

Course Syllabus

**offered by Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2017/18**

This form is for the completion by the *Course Leader*. The information provided on this form is the official record of course. It will be used for the City University's database, various City University publications (including websites) and documentation for students and others as required.

Please refer to the Explanatory Notes attached to this form on the various items of information required.

Prepared / Last Updated by:

Name: Carl J W Ng Academic Unit: Department of English

Phone/email: 3442 8883 Date: 26 May 2016

Course Syllabus

offered by Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2017/18

Part I Course Overview

Discourse, Ideology and Power

Course Title:

EN6521

Course Code:

1 semester

Course Duration:

3

Credit Units:

P6

Level:

- Arts and Humanities
 Study of Societies, Social and Business Organisations
 Science and Technology

Proposed Area:
(for GE courses only)

English

Medium of Instruction:

English

Medium of Assessment:

Nil

Prerequisites:
(Course Code and Title)

Nil

Precursors:
(Course Code and Title)

Nil

Equivalent Courses:
(Course Code and Title)

Nil

Exclusive Courses:
(Course Code and Title)

Part II Course Details

1. Abstract

(A 150-word description about the course)

The focus of this course is on the ‘critical’ study of discourse, specifically in terms of how the use of language and other semiotic resources is implicated in (re)producing and perpetuating ideological interests and power relations in contemporary society. Students will be introduced to conceptual and analytic frameworks for the critical investigation of linguistic and visual data in various social domains and institutional settings, such as politics and governance, media and advertising, and corporate branding and communication, and be sensitized to how semiotic features reflect and enact particular ideological underpinnings, authority relations, and social currents.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

No.	CILOs [#]	Weighting* (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	A2	A3
1.	Explain the key aims, principles and methods of Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) and the key issues and concepts surrounding the practice of CDS, such as ideology, hegemony and power.		✓	✓	
2.	Develop a critical understanding of a variety of social issues and problems (e.g. racism, capitalism, gender) and their relation to discourse.		✓	✓	
3.	Analyse a variety of discourse and text types, involving a variety of social issues or problems, using CDS methods.		✓	✓	✓
4.	Evaluate the efficacy of techniques and methods of CDS and how their limitations might be ameliorated or overcome.			✓	✓
		100%			

* If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.

[#] Please specify the alignment of CILOs to the Gateway Education Programme Intended Learning outcomes (PILOs) in Section A of Annex.

A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.

A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

(TLAs designed to facilitate students’ achievement of the CILOs.)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4			
Interactive lectures,	These sessions introduce students to the key concepts and methods	✓	✓	✓				Throughout the semester

tutorial discussions	relating to the critical study of discourse, and provide opportunities for students to explore their relevance for investigating social issues and problems.							
Case study and text analysis	These hands-on activities help students to consolidate their understanding of critical approaches to the study of discourse, allowing them to develop proficiency in applying the associated analytic tools to real-life texts and issues.	✓	✓	✓				Throughout the semester
Student-led seminar discussions and presentations	Students apply and extend what they have learnt by working in groups to research particular social issues or problems using particular discourse-analytic tools, leading their peers in an exploration of the topics they have researched.	✓	✓	✓	✓			From week 5

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.					Weighting*	Remarks
	1	2	3	4			
Continuous Assessment: 100%							
Individual analysis essay	✓	✓	✓	✓		45%	Individual assessment
Seminar presentations		✓	✓	✓		40%	Group-based assessment
Class work and participation		✓	✓	✓		15%	Individual assessment
Examination: ____% (duration: _____, if applicable)							
* The weightings should add up to 100%.						100%	

5. Assessment Rubrics

(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Adequate (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. Individual analysis essay	Content, language and style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates an excellent grasp of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools; ▪ Presents a very clear, systematic, thorough and insightful analysis; ▪ All relevant information is well covered and amply evaluated; ▪ The discussion or argument is extremely coherent and well developed, with excellent integration between the various parts of the paper; ▪ Excellent quality of written English with highly appropriate style and tone; ▪ Occasional errors in grammar and word choice may occur but do not interfere with understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates a strong grasp of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools; ▪ Presents a clear and systematic analysis with some interesting insights; ▪ Relevant information is sufficiently covered and evaluated; ▪ The discussion or argument is coherent and reasonably developed, with good integration between the various parts of the paper; ▪ Good command of written English with appropriate style and tone; ▪ Some errors of grammar and word choice are present but do not interfere with understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates a basic understanding of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools; ▪ Partial analysis with some insights; ▪ Coverage of information is somewhat relevant with some evaluation; ▪ The discussion or argument is somewhat coherent and developed, with some integration between the various parts of the paper; ▪ Adequate command of written English with somewhat appropriate style and tone; ▪ Language errors sometimes affect comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shows limited understanding of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools; ▪ Partial analysis with limited insights ▪ Coverage of information is often irrelevant and largely descriptive; ▪ The discussion or argument demonstrates little coherence and development, with little integration between the various parts of the paper; ▪ Command of written English is inadequate and ideas are inaccurately expressed; ▪ Language errors impede comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shows little or no understanding of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools; ▪ Analysis is very limited or absent; ▪ Information covered is irrelevant, inaccurate and mainly descriptive; ▪ The discussion or argument is incoherent and fragmented, and the various parts of the paper are not integrated; ▪ An extremely weak command of written English that makes the essay largely unintelligible; ▪ Language errors seriously impede comprehension.
2. Seminar presentation	Content and delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shows an excellent grasp of topic, and conveys this in a very 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shows a strong grasp of topic, and conveys this in a clear and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partial grasp of topic; ▪ Analysis is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grasp of topic is highly inconsistent; ▪ Occasionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grasp of topic is weak or absent; ▪ Analysis is

