Form 2B

City University of Hong Kong
Information on a Course
To be offered by Department of English
with effect from Summer 2009-2010

Part I

Course Title:	Research Writing in Business Administration
Course Code:	EN8011D
Course Duration:	Equivalent of 13 weeks (Summer plus Semester A)
Credit Units:	3 Total contact hours 39
Level:	R8
Teaching Pattern:	Lecture/tutorial/workshop
Medium of Instruction:	English
Prerequisites: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil
Precursors: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil
Equivalent Courses: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil
Exclusive Courses: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil

Part II

1.   Course Aims:

This course aims to help DBA students to cope with demands imposed on them by the tasks of reading, understanding, analyzing published disciplinary literature of relevance to their own doctoral studies, and the writing of the literature reviews, research proposals, and journal articles for publication in their specific fields.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to:

No.	CILOs	Weighting
1	identify and describe the format, linguistic conventions and rhetorical strategies used in the key sections (i.e., the literature review, the concept map, and the research methodology) of a typical doctoral research proposal;	60%
2	apply the knowledge specified in CILO 1 when writing the key sections of their own research proposals.	
3	identify and describe the format of a journal article and rhetorical strategies needed in writing one in their own disciplines;	30%
4	apply the knowledge specified in CILO 3 needed in writing journal articles in their own disciplines .	
5	identify and apply effective strategies needed to overcome writer's blocks and those needed to manage extensive writing projects such as those specified in CILOs 1-4.	10%

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

ILO No	TLAs	Hours/week
CILOs 1-5	• guided group discussions • guided analyses of good and bad samples of literature reviews, proposals, and journal articles provided by the instructor and/or collected by students, relevant to their own research • guided writing tasks in specific genres or part-genres.	

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities

Students are required to submit four written products for assessment. The first three make up the different major sections of a research proposal that they need to submit to their thesis supervisors. The fourth relates to the development of a journal article.

CILO No	Type of assessment tasks/activities	Weighting	Remarks
CILO 1,2, 5	*Task 1: Producing a literature review* Students are required to submit a draft or a part draft of the literature review of the research proposal.	25%	Nil
	They will also be asked to produce several short writing log entries to record how they have managed this writing task or how they have overcome various writer's blocks / writing lulls.	5%	

CILO 1,2, 5	*Task 2: Producing a concept map* Students are required to produce a concept map for the proposal and reflect on their improvement in managing their writing.	20%	NIL
	They will also be asked to continue to produce several short writing log entries to reflect on how their management of the writing assignment might have improved when compared with that of the previous writing task or to reflect on the effectiveness of various strategies used to overcome various writer's blocks/ writing lulls.	5%	
CILO 1,2, 5	*Task 3: Writing the research methodology* Students are required to write the methodology section of the proposal.	15%	
CILO 3,4,5	*Task 4: Writing a blue-print for a journal article* Students are required to produce a detailed outline of a manuscript to be submitted to a specific journal.	30%	NIL

5. Grading of Student Achievement:
Grading pattern: Standard (A+, A, A-….F). Grading is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities.

The literature review

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
A+ A A-	**Content & organization** • A focused and well-balanced survey of the literature is provided. • The survey is well-connected to the research described in the proposal. • An elaborate and sound critique of the literature is provided which translates well into a convincing justification for the research to be undertaken. • Ideas are very well-sectioned and well-connected with very few logical jumps. • The piece needs very little revision. **Citations** • Extensive reading is evident as reflected by the impressive number of recognized sources cited (above 30). • Cited ideas are very well integrated. • No sign of plagiarism is detected. • Effective choices of forms (syntax) and citation verbs are made which contributes greatly to the clarity and flow of the text. • The piece reflects the writer's sophisticated/ mature mastery of citation strategies and citation conventions. **Language** • Ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The piece displays a *close-to-perfect* and *very sophisticated* mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language. • It also reflects an advanced mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
B+ B B-	**Content & organization** • A fairly focused and fairly balanced survey of the literature is provided. • The survey is fairly well-connected to the research described in the proposal. • A fairly elaborate critique of the literature is provided which can somehow lends to the justification of the

