics—while the contemporary corpus consists almost entirely of articles describing a single activity, in older issues, My Share also contained descriptions of new classroom technologies, general approaches to a teaching problem, and other less focused articles.

There are two additional findings in the structure analysis. First, an examination of the visual elements (position in the journal, fonts, use of photographs, etc.) demonstrates significant difference between the peer-reviewed portion of *The Language Teacher* and the My Share articles. These differences perpetuate the elevation of research over teaching and collectivize the act of classroom teaching. Second, all the articles in corpus are written in English, despite coming from a bilingual organization (conversely, a small number of the peer-reviewed articles are written in Japanese). This links the practice of classroom teaching (as opposed to other aspects of the teaching profession, like research, which take place outside of the classroom) exclusively to English.

6. Move Analysis

This chapter uses a method which comes out of genre analysis called "move analysis" to analyze the rhetorical structure of the articles. In move analysis, a text is divided into units by the analyst, where each unit has a single rhetorical function. Because no prior genre-based research has been conducted on activity plans, a new categorization scheme had to be developed through an iterative bottom-up process, which resulted in the development of a coding scheme consisting of 15 moves organized into eight categories.

The move analysis helps clarify the purpose of the introduction and Conclusion sections. Most introduction sections provide background information, and many also list some of the activity's positive qualities such as the teaching goal(s) or a typical language learning problem that it mitigates or solves. Conclusion sections, on the other hand, have more varied purposes, but more than 80% tout the benefits of the activity.

After examining individual moves and their distribution across the sections, the ordering of the moves is analyzed. While there are no obligatory move sequences, there are some common patterns. For instance, introduction sections frequently move from general background information to specific information about the activity itself. Conclusion sections are more varied, but more than half of all Conclusions end with a "Benefit" move. This represents the article finishing with a strong promotion of why the activity is worth using.

7. Argument Analysis

This chapter is an expansion of the move analysis, and uses all three lenses to analyze the arguments made by the articles. As with the move analysis, the categorization of the benefits involved a bottom-up process of assigning numerous potential labels and then accreting them into larger categories. The first part of the argument analysis focuses on the "Benefit" moves, which details positive, non-academic qualities of the activities, with the two most frequent being "positive emotions" (such as "fun," "energized," or "comfortable") and "teacher-linked" (such as "flexible") which occur in 52% and 22% of the articles, respectively. The former points to a belief in the value of linking emotion with language learning, while the latter points to a belief that it is acceptable for teachers to make teaching decisions for their own benefit, rather than only thinking about student wants and needs.

This chapter also looks at arguments embedded in three other moves. First, "negative claims" moves make claims about problems that students have in learning languages or that exist in other activities; these moves are invariably included so the activity can "solve" these problems. Second, "experience" moves, which describe the author's experience with the activity, often involve appropriation of student voices to praise the author or activity, transforming students into props to support the article's arguments. Third, "context/background" moves often contain broader statements of teacher beliefs about students, language learning, etc. While these claims are varied, what is more important is the tone—they rarely use hesitant or qualified language, instead boldly asserting "truths."

8. Lexicogrammar Analysis

The analysis of the corpus's lexicogrammar is the most "corpus-based" portion of the project because it relies heavily on automated tools to examine micro-linguistic details of the corpus. There are two main focuses: an analysis of the main agents (students and teachers)—how they are represented and what verbs they co-occur with—and an analysis of frequent N-grams. While students are highly frequent and lexically visible in the corpus, when teachers appear semantically, they are lexically elided as the deleted agents of passive and imperative verbs in a majority of cases. Passive constructions tend to hide students' lack of agency by grammatically appearing to give students choices but semantically reserving those choices for teachers. In imperatives, on the other hand, teacher power is so blatant that it naturalizes teacher dominance. In both cases, the corpus naturalizes the idea that teachers should have agency and power, and students should be powerless objects of teacher actions.

Similar consequences appear when verb-agent co-occurrences are examined. By supplementing this corpus-based approach with text analysis, it is possible to see that teachers—but not students—are often associated with verbs of judgment (e.g., *award, emphasize,* and *grade*) and management/control (e.g. *announce, assign,* and *monitor*). Conversely, students—but not teachers—co-occur with verbs representing mental growth such as *learn, memorize,* and *understand*. Finally, regarding verbs related to mental states, both groups co-occur with generic verbs like *think* and *consider*, but only students are

associated with verbs related to emotions, such as *enjoy* and *worry*. In total, teachers lack the ability to grow, change, or have feelings, while students lack agency. Teachers are portrayed as inhuman robots or as "forces" acting as an extension of the activity rules, while students are portrayed as the objects which are manipulated by these rules.

