

Subject Code	ENGL520
Subject Title	Critical Language and Cultural Studies
Credit Value	3
Level	5
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	N/A
Objectives	<p>This course focuses on developing an awareness of critical literacy and critical discourse analysis as a way to gain insights into the core cultural meanings in contemporary social life. We will analyse discourse in order to understand the cultural assumptions embedded within texts. More specifically, we will investigate how texts reflect power relations, political ideologies, and group identities. The subject seeks to investigate:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">How language conventions and language practices are invested with power relations and processes which people are often unaware of. It criticizes mainstream language study for taking conventions and practices at face value as objects to be described, in a way which obscures their political ideological investment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Fairclough, 1992:7)</p>
Intended Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Distinguish between the terms ‘critical thinking’ and ‘critical literacy’; b. Understand the dialectical relationship between language and society; c. Demonstrate the ability to critically examine and discuss texts in terms of prevailing social and cultural assumptions d. Analyse texts with respect to political ideologies, power relations, and group identities
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dialectical relationship between language and society • Language as a Social Construct • Critical Thinking and Critical Literacy • Key Linguistic Features for the Analysis of Texts • Metaphor Analysis • Political Ideology and Language • The Power of Images • Language and Power

Teaching/Learning Methodology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lectures with a heavy dose of interactive discussions and examples from current affairs; Powerpoints, handouts and web-based resource materials available. In-class group activities and assignments focusing on reading assignments and short analysis and discussion of selected texts. 																																																				
Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes <i>(Note 4)</i>	<table border="1" data-bbox="472 477 1417 972"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th>d</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Quizzes</td> <td>25%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Presentation</td> <td>25%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Term paper</td> <td>50%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100 %</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="472 1025 1305 1099">Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes:</p> <p data-bbox="472 1115 1417 1189">Quizzes aim to assess students' understanding of the content presented in the lectures and readings.</p> <p data-bbox="472 1227 1417 1473">Presentation: The seminar presentation is a PowerPoint presentation showcasing students' ability to apply theoretical concepts to the comparative analysis of two texts that the student has selected for analysis in the term paper. As part of this assessment, students will also be assessed on their ability to cogently question the analysis provided by their classmates.</p> <p data-bbox="472 1496 1417 1682">Term papers aim to demonstrate students' ability to apply theoretical concepts to the comparative analysis of two texts written from different viewpoints about an international news event to demonstrate the ways a particular event is construed by the media through language and discourse Length: around 4000 words.</p>							Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c	d			1. Quizzes	25%	✓	✓	✓				2. Presentation	25%			✓	✓			3. Term paper	50%			✓	✓			Total	100 %						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																																			
		a	b	c	d																																																
1. Quizzes	25%	✓	✓	✓																																																	
2. Presentation	25%			✓	✓																																																
3. Term paper	50%			✓	✓																																																
Total	100 %																																																				
Student Study Effort Expected	Class contact:																																																				
	▪ Lecture						39 Hrs.																																														
	▪ Seminar						0 Hrs.																																														
	Other student study effort:																																																				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparation for seminars and lectures 	42 Hrs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparation for assignments 	39 Hrs.
	Total student study effort	120 Hrs.
Reading List and References	<p>References</p> <p>Ahrens, Kathleen (Ed.) 2009. <i>Politics, Language and Conceptual Metaphors</i>. London: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Ahrens, Kathleen. 2009. Conceptual Metaphors. (In Chinese). In I-wen Su and Yung-O Biq (Eds.), <i>Language, Culture, and Cognition</i>. Taipei: National Taiwan University Press. pp.55-81.</p> <p>Anderson, K.V., & Sheeler, K.H. (2005). <i>Governing Codes: Gender, metaphor, and political identity</i>. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.</p> <p>Bhatia, Aditi and Jenks, Chris J (2018) ‘Fabricating the American Dream in US media portrayals of Syrian refugees: A discourse analytical study’. <i>Discourse & Communication</i> 12(3), 223-239.</p> <p>Bhatia, Aditi (2016) ‘Discursive Construction of the ‘Key’ Moment in the Umbrella Movement’. <i>Journal of Language and Politics</i> 15(5), 551-568.</p> <p>Burgers, C. & Ahrens, K. (In press). Change in metaphorical framing over time: Metaphors of TRADE in 225 years of State of the Union addresses (1790-2014). <i>Applied Linguistics</i>.</p> <p>Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2005. <i>Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor</i>. London: Macmillan.</p> <p>Cheng, W. & Lam, P. (2013). Western perceptions of Hong Kong ten years on: A corpus-based critical discourse study. <i>Applied Linguistics</i>, 34(2), 173-190. (SSCI)</p> <p>Chilton, Paul. 2004. <i>Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice</i>. London & New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Cienki, Alan. 2008. The application of conceptual metaphor theory to political discourse: methodological questions and some possible solutions. In Carver, T and Pikalo, J (ed.). <i>Political Language and Metaphor: interpreting and changing the world</i>. London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 241-256.</p> <p>Fairclough, Norman. 2001. <i>Language and Power</i>. London. London: Pearson ESL.</p> <p>Flowerdew, John and Leong, Solomon. 2007. Metaphors in the discursive construction of patriotism: the case of Hong Kong’s constitutional reform debate. <i>Discourse & Society</i>, 18(3), 273-294.</p> <p>Goatly, Andrew. 2007. <i>Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology</i>. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.</p> <p>Gonçalves, K. and Schluter, A. (2017). “Please do not leave any notes for the cleaning lady, as many do not speak English fluently”: Policy, power, and language brokering in a multilingual workplace. <i>Language Policy</i> 16 (3).</p>	

	<p>Group, Praggeljaz. 2007. MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. <i>Metaphor and Symbol</i>, 22(1), 1-39.</p> <p>Ho, V. (2010). Constructing identities through request e-mail discourse, <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i> 42(8): 2253 – 2261.</p> <p>Kövecses, Zoltán. 2003. Language, Figurative Thought, and Cross-cultural Comparison. <i>Metaphor and Symbol</i>, 18(4), 311-320.</p> <p>Ladegaard, Hans. 2011. ‘Doing power’ at work: Responding to male and female management styles in a global business corporation. <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i> 43, 4-19.</p> <p>Lakoff, George. 2002. <i>Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think (2nd Ed.)</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p> <p>Lee, Cher-Leng. 2005. Media and metaphor: Exploring the rhetoric in China’s and Hong Kong’s public discourses on Hong Kong and China. In Shi-xu, M. Kienpointner and J. Servaes (eds.). <i>Read the Cultural Other: Forms of Otherness in the Discourses of Hong Kong’s Decolonization</i>. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp.139-163.</p> <p>Musolff, Andreas and Zinken, Jorg. (eds). 2009. <i>Metaphor and Discourse</i>. Basingstroke and New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.</p> <p>Semino, Elena. and Koller, Veronika. 2009. Metaphor, politics and gender: a case study from Italy. In K. Ahrens (ed.). <i>Politics, Gender, and Conceptual Metaphors</i>. Basingstroke and New York: Palgrave-MacMillan. Pp.36-61.</p> <p>Van Dijk, Teun. 1993. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. <i>Discourse & Society</i>, 4(2), 249-283.</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Revised by Kathleen Ahrens (March 2019)