

EN5491: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Effective Term

Semester A 2025/26

Part I Course Overview

Course Title

Discourse Analysis

Subject Code

EN - English

Course Number

5491

Academic Unit

English (EN)

College/School

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CH)

Course Duration

One Semester

Credit Units

3

Level

P5, P6 - Postgraduate Degree

Medium of Instruction

English

Medium of Assessment

English

Prerequisites

Nil

Precursors

Nil

Equivalent Courses

Nil

Exclusive Courses

Nil

Part II Course Details

Abstract

This course provides participants with the opportunity to analyse various properties of English written texts and spoken texts, and how such properties are implicated by the nature of the English language and various exigencies of

communicating in diverse contexts. The course also develops students' ability to apply meta-language and analytical skills that can be used to analyse written texts and spoken texts. Students will also develop the ability to propose implications for the research and teaching of English in different academic and professional contexts.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

CILOs		Weighting (if DEC-A1 app.)		DEC-A2	DEC-A3
1	1a. outline a set of concepts and theories relating to discourse studies (e.g., genre theory, register, coherence, speech acts, cooperative principles) in written and spoken texts 1b. make use of some established meta-language when describing the meanings of the concepts and the theories.	50	x		
2	2a. by applying the concepts, theories and meta-language listed in CILO 1, identify, describe and interpret different textual and interactional phenomena characteristic of specific genres (e.g., academic articles, websites, promotional materials, conversations, etc.); 2b. analyse and apply some established procedures when performing the type of analysis described in 2a.	20		x	x
3	3a. describe and critically evaluate the discourse and pragmatic approaches to the analysis of texts, genres and interactions; 3b. by drawing on the concepts, theories, and approaches learned in CILOs 1-3a, present critical analyses of written and spoken discourses from a range of genres.	20	x		
4	4a. propose implications for the research and teaching of discourse based on your research findings.	10		x	x

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 real-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.

Learning and Teaching Activities (LTAs)

3	Interactive lectures, in-class exploratory tasks, in-class discussions	Students will learn to describe and critically evaluate the discourse approach to the critical analysis of written texts and spoken texts through interactive lectures and participating in in-class exploratory tasks. They will also be guided to discuss how the knowledge and insights gained from the activities can have implications for research and pedagogy in English language teaching and learning; Students will be led through in-class discussions to apply what they have learned in the previous tasks to describe, identify, interpret and evaluate the characteristic features of written and spoken texts. They will be also guided to make suggestions to improve research and pedagogy in English language teaching and learning.	3	3 weeks
---	--	--	---	---------

Assessment Tasks / Activities (ATs)

	ATs	CILO No.	Weighting (%)	Remarks ("- " for nil entry)	Allow Use of GenAI?
1	Individual Research Paper Students will analyze (i.e., identify, describe and interpret) the textual or discourse features of a given text. To carry out the analysis, students will be required to draw on the various concepts, theories and meta-language learned as described in CILO1 and follow the methods and procedures developed as described in CILO2. In performing the research and analysis of the given text, students will need to draw on the concepts, theories and approaches described in CILO3 and CILO4, and also the insights gained in the Learning Activities listed for CILOs 3 and 4. Students will be required to produce a 2,000-2,500-word paper to report and discuss the analysis carried out in the project. In so doing, they will need to apply the concepts, theories, approaches and metalanguage listed for CILOs 1-4.	1, 2, 3, 4	70	Individual	Yes

2	Group Oral Presentation Students will analyze (i.e., to identify, describe and interpret) the discourse features of a self-chosen spoken text. To carry out the analysis, they will be required to draw on the various concepts, theories and metalanguage learned as described in CILO1 and follow the methods and procedures developed as described in CILO2. Students will be required to collaborate in groups to produce a 20-minute talk to report and discuss the analysis carried out in the project. In so doing, they will need to apply the concepts, theories, approaches and metalanguage listed for CILOs 1-4.	1, 3, 4	30	Group and individually assessed	Yes
---	---	---------	----	---------------------------------	-----

Continuous Assessment (%)

100

Additional Information for ATs

Students are permitted to use AI, insofar as it is accordance with university policy. The course instructor requires a declaration of such use.

Assessment Rubrics (AR)**Assessment Task**

Group Oral Presentation (30%)

Criterion

Content, Analysis, Organization (25%)(group-assessed)

Excellent

(A+, A, A-)

- The topic is extremely well-presented and analyzed;
- All relevant information is excellently covered;
- The purpose of analyzing and presenting the material is completely achieved;
- Style and tone are highly appropriate.