The second half of the lexicogrammatical analysis looks at the most frequent 1 through 5-grams in the corpus (overall and per section). This provides additional depth to the findings from the structural and move analyses about the purpose of each section.

9. Activity Analysis

This chapter steps back from looking at the articles to looking at the activities that the articles describe, mostly via a combination of genre and text analysis. The initial portion focuses on fine details of the activities: the items in the Quick Guide section, materials used, use of the students' L1, and teaching targets. The Quick Guide is sometimes confusing because the terminology is not standardized or consistent with the activities themselves. The activities require a wide variety of materials, but there is a presumption that all teachers will have access to computers (for preparation), photocopiers, and black or whiteboards. Regarding the use of students' L1, while 14% of the articles allow the use of Japanese in the classroom (and less than 5% recommend actively preventing Japanese use), they tend to treat this use as transgressive, implying the default is "English Only."

The corpus includes many different teaching targets in the keywords and in "teaching target" moves in the article bodies. Using corpus-based and text analysis, a few patterns emerge. First, the four-skills paradigm is prominent, though reading activities are much less frequent than those using the other three skills. Second, vocabulary is taught both more frequently and in a more generic way than grammar. Finally, a sizable minority of articles include non-linguistic teaching goals.

The second half of this chapter takes a more holistic and qualitative approach to the activities, employing mostly text analysis, and consists of three parts. The first, which looks at the pedagogical structure of the activities, finds that over 83% of the activities involve at least some group work. In addition, about 18% of the activities have a competitive element, while 71% include a collaborative element. Second, three major "archetypes" of activities are examined: role-plays, presentations, and games. This analysis demonstrates that there are connections between the beliefs represented in articles and the types of activities conducted. For example, games are positively correlated with the "energizing" benefit, while presentations are inversely correlated with the same. Finally, four pairs of articles with similar activities are compared. Close text analysis of these pairs demonstrates significantly different attitudes towards students with consequent differences in how the activities are conducted. Thus, even within individual articles, we can see the link between teacher beliefs and how language is taught.

10. Special Topics Analysis

The previous results chapters start "within" the corpus by looking for trends and frequently occurring elements. In Chapter 10, on the other hand, three topics (*kokusaika,* active learning/autonomy, and neoliberalism) that have been prominent in Japanese educational policies over the last several decades were preselected, and then the corpus is searched for traces of these activities using mostly text analysis but also light touches of genre analysis and corpus-based approaches.

Kokusaika is rarely directly referenced in the corpus. Furthermore, there are no cases where internationalization is used as a justification for why learning English is important, as opposed to how *kokusaika* is often used in government policy documents as the rationale for studying English. Looking more thematically, some articles are consistent with *kokusaika*, giving students tools to talk about international issues while holding them at a distance. Others stand opposed to *kokusaika* in that they explicitly link global problems to students' lives. There are two other major connections to *kokusaika*. First, the only languages that occur regularly in the corpus are English and Japanese, thus reinforcing the idea that the world is binary, consisting of only Japan and "the other." Second, politically, geographically, and culturally the corpus overemphasizes the United States, a bias that is consistent with the strong preference for U.S. English in Japan.

Active learning and autonomy are teaching styles that the Japanese government has promoted for tertiary and secondary education, respectively. These concepts are more prevalent in the corpus than *kokusaika*, appearing directly or via related moves in about one-third of the articles. Furthermore, using the most basic idea of active learning, every activity in the corpus contains at least a small amount of student engagement (that is, none of the articles describe a purely teacher-centered lecture). However, a substantial number of articles that explicitly call on the ideas of AL/autonomy do not follow through on what they promise, such as activities described as promoting student autonomy which give students little opportunity to make substantive decisions over what and how they learn.

Regarding neoliberalism, many articles contain references to capitalism/consumerism (students engaging in shopping, home, and car ownership, etc.). In addition, a few articles focus on hypothetical English use in the students' future employment. However, there is no major infiltration of the language of economics and finance into the My Share articles as has been found in other genres of education-related texts (Fairclough, 1993).

