

Hong Kong Shue Yan University
Department of English Language & Literature
2nd term, 2021-2022

Course Title: Discourse Analysis
Course Code: ENG 270
Year of Study: 2nd and 3rd
Number of Credits: 3
Number of QF Credits: 12
Duration in Weeks: 15
Contact Hours per Week: 3
Pre-requisite(s): ENG160 Introduction to Linguistics
Prepared by: Dr. Sherman LEE

Course Aims

Discourse analysis (DA) is concerned with the examination of language in use. It encompasses a diversity of approaches with which to describe and explain the structure and function of texts, and how they communicate meaning in different social and situational contexts. This course aims to introduce students to some of the fundamental concepts and methods for describing and analysing written, spoken and visual discourse. Authentic examples of texts will be drawn from a variety of genres for illustration (e.g. conversations, speeches, academic writing, newspaper articles, internet communication, advertisements). Students will be encouraged to collect and analyse their own data for their assignments.

Course Outcomes, Teaching Activities and Assessment

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)	
Upon completion of this course students should be able to:	
CILO1	Distinguish between different types and genres of texts produced in different social and situational contexts, and describe their structural features and communicative functions
CILO2	Explain fundamental concepts, terms and methods associated with key approaches to discourse analysis
CILO3	Apply such concepts, terms and methods to the examination of written, spoken and visual texts of various genres
CILO4	Synthesise and utilise their discourse analytic knowledge and skills to critically analyse and evaluate authentic texts and discourse practices

Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)	
TLA1	Interactive lectures introducing key concepts and skills
TLA2	In-class analysis of written, spoken and visual texts
TLA3	Group presentations and discussions
TLA4	Consultations on data collection and analysis for group project and term paper

Assessment Tasks (ATs)			
		Group	Individual
AT1	Class participation Active participation in lessons; contribution to class discussions and activities		10%
AT2	Mid-term quiz A two-hour closed-book quiz on DA concepts, terms and methods covered in the first half of the course		20%
AT3	Group poster presentation and discussion In small groups of 3-4, students prepare a poster and give an oral presentation (approx. 30 minutes) on a selected topic, illustrated with authentic data, to demonstrate their understanding and application of relevant DA concepts	25%	10%
AT4	Term paper Individual paper (approx. 2000 words) presenting an in-depth and critical analysis of a piece of authentic written, spoken, visual or multi-modal text, using one or more DA approaches covered in the course		35%
	TOTAL	100%	

Alignment of Course Intended Learning Outcomes, Teaching and Learning Activities and Assessment Tasks		
Course Intended Learning Outcomes	Teaching and Learning Activities	Assessment Tasks
CILO1	TLA1,2,3	AT1,2,3,4
CILO2	TLA1,2,3	AT1,2,3,4
CILO3	TLA2,3,4	AT1,2,3,4
CILO4	TLA2,3,4	AT3,4

Distribution of Notional Learning Hours/ QF Credits

Activity	Notional Learning Hours (NLHs)
Contact Hours (a)	
Lecture	26
Tutorial	13
Consultation	1
TOTAL:	40
Self-Study Hours (b)	
Reading	24
Revision for quiz	6
Preparation for group poster and presentation	25
Term paper	25
TOTAL:	80
Total NLHs: (a)+(b)	120
QF Credits: (Total NLHs/10)	12

Course Outline

1	Course introduction Definitions; discourse, text, context <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). A1-10, B1. <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Johnstone (2018). Ch1.
2	Genre Genre, communicative purpose, discourse community, intertextuality, move analysis <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). A3, B3, C3, D3, D2(B) <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Johnstone (2018). 6.1, 6.5. Nunan (2008).
3-4	Speech acts Speech act theory, direct and indirect speech acts, felicity conditions <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). B5 (pp. 62-65), C5, D5(A). <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Cutting (2015). A3, B3, C3, D3. Johnstone (2018). 3.1. Yule (1996). Ch6.
5	The ethnography of communication Speech community, communicative competence, units of interaction, Hymes' SPEAKING grid <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). A7, B7, C7, D7. <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Saville-Troike (2003). pp. 1-40
6-7	Cohesion, coherence, discourse structure Context and cotext, cohesive devices, cohesion and coherence, knowledge structures, information structure, thematic structure <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). A2, B2, C2, D2(A). <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Cutting (2015). A2, B2, C2, D2. Johnstone (2018). 4.2, 4.3.
8	Reading week
9	Mid-term review and quiz / Consultations for groupwork
10	Group presentations
11-12	Discourse analysis and talk Features of talk and conversation, principles and focuses of conversation analysis <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). A5, B5 (pp. 65-68), (B6, C6, D6). <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Cutting (2015). A4, B4, C4, D4.