Good

(B+, B, B-)

- The topic is competently presented and very well analyzed;
- The information is sufficiently covered;
- The purpose of analyzing and presenting the material is achieved;
- Style and tone are appropriate.

Fair

(C+, C, C-)

- The topic is adequately presented and analysed;
- Only part of information is included;
- The purpose of analysing and presenting the material is only partially achieved;
- Style and tone are somewhat appropriate.

Marginal

(D)

- The topic is sketchily presented and analysed;
- Only limited information is included;
- The purpose of analysing and presenting the material is barely achieved
- Style and tone are adequate.

Failure

(F)

- The topic is highly inadequate in its presentation and is very badly analyzed;
- Very limited or inaccurate information is included;
- The purpose of analyzing and presenting the material is not achieved in any way;
- Style and tone are completely inappropriate.

Assessment Task

Group Oral Presentation (30%) - continued

Criterion

Language (5%)(individually-assessed)

Excellent

(A+, A, A-)

- The presentation is delivered in fluent, clear and accurate English

Good

(B+, B, B-)

- The presentation is delivered in largely fluent, clear and accurate English

Fair

(C+, C, C-)

- The presentation is delivered in fairly clear and accurate English.

Marginal

(D)

- Spoken English is comprehensible but the standard of the spoken English may need improvement

Failure

(F)

- Significant problems in the standard of the spoken English
-

Assessment Task

Individual Research Paper (70%)

Criterion

Content, Analysis, Organization, Language

Excellent

(A+, A, A-)

- Shows full understanding of main concepts;
- The written text is comprehensively analyzed;
- The findings are comprehensively discussed with reference to the literature reviewed;
- Shows full ability to draw logical conclusions;
- Shows full ability to suggest logical implications for English language teaching and research;
- Style and tone are highly appropriate

Good

(B+, B, B-)

- Shows competent understanding of main concepts;
- The written text is sufficiently analyzed;
- The findings are competently discussed with reference to the literature reviewed;
- Shows competent ability to suggest logical implications for English language teaching and research;
- Style and tone are appropriate

Fair

(C+, C, C-)

- Shows sufficient understanding of main concepts;
- Only partial analysis of the written text is provided;
- The findings are partially discussed with occasional reference to the literature;
- Shows sufficient ability to suggest logical implications for English language teaching and research;
- Style and tone are somewhat appropriate

Marginal

(D)

- Shows sketchy understanding of main concepts;
- Only sketchy analysis of the written text is provided;
- The findings are sketchily discussed with occasional reference to the literature;
- Shows limited ability to suggest logical implications for English language teaching and research;
- Style and tone are marginally appropriate

Failure

(F)

- Shows inadequate understanding of main concepts
- The analysis of the written text is not at all comprehensible;
- The findings are inadequately discussed with little reference to the literature;
- Shows inadequate ability to suggest logical implications for English language teaching and research;
- Style and tone are completely inappropriate

Part III Other Information

Keyword Syllabus

Coherence; cohesion; context; conversation analysis; critical discourse analysis; evidentiality; gendered discourse; genre; incivility; metadiscourse; modality; multi-modality; stance; politeness

Reading List

Compulsory Readings

Title	
1	Flowerdew, J. (2013). Discourse in English Language Education. London: Routledge.

Additional Readings

Title	
1	Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2	Bowles, (2006). Bridging the gap between conversation analysis and ESP – an applied study of the opening sequences of NS and NNS service telephone calls. English for Specific Purposes 25 332–357.
3	Carrell, P.L. (1982). Cohesion is not coherence. TESOL Quarterly, 16 479-488.
4	Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5	Cheng, W. & Mok, E. (2008). Discourse processes and products: Land surveyors in Hong Kong. English for Specific Purposes, 27 (1) 57-73.
6	Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students. (pp.1-21). New York: Routledge.
7	Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
8	Hyland, K. (2004). Genre and second language writing. (Chapters 5 and 7). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
9	Kwan, B.S.C. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of Applied Linguistics. English for Specific Purposes, 25 30-55.
10	Lee, I. (1998). Enhancing ESL students' awareness of coherence-creating mechanisms in writing. TESL Canada Journal, 15(2), 36-49.
11	McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse analysis for language teachers. Chapter 2. Cambridge: CUP.
12	Paltridge, B. (2022). Discourse analysis. Second edition. London: Bloomsbury.
13	Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. Language Learning 59(4): 796–824
14	Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. London: Sage.