11. Interview and Questionnaire Analysis

This chapter supplements the analysis of the actual corpus with information from the authors and editors to better understand the publication process and why the authors submitted My Share articles. This addition is justified under both general CDA principles (Wodak, 2001) and Critical Genre Analysis (Bhatia, 2012, 2015).

The first key finding from the interviews is that the editors tried to accept as many submissions as possible, and the editing they did was mostly surface level: grammar, word

choice, and length. Thus, the editors had little effect on the macro-level contents of the articles. Also, the editors didn't attempt to judge whether the activities were likely to be effective, or what ideologies were embedded in them. Nonetheless, since the explicit genre rules (especially, the word limits) likely affected what information could be included, and since some of the lexicogrammatical choices had consequences on the teacher beliefs and identities portrayed by the articles, it would be inaccurate to completely ignore their contribution to the genre.

Questionnaire responses were solicited from the authors by email, with 34% completing the survey. The survey asked about the authors' demographic details, their motivations for publishing in My Share, the submission/publication process, and their teacher beliefs. However, the responses to the demographic questions indicated that the results were probably not representative of the average author. Many of the respondents indicated being experienced authors and having an average of 15 years of experience teaching, while the editors universally stated that the typical My Share author was new to academic publishing. This mismatch made me minimize the importance of the survey, especially the teacher belief portions.

The most useful data from the survey are the authors' explanations for their reasons for publishing in My Share. 60% of respondents stated that they wanted to improve their CV. The next most frequent response—that they wanted to share an activity with other teachers—was present in 36% of responses. This implies dual purposes for My Share that are somewhat contradictory: the former is individualistic and competitive (since the goal is to compete with other teachers for employment), while the latter is cooperative (since teachers are working together to improve language education in Japan).

12. Discussion

The discussion chapter pulls together the various findings to try to build answers to the research questions. However, in keeping with the postmodern, critical perspective of this project, I do not build a totalizing narrative, instead intentionally opting for a complex, multifaceted picture.

With respect to research question 1, it was shown that structurally the genre is stable, with a core set of five obligatory and semi-obligatory sections along with several optional sections. Note that this is in contrast to how the genre operated prior to 2003, when My Share articles had highly varied organizational schemes and contents. While there is flexibility in the contents of each section and there are no obligatory contents (except that Procedures always explains what to do during the actual activity), move and N-gram analyses showed that each section focuses on certain types of information and arguments.

Topically, the articles cover a wide variety of language learning goals, though different skills are not treated equally. Another finding was that there are unnecessary inconsistencies in the way that certain terms are used, especially those associated with learner maturity and English level.

The most complex finding related to research question 1 is that many of the My Share articles seem to have a fairy-tale structure underlying their ostensibly documentary nature. Teachers are portrayed as heroes overcoming problems. Students are, at best, supporting characters who are saved by the actions of the teacher. Because the genre includes only successful language lessons, and because both the length and the style of writing renders student voices, confusion, and resistance invisible, the My Share fairy tales inevitably proceed to fantastic outcomes. Success is positioned as the result of the magical application of the techniques provided by the articles rather than the hard work of students. This structure denies agency and humanity to students (and, to a lesser degree, teachers), and perpetuates a belief that success or failure in language learning is a result of proper methodology.

Regarding research question 2, many teaching beliefs can be found in the corpus. One of the most widely displayed is that language learning requires interaction—that is, it cannot/should not be learned through teacher-centered lectures. However, the surprisingly high frequency of the term *group* in the keywords indicates a belief that group activities are not the norm in English classes in Japan. Another broad finding is that cooperative activities are preferred to competitive activities, but that the latter has a sizable following.

However, other issues are less consistent, with only a handful of benefits occurring in more than 10% of the articles. The promotion of happiness and an increase in energy levels are the most frequently used benefits in the corpus. Evidence from the activity analysis suggests that this variety may be intentional, and that authors may be making deliberate tradeoffs under the belief that no one activity or approach suffices to handle all aspects of language learning. Finally, the lack of activities related to critical thinking (such as criticism of current political, cultural, or educational systems) represents/constructs a belief that such activities are unnecessary and/or undesirable for English learning.

