Department of English, Stockholm University

ENDA75, Discourse Analysis (MA, advanced level course)

Course leader:
Prof. Maria Kuteeva (maria.kuteeva@english.su.se)

Course overview:
The course focuses on the study of language in action by examining discourse in relation to the social contexts in which it occurs. It provides students with an overview of different approaches to discourse analysis, as well as theoretical and methodological tools used in discourse analytical research. The practical component of the course involves collecting and analyzing authentic data using a variety of theories and methods studied in the course.

How do humans actually use language to communicate? How do speech and writing differ? In what ways do factors like context and cultural influences affect people's language use? These are some of the questions addressed in this course on discourse analysis.

Learning outcomes:
By the end of the course, the student is expected to be able to:

- Select and justify the use of a specific discourse analysis theory, method or framework depending on the type of data and purpose of the study;
- Apply a variety of methods to analyse spoken and written discourse;
- Interpret the findings from own discourse analysis in the context of recent research in the field;
- Express themselves in academic English.

Teaching:
Form of teaching for HT24:

On-campus seminars and online tasks, 80% participation required.

The course will take place in the form of seminars, where students will discuss the readings and complete discourse analysis tasks. Seminars are intended to be active, hands-on opportunities for students to practice the skills they will learn throughout the module. Prior to each seminar, the course participants are required to write a reflection on the assigned readings and post it in the online forum (on Athena). Students are also required to complete outlines and drafts of their written assignment and to participate in peer review tasks.

Students are expected to participate actively in the seminars by doing the assigned reading and taking part in classroom discussions. To receive a pass grade, each student needs to do an oral presentation based on the topic of their written assignment.

Examination:

1. Students are expected to participate actively in the seminars by doing all assigned reading, taking part in classroom discussions, and submitting tasks online (Athena). At least 80% attendance of the seminars is required. Missed seminars must be made up by submitting a summary of the required readings for the session and completing in-class tasks in writing.

2. Each student is required to give a short oral presentation on their research project (work in progress).
3. At the end of the course, students are expected to submit a final research project focusing on a specific area of discourse.
   This assignment must include the following components: brief introduction, literature review, method description, data analysis and results, and discussion and conclusion.

The following will also be taken into account when assessing written and spoken tasks: theoretical and terminological accuracy; coherence of argumentation; use of relevant sources; language use.

The final grade will be given as follows:
- Written assignment (grade A—F; 100%)
  A small-scale research project, should contain at least 8 references to relevant literature on the selected topic (3000 words).
- Oral presentation (pass/fail)
  Each student is expected to give a 5-minute presentation on the topic of their final written assignment. Further instructions will be given during the course. The oral presentations will take place at the course symposium. It is important for all students to attend to show solidarity towards everyone in the group.

Seminar schedule:

Seminar	Topic	Individual tasks and readings before seminar
1	Discourse Analysis: Introduction and overview	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: Paltridge, *DA*, chapters 1& 2; Jaworski, 2015.
2	Discourse, pragmatics and conversation	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: *DA*, chapters 3 & 5. Nguyen & Nguyen (2017).
3	Genre approaches to DA	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: Paltridge, *DA*, chapter 4; *BCDA*, Tardy, chapter 4; Bondi 2018.
4	Corpus approaches to DA	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: Paltridge, *DA,* chapter 7; Biber & Gray 2010; Hyland 2005; Hyland & Jiang 2017
5	Critical Discourse Analysis; Discussion of essay topics and outlines	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: Paltridge, *DA*, chapter 10; Thurlow 2020; Bednarek & Caple 2017.

6	CDA (continued) and multimodal approaches to DA	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: *DA,* chapter 8; Anderson 2020; Two individually chosen articles for the written assignment; After: Prepare an essay outline (about 500 words – consult *DA*, chapter 11)
7	Discourse and digital media; Peer review and discussion of essay outlines	Read the texts and post reflection on Athena: *DA*, chapter 9. Bolander & Locher 2020; Kuteeva & Mauranen 2018.
8	Course symposium	Prepare a 5-min presentation based on the essay topic, post an abstract (c. 150 words) on Athena and upload the slides

DATE – 19 January 2025: submit your final assignment on Athena.
Retake for the final assignment: 23 February 2025, oral presentation – 5 weeks after seminar 8, date to be confirmed.

Required reading:

Selected chapters from two textbooks:

Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. (2011). *Bloomsbury companion to discourse analysis*. London: Bloomsbury. (*BCDA*)
Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. 3rd edition. London: Bloomsbury. (*DA*)

Journal articles:

- Anderson, H. (2020). Nature, nationalism and neoliberalism on food packaging: The case of Sweden. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 34, 1-9.
- Bednarek, M. & Caple, H. (2014). Why do news values matter? Towards a new methodological framework for analyzing news discourse in Critical Discourse Analysis and beyond. *Discourse & Society*, 25(2), 135-158.
- Bednarek, M. & Caple, H. (2017). *The discourse of news values*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 4, pp. 77-106.
- Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2010). Challenging stereotypes about academic writing: Complexity, elaboration and explicitness. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*, 2-20.
- Bolander, B. & Locher, M. (2020). Beyond the online offline distinction: Entry points to digital discourse. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 35, 1-7.
- Bondi, M. (2018). *Try to prove me wrong*: Dialogicity and audience involvement in economics blogs. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 24, 33-42.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Hyland, K. & Jiang, F. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal? *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 40-51.
- Jaworski, A. (2015). *Globalese*: A new visual-linguistic register. *Social Semiotics*, 1-18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2015.1010317
- Kuteeva, M. & Mauranen, A. (2018). Digital academic discourse: Texts and contexts. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 24, 1-8.
- Nguyen, H.T. & Nguyen, M.T. (2017). "Am I a good boy?": Explicit membership categorization in parent–child interaction, Journal of Pragmatics, 121, 25-39.
- Thurlow, C. (2020). Dissecting the language of elitism: The 'joyful' violence of *premium*. *Language in Society*, 1-28. doi:10.1017/S0047404519001015

Grading criteria:

A: *Excellent.* The project demonstrates an excellent achievement of the learning outcomes: the student has reached a deep understanding of key theories, concepts, and methodological issues in the field; the student can critically use this knowledge to review existing research on topics in DA and to justify the selection of a method/framework for their project; the student is able to apply this knowledge to carry out a well-supported and insightful analysis; the student can express themselves in excellent academic English.
B: *Very good.* Meets the criteria for C plus some for A.
C: *Good.* The project demonstrates a good achievement of the learning outcomes: the student has developed a good understanding of key theories, concepts, and methodological issues in the field; the student can use this knowledge with some critical insight to discuss existing research on topics in DA and discuss the selection a method/framework for their project; the student is able to use this knowledge to carry out a solid analysis; the student can express themselves in good academic English.
D: *Satisfactory.* Meets the criteria of E plus some for C.
E. *Adequate.* The project demonstrates minimally adequate achievement of the learning outcomes: the student has developed a basic understanding of key theories, concepts, and methodological issues in the field; the student can draw some connections between this knowledge and existing research on topics in DA and is able to apply this knowledge to write a satisfactory analysis; the student can express themselves in academic English.
Fx. *Fail.* Some additional work is required.
F. *Fail.* The student work does not demonstrate the achievement of the course outcomes at a minimally adequate level. Much more work is required.

To receive the grade *Pass*, the student needs to meet the criteria of E.