	Cutting & Fordyce (2021). D2 Jones (2016). Ch1, Ch5. Thornbury (2005). Ch4.
13	Critical discourse analysis Principles and goals of CDA, discourse as social practice, power and ideology <u>Required reading:</u> Jones (2019). A4, B4, C4, D4(A). <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Johnstone (2018). Ch2, 5.1, 5.3 Van Dijk T.A. (2015).
14	Multimodal discourse analysis Semiotic resources, multimodality and multimodal literacy, multimodal texts <u>Required reading:</u> Jones, R. (2019). <i>Discourse Analysis</i> . London: Routledge. A9, B9, C9, D9. <u>Supplementary reading:</u> Van Leeuwen (2015). O'Halloran (2021).
15	Reading week

Resources

Required text:

Jones, R. (2019). *Discourse analysis: A resource book for students. 2nd Edition*. London: Routledge.

Supplementary and further reading:

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Sage.

Cutting, J. (2015). *Pragmatics: A resource book for students* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Cutting, J., & Fordyce, K. (2021). *Pragmatics: A resource book for students* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Gee, J.P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.

Hyland, K., Paltridge, B., and Wong, L. (Eds.). (2021). *The Bloomsbury handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (2014). *The discourse reader*. Routledge.

Jewitt, C. (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal literacy*. Routledge.

Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis. 3rd Edition*. Blackwell.

Jones, R.H. (2016). *Spoken discourse*. Bloomsbury.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2021). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Nunan, D. (2008). Exploring genre and register in contemporary English. *English Today*, 24(2), 56-61.

O'Halloran, K.L. (2021). Multimodal discourse analysis. In K. Hyland, B. Paltridge, and L. Wong

- (Eds.). (2021). *The Bloomsbury handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). (pp. 249-266). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Paltridge, B. (2021) *Discourse analysis: an introduction*. Bloomsbury.
- Richardson, J. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication*. Blackwell.
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H.E. & Schiffrin, D. (Eds.). (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Wiley Blackwell.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *Beyond the sentence*. Macmillan.
- Van Dijk T.A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H.E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). (pp. 466-485). Wiley Blackwell.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2015). Multimodality. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H.E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). (pp. 447-465). Wiley Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

(Additional texts and readings may be provided in class).

Academic Honesty

You are expected to do your own work. Dishonesty in fulfilling any assignment undermines the learning process and the integrity of your college degree. Engaging in dishonest or unethical behavior is forbidden and will result in disciplinary action, specifically a failing grade on the assignment with no opportunity for resubmission. A second infraction will result in an F for the course and a report to University officials. Examples of prohibited behavior include, but are not limited to:

- Cheating – an act of deception by which a student misleadingly demonstrates that s/he has mastered information on an academic exercise. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - Copying or allowing another to copy a test, quiz, paper, or project;
 - Submitting a paper or major portions of a paper that has been previously submitted for another class without permission of the current instructor;
 - Turning in written assignments that are not your own work (including homework);
- Plagiarism – the act of representing the work of another as one's own without giving credit:
 - Failing to give credit for ideas and material taken from others;
 - Representing another's artistic or scholarly work as one's own;
- Fabrication – the intentional use of invented information or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive.

To comply with the University's policy, any written work has to be submitted to VeriGuide.

Assessment rubrics for class participation (AT1) (10%)