There are significant differences between depictions of teacher and student identity in the corpus. Teachers are portrayed as unchanging, emotionless robots, who exist less as people and more as abstract authorities. Their primary roles are to manage students and make judgments; they are not co-learners. Students have emotions, and change over the course of doing the activities, but they have little agency—they are the objects of language teaching, rather than the subjects of language learning.

Combining the visual analysis and the questionnaire data yielded information about aspects of teacher identity external to the classroom. There is a clear division between teaching and research/publication, with the latter being valued over the former. My Share offers a way for teachers who prefer teaching to acquire the publications necessary for professional employment as a teacher; however, this same opportunity could mean that activities are being "shared" more because this helps the author personally than because it is beneficial for students.

Regarding research question 3, and connected with the above discussion about teacher and student identity, almost all the power is assigned to teachers and almost none is assigned to the students. This is shown in the lexicogrammar analysis in the way agents

are depicted and the verbs they co-occur with, as well at the activity level in the paucity of lessons that truly encourage student autonomy. Students become a collective object on which language teaching practices are enacted. This power differential is a consequence of the system in a Foucauldian, panoptic manner, not the exercise of top-down force.

Regarding research question 4, the corpus contains cases of both support for and opposition to various ideologies and government policies about language teaching and learning. The focus on interactive, communicative, group-based lessons places this corpus in opposition to the "normal" focus on *juken eigo* and teacher-driven *yakudoku* language learning. *Kokusaika* is broadly supported by the corpus in that lessons are focused only on English language learning and that the U.S. and its cultural artifacts are overrepresented in the corpus. However, internationalization is rarely discussed directly in the corpus. With regards to the Japanese government's promotion of active learning and autonomy, the former seems to be, at least at a basic level, well-supported in the corpus, while the latter, as discussed above with respect to research question 3, is not. Neoliberalism is in some ways pervasive in the corpus, in that capitalism, consumerism, and students' future jobs are used as lesson topics or examples and there is an overall sense of the classroom resembling an office or factory, but there was little evidence of financial or market discourse taking over the genre itself as has occurred in other educational discourses.

Part 4 Conclusion (Chapter 13)

13. Conclusion

This project resulted in significant research implications for the fields of critical discourse analysis and teacher belief/identity. It has examined a previously unexplored genre (*My Share* articles) within an education-related discourse (practically-focused professional publications) that has rarely been explored. Furthermore, it has added to the prior research on teacher beliefs in Japan by demonstrating a large number of beliefs reflected and constructed by the My Share corpus (as discussed in detail above in Chapter 12). Most importantly, following the call of Ainsworth and Hardy (2004), it has examined the important role that discourse plays in creating and perpetuating beliefs and identities. Many of the findings on beliefs, identity, and power were possible only through detailed examination of corpus-wide trends that would not be apparent from a simple reading of the texts.

In addition to reviewing and contextualizing the main findings of this project, the conclusion chapter also provides practical implications. I have transformed these implications into a set of suggestions—first, for JALT and the My Share editors, and second for teacher-researchers in general. Regarding My Share, I recommend that the editors play a more assertive and involved role in the publication process, both to resolve confusing aspects of the genre and to alleviate some of its negative aspects. Also, I argue that if the genre were returned to the more flexible style it previously had, this might allow for a more equitable presentation of teaching and a decrease in the teacher-centered fairy-tale narratives that currently dominate the genre. Moving more generally to all cases where

teachers seek to publish information about teaching, I suggest that they consider the consequences their writing has on student and teacher potential identities. Some of the ways that teachers and students are represented in the My Share (especially the fairy-tale structure, the dehumanizing of students and teachers, and the uncritical promotion of status quo ideologies) are potentially harmful, and teachers who write or speak about their experiences and/or their students need to take care to not perpetuate inequalities and/or harmful identities.

Finally, this chapter briefly notes the limitations of this study and makes suggestions for further research. While the corpus that was studied is fairly large, if it were larger, it would be possible to make stronger claims, especially at the lexical level. Thus, future research could seek larger corpora, including the possibility of expanding the research to lesson plans published in other places (so long as such research remains grounded in the sociohistorical conditions said articles were designed for). Other linguistic features of this or other corpuses could also be examined, such as those coming from systemic functional linguistics that are favored by CDA researchers such as Fairclough (2003). Finally, it might be worthwhile to extend this project into either the classroom (to see how these activities are used in practice) or to the perspective of the reader (to see how they react to the various ideas embedded in the My Share).