	research to be undertaken. • Ideas are fairly well-sectioned and fairly well-connected with some obvious but occasional jumps. • The piece needs some minor revision. ***Citations*** • Somewhat extensive reading is evident as reflected by a substantial amount of recognized sources cited (20-29 references provided). • Ideas cited are fairly integrated and arranged. • No sign of plagiarism is detected. • The piece reflects a somewhat advanced mastery of citation conventions. ***Language*** • Ideas are mostly communicated clearly and effectively though not entirely succinctly. • The piece displays a good mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language with only minor errors evident. • It also reflects a good mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
C+ C C-	***Content & organization*** • A somewhat focused survey of the literature is provided. • Some parts of the survey are irrelevant to the research described in the proposal. • A rather thin critique of the literature is provided which in general lacks rigor and weakens its force in justifying the project to be undertaken. • The core ideas discussed in general lack clarity. • Ideas are adequately sectioned and organized. • A noticeable number of logical jumps are observed which make the piece somewhat difficult to follow. • The piece needs some major revision. ***Citations*** • Only 10-19 recognized sources have been cited. • Ideas cited somewhat lacks integration. • No sign of plagiarism is detected. • The piece reflects a partial mastery of citation conventions. ***Language*** • Ideas are somewhat vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a somewhat partial and unsophisticated mastery of the English language. • It displays a satisfactory mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is evident.
D	***Content & organization*** • A survey of the literature is provided but it lacks a clear focus. • Most parts of the survey are irrelevant to the research described in the proposal. • No critique of the literature is provided. • Ideas are in general poorly connected and inadequately sectioned, which makes the piece very difficult to follow. • The piece needs substantial major revision. ***Citations*** • Very few sources have been cited. • Many of the ideas cited are not integrated at all. • No sign of plagiarism is detected. • The piece displays a poor mastery of citation conventions. ***Language*** • Ideas in general are very vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a poor mastery of the English language. • The piece also displays a poor mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
F	***Content & organization*** • Most of the content requirements set for the assignment are not met. • The ideas are poorly discussed, carrying no focus and showing coherence at all. • Ideas discussed are completely irrelevant to the research described in the proposal. • The survey needs to be rewritten completely.

	Citations • No reading is evident. ***Language*** • Signs of plagiarism are detected. OR • Ideas are all vaguely communicated. • The piece displays an extremely poor mastery of the English language and the academic register. • It is extremely difficult to comprehend owing to the great number of language errors.

The concept map

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
A+ A A-	**Content & organization** • The concept map provides a succinct, well-developed and well-integrated discussion of the key concepts and/or a theoretical framework that is built on the survey of literature provided in the literature review section. • The discussion also has direct and explicit implications for the research actions described in the methodology section of the proposal. • Ideas are very well-sectioned and well-connected with very few minor logical jumps. • The map needs very little revision. **Language** • Ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The piece displays a *close-to-perfect* and *very sophisticated* mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language. • It also reflects an advanced mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
B+ B B-	**Content & organization** • The concept map provides a fairly well-developed and fairly well-integrated discussion of the key concepts and/or a theoretical framework that is built on the survey of literature provided in the literature review section. • The discussion also has somewhat explicit implications for the proposed research actions that are described in the methodology section of the proposal. • Ideas are fairly well-connected with a few noticeable logical jumps that need to be fixed. • The map needs some minor revision. **Language** • Ideas are mostly communicated clearly and effectively though not entirely succinctly. • The piece displays a good mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language with only minor errors evident. • It also reflects a good mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
C+ C C-	**Content & organization** • The concept map provides a weakly well-developed discussion of the key concepts and/or a theoretical framework that is somewhat built on the survey of literature provided in the literature review section. • The link between the concept map and the survey literature needs to be made explicit. • The discussion bears a few implications for the proposed research actions that are described in the methodology section of the proposal. The implications need to be made more explicit. • The discussion shows a noticeable number of major logical jumps that need to be fixed. • The discussion needs substantial revision. **Language** • Ideas are somewhat vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a somewhat partial and unsophisticated mastery of the English language. • It displays a satisfactory mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is evident.
D	**Content & organization** • The concept map carries a under-developed discussion of the key concepts and/or a theoretical framework. • There link between the concept map and the literature survey is very weak and needs to be strengthened substantially. • The discussion bears very few implications for the proposed research actions that are described in the methodology section of the proposal. The implications need to be made more explicit. • The discussion shows quite a number of major logical jumps. • The discussion needs major rewriting. **Language** • Ideas in general are very vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a poor mastery of the English language. • The piece also displays a poor mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
F	**Content & organization** - The concept map poorly discussed and carries only few concepts that are relevant to the study. - The theoretical framework is missing. - The concept map shows no link at all to the literature survey. - The discussion shows no implications at all for the proposed research actions that are described in the methodology section of the proposal. - The discussion shows many logical jumps. - The discussion needs to be rewritten completely. **Language** - Signs of plagiarism are detected. OR - Ideas are all very vaguely communicated. - The piece displays an extremely poor mastery of the English language and the academic register. - It is extremely difficult to comprehend owing to the great number of language errors.

