Form 2B

City University of Hong Kong
Information on a Course
To be offered by Department of English
with effect from January 2011

Part I

Course Title:	English for Academic Research and Publication
Course Code:	EN8012
Course Duration:	9 weeks
Credit Units:	1 (Total contact hours 18)
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:

The course aims to provide students with the language skills and writing strategies necessary for writing dissertations, and authoring research papers for publication in international-refereed journals.

2.   Course intended learning outcomes (CILOs)

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

No.	CILOs	Weighting
1	describe the generic formats of theses and research articles and adapt the formats in order to organize their research writing effectively;	15%
2	describe and present in coherent fashion the essential types of information needed in the key sections of a thesis and a research article;	25%
3	describe and employ various linguistic conventions and strategies of citation needed to create well-integrated, meaningful prose and to establish their own authorial voices when drawing on others' work in their writing;	25%
4	describe and employ various strategies and linguistic resources needed to construct cogent arguments;	15%
5	describe the process of journal publishing as well as the various strategies needed and apply the knowledge to publish parts of their theses in international refereed journals.	20%

3.   Teaching and learning activities (TLAs)

ILO No	TLAs	Hours/week
1-4	▪ Interactive lectures ▪ Small group discussions ▪ Guided analyses of different types of research texts such as qualifying reports, theses and research articles ▪ Short writing tasks ▪ Language exercises	15 hours (about 7.5 weeks)
5	▪ Interactive lectures by course instructors and invited speakers such as journal editors, reviewers and prolific writers ▪ Small group discussions ▪ Guided analyses of discipline-specific journals ▪ Guided analyses of papers published by PhD students. ▪ Short writing tasks	3 hours (about 1.5 week)

4. Assessment activities/tasks

CILO No	Type of assessment activities/tasks	Weighting	Remarks
1-5	1. *Producing a research text* Students will be asked to produce one substantial piece of research writing aimed for a qualifying examination (e.g., one part of a qualifying report, one chapter of a thesis, etc.) or a draft of a manuscript aimed for publication in an international refereed journal.	80%	Nil
4	2. *Writing a short critique* Students will be asked to write a critique of one published work or a group of related published works.	20%	Nil

5. Grading of student achievement:

Grading pattern: Pass (P) and Fail (F). Grading is based on student performance in the two assessment tasks below.

Producing a research text

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
P	*Content* • The writing carries the essential ideas expected of the genre/genre-part that the writing represents. • The ideas are communicated clearly, effectively and succinctly. *Use of citations* • Extensive reading is evident as reflected by the number of sources cited. • Cited ideas are in general meaningfully engaged and are well-synthesized. • Authorial voice is evident. • Sources of cited ideas are properly documented and formatted. *Development of arguments* • Arguments are well-supported and well-developed. *Organization and format* • The writing is effectively sectioned. • Ideas within and across sections are well-connected. *Language* • The writing displays an appropriate mastery of the English language the scholar register. • No plagiarism is detected.

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
F	**Content** • The piece is on the whole incomplete and many essential ideas are missing. • Ideas are vaguely communicated. **Use of citations** • The piece carries very few citations. • Cited ideas do not cohere and the purposes of citing them are mostly unclear. • Authorial voice is in general lacking. • Sources of cited ideas are inadequately documented and/or poorly formatted. **Development of arguments** • Arguments are poorly supported or under-developed. **Organization and format** • Sectioning is ineffectively done. • Continuity of ideas within/across sections is lacking. **Language** • The writing displays a poor command of the English language and the scholar register. • Plagiarism is detected.

Writing a short critique

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
P	**Content** • The writing provides a summary and a critique of a published work(s). • Content of the published work(s) is accurately represented in the summary. • The critique is cogently developed and demonstrates an adequate use of argumentation techniques discussed in the course (e.g., grounds, warrants, backing, qualifications, rebuttals, etc.). **Organization** • The writing is well-organized. **Language** • Ideas are communicated clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The piece reflects an appropriate mastery of the English language and the scholarly register. • No plagiarism is detected.
F	**Content** • Either the summary of the published work(s) or the critique is missing. • The content of the published work(s) is inaccurately presented. • The critique is under-developed and on the whole lacks cogency. • Use of argumentation techniques discussed in the course is either absent or inadequate. **Organization** • The writing is poorly organized. **Language** • There is a general lack of clarity in the ideas communicated. • The writing reflects a poor command of the English language and the scholarly register. • Plagiarism is detected.

Part III

Keyword syllabus:

Authorial voice, citation conventions, citation strategies, constructing arguments, research articles, thesis formats, thesis writing, writing for publication.

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.

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. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman's "Stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7, 77-86*.

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, 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, 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*.

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, 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*. Thousand Oak, Calif.: 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
- Concordancing tool: AntConc (http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html)
- Licensed EAP corpus: MICASE

Returned by:

Name: Kingsley Bolton & Becky Kwan   **Department**: English
Tel: Ext 8853, 9781   **Date**: August 18, 2010