		<p>clear, interesting and interactive manner;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis is highly systematic and coherent, and demonstrates a high level of depth and precision; ▪ Very perceptive observations and thought-provoking insights; ▪ Leads the class on a very effective exploration of the topic with the use of meaningful activities and appropriate materials; ▪ Delivery is very clear and in excellent spoken English. 	<p>interesting manner;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis is systematic and coherent, with appropriate depth and precision; ▪ Perceptive observations are distilled; ▪ Leads the class on an effective exploration of the topic with the use of meaningful activities and appropriate materials; ▪ Delivery is clear and in good spoken English. 	<p>somewhat systematic and coherent, albeit superficial and sometimes inaccurate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Observations are fair but can be limited; ▪ Demonstrates some attempt to lead the discussion with the use of some activities and materials; ▪ Delivery is clear in places and with an adequate command of spoken English. 	<p>coherent analysis that is largely superficial;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Observations are limited; ▪ Limited attempt at leading the discussion; ▪ Delivery is largely unclear and a command of spoken English is inadequate. 	<p>incoherent and inaccurate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Observations are limited and flawed; ▪ No attempt at leading the class in an exploration of the topic; ▪ Delivery is unclear and the command of spoken English is weak.
3. Class work and participation	Engagement and participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student is highly engaged in class/group activities and discussions, extremely pro-active in offering insightful views on topics covered, and plays a significant role in leading and steering discussions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student is engaged in class/group activities and discussions, and active in contributing insightful views on topics covered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student participates in learning activities, and offers views on topics covered from time to time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student sometimes participates in learning activities, and views on topics covered are offered infrequently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal participation in class activities.

Part III Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1. Keyword Syllabus

(An indication of the key topics of the course.)

Critical discourse studies; ideology and hegemony; power relations; identity; social actors/action; visual semiotics; multimodality; cognitive metaphor; social cognition; intertextuality; interdiscursivity; neoliberalism

2. Reading List

2.1 Compulsory Readings

(Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

1.	Machin, D. & Mayr, A. (2012). <i>How To Do Critical Discourse Analysis</i> . London: Sage.
2.	Jewitt, C. & Oyama, R. (2001). Visual meaning: A social semiotic approach. In T. van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), <i>Handbook of Visual Analysis</i> (pp. 134-156). London: Sage.
3.	Machin, D. (2004). Building the world's visual language: The increasing global importance of image banks in corporate media. <i>Visual Communication</i> , 3(3), 316-336.
4.	Thibodeau, P.H. & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphor we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 6(2), e16782. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016782.
5.	Flowerdew, J. (2004). The discursive construction of a world-class city. <i>Discourse & Society</i> , 15(5), 579-605.
6.	Fairclough, N. (2000). Language and neo-liberalism. <i>Discourse & Society</i> , 11(2), 147-148.
7.	Ng, C.J.W. (2014). Semiotizing capitalism in corporate brand enactment. <i>Critical Discourse Studies</i> , 11(2), 139-157.
8.	Koller, V. (2009). Brand Images: Multimodal metaphor in corporate branding messages. In C. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.), <i>Multimodal Metaphor</i> (pp. 45-71). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

2.2 Additional Readings

(Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

1.	Baker, P., Gabrielatos C., Khosravini, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, T. & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. <i>Discourse & Society</i> , 19(3), 273-305.
2.	Fairclough, N. (2010). <i>Critical Discourse Analysis</i> (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
3.	Fairclough, N. (2015). <i>Language and Power</i> (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
4.	Flowerdew, J. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and strategies of resistance. In V.K. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew & R.H. Jones (Eds.), <i>Advances in Discourse Studies</i> (pp. 195-210). London: Routledge.
5.	Goatly, A. (2007). <i>Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology</i> . Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
6.	Koller, V. (2010). Lesbian nation: A case of multiple interdiscursivity. In R. de Cillia, H. Gruber, M. Krzyzanowski & F. Menz (Eds.), <i>Discourse, Politics, Identity</i> (pp. 369-381). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
7.	Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). <i>Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design</i> (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
8.	Thompson, G. (2004). <i>Introducing Functional Grammar</i> (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
9.	Mautner, G. (2005). The entrepreneurial university: A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword. <i>Critical Discourse Studies</i> , 2(2), 95-120.
10.	van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), <i>Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis</i> (pp. 32-70). London: Routledge.