The methodology

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
A+ A A-	**Content & organization** - The writing provides a succinct, well-developed and well-integrated discussion of research actions to be undertaken. - The discussion is well-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. - Ideas are very well-sectioned and well-connected with very few minor logical jumps. - The writing needs very little revision. **Language** - Ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly. - The piece displays a *close-to-perfect* and *very sophisticated* mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language. - It also reflects an advanced mastery of the academic register. - No sign of plagiarism is detected.
B+ B B-	**Content & organization** - The writing provides a fairly well-developed discussion of research actions to be undertaken. - The discussion is fairly well-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. The link can be made more explicit at some points. - Ideas are fairly well-connected with some minor logical jumps that need to be fixed. - The writing needs some very minor revision. **Language** - Ideas are mostly communicated clearly and effectively though not entirely succinctly. - The piece displays a good mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language with only minor errors evident. - It also reflects a good mastery of the academic register. - No sign of plagiarism is detected.
C+ C C-	**Content & organization** - The writing provides a weakly-developed discussion of research actions to be undertaken. - The discussion is weakly-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. The link needs to be made much more explicit. - Ideas are weakly-connected with some major logical jumps that need to be fixed. - The writing needs some major revision. **Language** - Ideas are somewhat vaguely communicated. - The piece displays a somewhat partial and unsophisticated mastery of the English language. - It displays a satisfactory mastery of the academic register. - No sign of plagiarism is evident.
D	**Content & organization** - The writing provides an under-developed discussion of research actions to be undertaken. - The discussion is poorly-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. The link needs to be made much more explicit.

	• Ideas are weakly-connected with a number of major logical jumps that need to be fixed. • The writing needs substantial major revision. ***Language*** • Ideas in general are very vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a poor mastery of the English language. • The piece also displays a poor mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
F	***Content & organization*** • The writing provides a very skimpy discussion of research actions to be undertaken. • There is no link built at all between the literature survey and the concept map. • The writing displays a large number of logical jumps and needs to be rewritten completely. ***Language*** • Signs of plagiarism are detected. OR • Ideas are all very vaguely communicated. • The piece displays an extremely poor mastery of the English language and the academic register. • It is extremely difficult to comprehend owing to the great number of language errors.

The paper manuscript blueprint

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
A+ A A-	***Content & organization*** • The blueprint carries all essential components of a research article (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology/methods, Results and Discussion). • There are a full-blown Introduction and a full-blown Literature Review in the piece which are well-connected to the rest of the components. • Plan for what to write in each of the rest of the components is very clearly and succinctly presented. ***Language*** • Ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The piece displays a *close-to-perfect* and *very sophisticated* mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language. • It also reflects an advanced mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
B+ B B-	***Content & organization*** • The blueprint carries all essential components of a research article (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology/methods, Results and Discussion). • The Introduction and the Literature Review are fairly well-developed and are fairly well-connected to the rest of the paper. • Plan for what to write in each of the rest of the components is quite clearly and succinctly presented. ***Language*** • Ideas are mostly communicated clearly and effectively though not entirely succinctly. • The piece displays a good mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language with only minor errors evident. • It also reflects a good mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
C+ C C-	***Content & organization*** • The blueprint carries all essential components of a research article (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology/methods, Results and Discussion). • The Introduction and the Literature Review are somewhat under-developed and are somewhat connected to the rest of the paper. • Plan for what to write in each of the rest of the components is somewhat clearly and succinctly presented. ***Language***