Assessment criteria	Exemplary	Competent	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Preparation for class	Evidence of extensive preparation for every session	Evidence of adequate preparation for most sessions	Preparation for class is inconsistent	Little evidence of preparation for class
Level of engagement	Proactively contributes to every session by offering relevant ideas and asking / responding to questions during class and group discussions, or online breakout rooms	Contributes to most sessions by offering relevant ideas and asking / responding to questions during class and group discussions, or online breakout rooms	Rarely contributes ideas, or asks questions during class and group discussions, or online breakout rooms; offers only minimal responses when called upon	Never contributes ideas, or asks /responds to questions in class and group discussions; does not participate in online breakout rooms
Attitude towards learning	Displays a consistently high level of interest and positive attitude towards learning; attends all sessions or views recordings to catch up on missed lectures	Generally displays interest and positive attitude to learning; attends most sessions or views recordings to catch up on missed lectures	Displays inconsistent attitude towards learning; often misses sessions and only occasionally views missed lecture content	Displays passive attitude and noticeable lack of interest in course content; makes little or no effort to attend sessions or view missed lecture content
Classroom behaviour and netiquette	Punctual to every session; always shows respect to other classroom or online participants; student's presence enhances class cohesion and dynamics	Punctual to most sessions; shows respect to other classroom or online participants; student's presence usually enhances class cohesion and dynamics	Sessions at times disrupted by student's late arrival, other interruptions or lack of cooperation and (n)etiquette: e.g. joins online meetings but frequently 'away from desk'	Sessions often disrupted by student's late arrival, other interruptions or lack of cooperation and (n)etiquette: e.g. joins online meetings but always 'away from desk'

Assessment rubrics for poster presentation and discussion (AT3) – (i) Group score (25%)

Assessment criteria	Exemplary	Competent	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Preparation and content of poster (Weighting 50%)	Evidence of extensive preparation and research effort	Evidence of adequate preparation and research effort	Not fully prepared, inconsistent effort put into task	Little evidence of preparation and effort
	Purpose clear and well-defined; content is relevant and focused	Purpose generally clear; content mostly relevant and on topic	Purpose not entirely clear; poster contains some irrelevant content	Purpose not stated or defined; content of poster lacks focus and clarity
	Details capture key information about topic, creates interest and enhances audience understanding	Details mostly informative and contributes to audience understanding of topic	Details too general; informational gaps need to be filled in to help audience understand	Poster communicates limited information about topic
	Accurate and convincing examination of authentic data demonstrating exceptional understanding of relevant DA concepts	Generally accurate and convincing examination of authentic data demonstrating good understanding of relevant DA concepts	Incomplete examination of data, with occasional inaccuracies, demonstrating only basic understanding of DA concepts	Limited or superficial examination of data, with frequent inaccuracies, demonstrating poor understanding of DA concepts
	Reliable and multiple reference sources used to support ideas	Mostly reliable and relevant reference sources used to support ideas	Limited or unreliable reference sources used to support ideas	No reference sources used to support ideas
Poster layout, design and mechanics (Weighting 30%)	Poster has excellent design and clear layout; ideas follow logical and engaging sequence	Poster is clearly designed; ideas follow logical sequence	Design and layout of poster or flow of ideas confusing in parts	Poster is poorly designed or lacks structure
	Interesting and effective visuals and graphics employed to enrich or reinforce presentation	Appropriate visuals and graphics employed to support presentation	Visuals and graphics employed to support presentation but not all are effective or related to content	Visuals and graphics irrelevant or detract from content of presentation
	Few or no language errors in usage, grammar and spelling	Minor errors in usage, grammar or spelling	Obvious errors in usage, grammar or spelling which interfere with meaning	Frequent errors in usage, grammar and spelling which obscure meaning
Teamwork and time management (Weighting 20%)	Strong team dynamics; members worked effectively together to achieve intended objectives and deliver presentation within given time	Good team dynamics; members mostly worked well together to achieve intended objectives and deliver presentation within given time	Evidence of teamwork, but occasional problems with team dynamics and time management	No evidence of teamwork; poor division of labour and time management

Assessment rubrics for poster presentation and discussion (AT3) – (ii) Individual score (10%)

Assessment criteria	Exemplary	Competent	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Delivery of oral presentation and language (Weighting 60%)	Presentation delivered in natural, confident and enthusiastic manner, with effective use of voice and nonverbal cues	Presentation mostly delivered in natural and confident manner, with sufficient use of voice and nonverbal cues	Presenters appear hesitant and use limited or inappropriate nonverbal cues	Presenters appear uninterested, and make ineffective use of voice and nonverbal cues
	Few or no language errors in usage, grammar and pronunciation	Minor errors in usage, grammar or pronunciation	Obvious errors in usage, grammar or pronunciation which interfere with meaning	Frequent errors in usage, grammar and pronunciation which obscure meaning
Contribution and discussion (Weighting 40%)	Speaker actively engages with audience and contributes to facilitating post-presentation discussion. Responses to audience's questions are thorough with clear explanations and elaboration	Speaker attempts to engage with audience. Responses to audience's questions are adequate.	Speaker does not actively engage with audience but attempts to answer audience's questions with some difficulty.	Little or no attempt to interact with audience; responses to questions are incorrect or incomplete

