

Subject Code	ENGL3020
Subject Title	Aspects of European Public Discourse
Credit Value	3
Level	3
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	N.A
Objectives	<p>How do politicians and the media conceptualize and communicate abstract topics such as social integration and economic progress, in order to win the hearts and minds of people? With an emphasis on the complex European setting, this subject teaches how metaphor is used to construct arguments which highlight the fundamental political parameter of <i>similarity</i> and <i>difference</i> between peoples and communities. Students will learn and apply theoretical frameworks from cognitive science, cognitive linguistics, and critical discourse analysis to gain a deeper understanding of i) prevalent social, political, and economic issues in contemporary Europe; ii) comparable issues in their own cultures and societies, particularly Hong Kong, and iii) the relevance of metaphor in other non-political domains of discourse. For each of these issues, they will determine i) the rhetorical/argumentative objectives of discourse producers, ii) the role of metaphor in supporting these objectives, and iii) the effects on discourse receivers (i.e. the general public). Individually and in groups, students will acquire theoretical knowledge in cognitive science and linguistics, practical knowledge in the application of metaphor for effective argumentation, as well as critical thinking skills in comparing issues across different cultures and societies.</p>
Intended Learning Outcomes <i>(Note 1)</i>	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <p>Category A: Professional/academic knowledge and skills</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Understand metaphor as a linguistic, discursive, and cognitive phenomenon b. Analyze contemporary social, political, and economic issues in European (and Hong Kong) society from the perspective of metaphor c. Appreciate and use metaphors to achieve more effective communicative practices <p>Category B: Attributes for all-roundedness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> d. Develop analytical and critical thinking skills e. Develop a critical awareness of the links between theory and real world application
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus <i>(Note 2)</i>	<p>Section One: Context and theoretical frameworks</p> <p>Introduction to European society and politics</p> <p>Introduction to Conceptual Metaphor Theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Image schemas and cultural models

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metaphor in discourse <p>Section Two: The politics of similarity Image schemas and the discourse of similarity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Common European Home • The European Union • Comparable examples from Hong Kong and elsewhere <p>Section Three: The politics of difference Cultural models and the discourse of difference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immigration policy • Economic policy • Comparable examples from Hong Kong and elsewhere <p>Section Four: Metaphor in other domains of discourse Image schemas and cultural models in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific discourse • Healthcare discourse 																																																						
<p>Teaching/Learning Methodology <i>(Note 3)</i></p>	<p>This subject will be interactively taught with each session comprising of lectures and small groups discussions closely supervised by the instructor. Examples of different modalities (text, video, visuals) will be drawn from a wide variety of contemporary sources to illustrate theoretical concepts.</p> <p>Medium of instruction: English.</p>																																																						
<p>Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes <i>(Note 4)</i></p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="533 1279 1482 1888"> <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>e</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Take home quiz (individual)</td> <td>30</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Essay (individual)</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project (group)</td> <td>30</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attendance (individual)</td> <td>10</td> <td colspan="6">N.A.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100 %</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes:</p>	Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c	d	e		Take home quiz (individual)	30	✓	✓					Essay (individual)	30			✓	✓	✓		Project (group)	30	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Attendance (individual)	10	N.A.						Total	100 %						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting			Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																																			
		a	b	c	d	e																																																	
Take home quiz (individual)	30	✓	✓																																																				
Essay (individual)	30			✓	✓	✓																																																	
Project (group)	30	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓																																																	
Attendance (individual)	10	N.A.																																																					
Total	100 %																																																						

	<p>The take home quiz is focused on theoretical concepts and assesses students' specific understanding of theories and frameworks. The essay complements this assessment by testing students' ability to apply these concepts at more general levels of argumentation and practice. The group project combines elements and objectives of both assessments while requiring students to demonstrate team skills.</p>	
<p>Student Study Effort Expected</p>	<p>Class contact:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ lecture 	<p>39 Hrs.</p>
	<p>Other student study effort:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ research (2 hrs x 14 wks) 	<p>28 Hrs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ reading preparation (3 hrs x 14 wks) 	<p>42 Hrs.</p>
	<p>Total student study effort</p>	<p>109 Hrs.</p>
<p>Reading List and References</p>	<p>Books</p> <p>Johnson, M. (1987). <i>The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p> <p>Kövecses, Z. (2005). <i>Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Musolff, A. (2004). <i>Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe</i>. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Semino, E. (2008). <i>Metaphor in Discourse</i>. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Tay, D. (2013). <i>Metaphor in Psychotherapy. A Descriptive and Prescriptive Analysis</i>. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.</p> <p>Articles and book chapters</p> <p>Charteris-Black, J., & Musolff, A. (2003). "Battered hero" or "innocent victim"? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading in British and German financial reporting. <i>English for Specific Purposes</i>, 22, 153–176.</p> <p>Chilton, P., & Ilyin, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse. The case of the "Common European House." <i>Discourse and Society</i>, 4(1), 7–31.</p>	

	<p>Kimmel, M. (2010). Why we mix metaphors (and mix them well): Discourse coherence, conceptual metaphor, and beyond. <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i>, 42(1), 97–115.</p> <p>Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), <i>Metaphor and Thought</i> (2nd ed., pp. 202–251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Shogimen, T. (2008). Treating the Body Politic: The Medical Metaphor of Political Rule in Late Medieval Europe and Tokugawa Japan. <i>The Review of Politics</i>, 70(01), 77–104.</p> <p>Tabor-Morris, A. E., Froriep, K. A., Briles, T. M., & McGuire, C. M. (2009). City of physics - analogies to increase cognitive coherence in physics learning. <i>Physics Education</i>, 44(2), 195–198.</p> <p>Zinken, J., Hellsten, I., & Nerlich, B. (2008). Discourse metaphors. In R. M. Frank, R. Dirven, T. Ziemke, & E. Bernárdez (Eds.), <i>Body, Language and Mind. Volume 2: Sociocultural Situatedness</i> (pp. 363–386). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.</p>
--	---

Revised as of August 2017