	• Ideas are somewhat vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a somewhat partial and unsophisticated mastery of the English language. • It displays a satisfactory mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is evident.
D	**Content & organization** • The blueprint carries all essential components of a research article (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology/methods, Results and Discussion). • The Introduction and the Literature Review are somewhat under-developed but in general show very little connection to the rest of the paper. • Plan for what to write in each of the rest of the components is vaguely presented. **Language** • Ideas in general are very vaguely communicated. • The piece displays a poor mastery of the English language. • The piece also displays a poor mastery of the academic register. • No sign of plagiarism is detected.
F	**Content & organization** • The blueprint carries all essential components of a research article (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology/methods, Results and Discussion). • The Introduction and the Literature Review are very poorly written and/or show no connection to the rest of the paper. • Plan for what to write in each of the rest of the components is either missing or very vaguely presented. **Language** • Signs of plagiarism are detected. OR • Ideas are all very vaguely communicated. • The piece displays an extremely poor mastery of the English language and the academic register. • It is extremely difficult to comprehend owing to the great number of language errors.

Part III
Keyword Syllabus:

Literature review, critical reading, structuring a literature review, argumentation, citation conventions, citation strategies, writing research proposal, journal article, journal conventions, organizing research proposal and article

Recommended Readings:

Artemeva, N. (2000). Revising a research article: Dialogic negotiation. In P. Dias & A. Paré (eds.), *Transitions: Writing in academic and workplace settings*, pp.74-87. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press Inc.

Bhatia, Vijay K. (1993): *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London, Longman.

Bhatia, Vijay K., (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*, London, Continuum.

Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 1, 47-59.

Casanave, C. & Vandrick, S. (eds.) (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.

Flowerdew, J. (in press). Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman's "Stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.002.

Flowerdew, J. & Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). Genre analysis of editorial letters to international journal contributors. *Applied Linguistics*, 23/4, 463-489.

Gosden, H. (2003). 'Why not give us the full story?': Functions of referees' comments in peer reviews of scientific papers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 87-101.

Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. London: Sage.

Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis and the Social Sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, 4, 321-337.

Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33, 3, 283-294.

Kanoksilapatha, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 269-292.

Kourilova, M. (1998). Communicative characteristics of reviews of scientific papers written by non-native users of English. *Endocrine Regulations*, 32, 107-114.

Kwan, B. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 30-55.

Kwan, B. (2008). The nexus of reading, writing and researching in the doctoral undertaking of humanities and social sciences: Implications for literature reviewing. *English for Specific Purposes, 27 (1), 42-56.*

Kwan, B. S.C. (2009). Reading in preparation for writing a PhD thesis: Case studies of experiences, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *3(3), 180-191.*

Kwan, B.S.C. (2010). An investigation of instruction in research publishing in doctoral programs: The Hong Kong case. *Higher Education,* 59(1), 55–68. (SSCI)

Lim, J. M. H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 282-309.

McNabb, R. (2001). Making the gesture: Graduate student submissions and the expectation of journal referees. *Composition Studies*, 29, 1, 9-26.

Meloy, J. M. (2002). Writing the qualitative dissertation: Understanding by doing (second edition). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Murthy, U.S., & Wiggnins, C. J., Jr. (2002). Why manuscripts are rejected: An analysis of JIS rejections. *Journal of Information Systems*, 16 (Spring), 41-48.

Peacock, M. (2000). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, 30, 479-497.

Peters, R. L. (1997). *Getting What You Came For (revised edition)*. New York: Noonday.

Ridley, D. (2008). *The literature review: A step-by-Step guide for students*. U.S.: Sage.

Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. (2000). *English in today's research world*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weissberg, R. & Buker, S. (1990). *Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.

Online Resources:
- On-line theses available at the CityU library website
- Free-downloading concordancing tool: AntConc
  (http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html)
- Licensed EAP corpus: MICASE

<u>Returned by:</u>

Name: Vijay Bhatia & Becky Kwan   **Department**: English
Tel: 2788-8853, 2788-9781   **Date**: 11 March, 2010