Assessment Rubrics for Term Paper (AT4) (35%)

Assessment criteria	Exemplary	Competent	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Depth and breadth of knowledge (Weighting: 30%)	Appropriate, interesting and original piece of authentic text collected or chosen for examination;	Appropriate piece of authentic text collected or chosen for examination;	Text chosen for examination is authentic but not entirely appropriate;	Text chosen for examination is inappropriate or not authentic;
	Clear and accurate description of selected data using precise and appropriate topic-specific vocabulary, showing strong understanding of relevant DA concepts and terms;	Mostly clear and accurate description of selected data using appropriate topic-specific vocabulary, showing understanding of most relevant DA concepts and terms;	Description of selected data not entirely clear, or inaccurate use of topic-specific vocabulary; some key DA concepts and terms relevant to data overlooked or misunderstood;	Inaccurate or no description of data; little or no evidence of understanding of DA concepts and terms
	Clear evidence of a wide range of relevant sources consulted to explore the topic and support the research.	Relevant sources consulted to explore the topic and support the research.	A limited number of sources used to support the research; some sources not entirely relevant.	Little or no evidence of reading or research relevant to the question or topic.

Critical thinking and depth of analysis (Weighting: 30%)	Suitable DA theories and methodology chosen to analyse the data, with very clear and accurate explanation of selected approach;	Mostly suitable DA theories and methodology chosen to analyse the data, with some clear and accurate explanation of selected approach;	DA theories and methodology chosen to analyse the data not entirely appropriate; or selected approach not entirely understood;	Little or no attempt to make use of appropriate DA theories or methodology;
	Selected approach correctly applied to provide an in-depth, accurate, critical and convincing analysis of the data. Meaningful conclusions drawn and important implications raised;	Selected approach adequately applied to provide a mostly accurate and convincing analysis of the data. Some appropriate and meaningful conclusions drawn;	Theory or methodology inaccurately applied to the analysis of data. Basic conclusions drawn but not entirely supported by evidence or argument;	Little or no attempt to analyse the data; reliance on presenting disconnected excerpts of data without interpretation. Conclusion missing or vague and unrelated to the whole;
	Work demonstrates sophisticated and original thought going beyond what was presented in class or in assigned readings.	Work is adequate and shows understanding of what was presented in class or in assigned readings but does not go much beyond that.	Work demonstrates superficial thinking and narrow understanding of core ideas presented in class or in assigned readings.	Work based on little relevant or accurate information, and reflects a failure to understand even core ideas presented in class, or to address core issues required to answer the assignment question.
Organisation and flow (Weighting: 15%)	Ideas effectively structured with a clear, logical flow, resulting in a very coherent and easy to read paper.	Ideas mainly well-structured with a generally clear, logical flow, resulting in a coherent paper.	Structure and flow of ideas not always clear or logical, resulting in a paper that is not entirely coherent.	Ideas poorly structured and unclear or illogical, resulting in a paper that is difficult to read.
Language use and clarity of writing (Weighting: 15%)	Expression clear, fluent and precise; tone and style highly appropriate for purpose and audience; virtually no errors in grammar, word choice, spelling and punctuation.	Expression mostly clear and precise, tone and style mostly appropriate for purpose and audience; minor errors in grammar, word choice, spelling or punctuation.	Expression frequently unclear; tone and style not always appropriate; significant errors in grammar, word choice, spelling or punctuation.	Expression is unclear, resulting in ambiguous meaning; tone and style inappropriate; frequent or major errors in grammar, word choice, spelling or punctuation.
Conventions and formatting (Weighting: 10% of total score)	Adheres to all length and formatting requirements, and all academic writing conventions, including appropriate use of source materials, accurate in-text citations and referencing.	Generally adheres to length and formatting requirements and academic writing conventions, including appropriate use of source materials, and mostly accurate in-text citations and referencing.	Minimally adheres to length and formatting requirements, and academic writing conventions; source materials not always appropriately used, or many errors in citations and referencing.	Length and formatting requirements, and academic writing conventions largely ignored; inappropriate use of source materials, or lack of citations and referencing, raising questions of plagiarism.