City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus

offered by Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2017 / 2018

Part I   Course Overview

Course Title:	Discourse, Ideology and Power
Course Code:	EN6521
Course Duration:	1 semester
Credit Units:	3
Level:	P6
Medium of Instruction:	English
Medium of Assessment:	English
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)*	Nil

Part II   Course Details

1.   **Abstract**

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%			

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, tutorial discussions	These sessions introduce students to the key concepts and methods relating to the critical study of discourse, and provide opportunities for students to explore their relevance for investigating social issues and problems.	✓	✓	✓				Throughout the semester
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)								
							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-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. Individual analysis essay	Content, language and style	▪ Demonstrates an excellent grasp of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools;	▪ Demonstrates a strong grasp of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools;	▪ Demonstrates a basic understanding of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools;	▪ Shows limited understanding of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools;	▪ Shows little or no understanding of key terms, concepts and/or analytic tools;
		▪ Presents a very clear, systematic, thorough and insightful analysis;	▪ Presents a clear and systematic analysis with some interesting insights;	▪ Partial analysis with some insights;	▪ Partial analysis with limited insights	▪ Analysis is very limited or absent;
		▪ All relevant information is well covered and amply evaluated;	▪ Relevant information is sufficiently covered and evaluated;	▪ Coverage of information is somewhat relevant with some evaluation;	▪ Coverage of information is often irrelevant and largely descriptive;	▪ Information covered is irrelevant, inaccurate and mainly descriptive;
		▪ The discussion or argument is extremely coherent and well developed, with excellent	▪ The discussion or argument is coherent and reasonably developed, with good integration	▪ The discussion or argument is somewhat coherent and developed, with some integration	▪ The discussion or argument demonstrates little coherence and development, with	▪ The discussion or argument is incoherent and fragmented, and the various parts of the

		integration between the various parts of the paper;	between the various parts of the paper;	between the various parts of the paper;	little integration between the various parts of the paper;	paper are not integrated;
		▪ Excellent quality of written English with highly appropriate style and tone;	▪ Good command of written English with appropriate style and tone;	▪ Adequate command of written English with somewhat appropriate style and tone;	▪ Command of written English is inadequate and ideas are inaccurately expressed;	▪ An extremely weak command of written English that makes the essay largely unintelligible;
		▪ Occasional errors in grammar and word choice may occur but do not interfere with understanding.	▪ Some errors of grammar and word choice are present but do not interfere with understanding.	▪ Language errors sometimes affect comprehension.	▪ Language errors impede comprehension.	▪ Language errors seriously impede comprehension.
2. Seminar presentation	Content and delivery	▪ Shows an excellent grasp of topic, and conveys this in a very clear, interesting and interactive manner;	▪ Shows a strong grasp of topic, and conveys this in a clear and interesting manner;	▪ Partial grasp of topic;	▪ Grasp of topic is highly inconsistent;	▪ Grasp of topic is weak or absent;
		▪ Analysis is highly systematic and coherent, and	▪ Analysis is systematic and coherent, with	▪ Analysis is somewhat systematic and	▪ Occasionally coherent analysis that is largely	▪ Analysis is incoherent and inaccurate;

		demonstrates a high level of depth and precision;	appropriate depth and precision;	coherent, albeit superficial and sometimes inaccurate;	superficial;
		▪ Very perceptive observations and thought-provoking insights;	▪ Perceptive observations are distilled;	▪ Observations are fair but can be limited;	▪ Observations are limited;	▪ Observations are limited and flawed;
		▪ Leads the class on a very effective exploration of the topic with the use of meaningful activities and appropriate materials;	▪ Leads the class on an effective exploration of the topic with the use of meaningful activities and appropriate materials;	▪ Demonstrates some attempt to lead the discussion with the use of some activities and materials;	▪ Limited attempt at leading the discussion;	▪ No attempt at leading the class in an exploration of the topic;
		▪ Delivery is very clear and in excellent spoken English.	▪ Delivery is clear and in good spoken English.	▪ Delivery is clear in places and with an adequate command of spoken English.	▪ Delivery is largely unclear and a command of spoken English in inadequate.	▪ Delivery is unclear and the command of spoken English in weak.
3. Class work and participation	Engagement and participation	▪ Student is highly engaged in class/group activities	▪ Student is engaged in class/group activities and	▪ Student participates in learning activities, and offers views on	▪ Student sometimes participates in learning activities,	▪ Minimal participation in class activities.

		and discussions, extremely pro-active in offering insightful views on topics covered, and plays a significant role in leading and steering discussions.	discussions, and active in contributing insightful views on topics covered.	topics covered from time to time.	and views on topics covered are offered infrequently.	

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). *How To Do Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
2.	Jewitt, C. & Oyama, R. (2001). Visual meaning: A social semiotic approach. In T. van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Visual Analysis* (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. *Visual Communication, 3*(3), 316-336.
4.	Thibodeau, P.H. & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphor we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE, 6*(2), e16782. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016782.
5.	Flowerdew, J. (2004). The discursive construction of a world-class city. *Discourse & Society*, *15*(5), 579-605.
6.	Fairclough, N. (2000). Language and neo-liberalism. *Discourse & Society, 11*(2), 147-148.
7.	Ng, C.J.W. (2014). Semioticizing capitalism in corporate brand enactment. *Critical Discourse Studies, 11*(2), 139-157.
8.	Koller, V. (2009). Brand Images: Multimodal metaphor in corporate branding messages. In C. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.), *Multimodal Metaphor* (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., Khosravinik, 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. *Discourse & Society, 19*(3), 273-305.
2.	Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
3.	Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and Power* (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.), *Advances in Discourse Studies* (pp. 195-210). London: Routledge.
5.	Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. 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.), *Discourse, Politics, Identity* (pp. 369-381). Tubingen: Stauffenburg.
7.	Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
8.	Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
9.	Mautner, G. (2005). The entrepreneurial university: A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword. *Critical Discourse Studies, 2*(2), 95–120.
10.	van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 32-70). London: Routledge.