Form 2B

City University of Hong Kong

Information on Proposed Course
offered by Department of English
with effect from Semester B in 2011-2012

Part I

Course Title:	English for Academic Research and Publication in Science and Engineering
Course Code:	EN8013
Course Duration:	13 weeks (3 hours/week)
Credit Units:	3
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 strategies necessary for the production of a variety of spoken and written scholarly texts which include conference paper proposals, presentations, research proposals, theses and research publications in international-refereed journals.

2. Course intended learning outcomes (CILOs)

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

No.	CILOs	Weighting
1	describe the generic formats of a variety of spoken and written research texts (e.g., conference paper proposals, presentations, research proposals, theses and research articles) and adapt the formats in order to organize their research writing effectively;	10%
2	describe and present in coherent fashion the essential types of information needed in the key sections of the research texts described in CILO 1;	30%
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 written research texts;	25%
4	describe and apply various linguistic resources and rhetorical strategies necessary for converting parts of their theses into manuscripts for publication in international refereed journals;	20%
5	describe and employ various linguistic resources and rhetorical strategies needed in delivering effective presentations at international conferences and seminars.	15%

3. Learning and teaching activities (LTAs)

ILO No	LTAs*	No. of hours
1-3	▪ Interactive lectures ▪ Small group discussions ▪ Guided analyses of different types of research texts ▪ Short writing tasks ▪ Language exercises	25 hours
4	▪ 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	6 hours
5	▪ Interactive lectures ▪ Guided analyses of transcribed presentation texts ▪ Short speaking activities	8 hours

4. Assessment activities and tasks

(designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs –Some assessment tasks/activities may address more than one CILO.)

ILOs	*Tasks*	Weighting
1-4	*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.	70%
5	*2. Delivering an oral presentation* Students will be asked to write the proposal of a conference paper and deliver an oral presentation of the paper to their colleagues.	30%

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 scholarly register. • No plagiarism is detected.

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 scholarly register. • Plagiarism is detected.

Delivering an oral presentation

Letter Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
P	***Content*** • The presentation carries essential ideas expected of a paper presented at a conference. ***Organization and format*** • The presentation is effectively organized. • Ideas are well-connected. ***Handling the Q/A time*** • The presenter is confident and displays an appropriate command of the pragmatic skills / strategies when handling questions from the audience. ***Language*** • The ideas are communicated clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The presenter displays an appropriate mastery of spoken English and the scholarly register typical of conference presentations. ***Use of visuals*** • Visuals are appropriately designed and effectively presented. ***Assertiveness and eye contact*** • The presenter is assertive, relaxed and natural throughout. • The presenter maintains natural /sufficient eye contact with the audience.

F	***Content*** • Many essential ideas expected of a paper presented at a conference are missing. ***Organization and format*** • The presentation is poorly organized. • Ideas are mostly unconnected. • There is a general lack of signposts. ***Handling the Q/A time*** • The presenter is nervous and displays a poor command of pragmatic skills / strategies when handling questions from the audience. ***Language*** • The speech of the presenter is mostly unintelligible. • The presenter displays a poor command of spoken English and the scholarly register typical of conference presentations. ***Use of visuals*** • Visuals are inappropriately designed and poorly presented. ***Assertiveness and eye contact*** • The presenter is nervous and unassertive throughout. • The presenter maintains very little eye contact with the audience.

Part III

Keyword syllabus:

Authorial voice, citation conventions, citation strategies, paper proposals, conferences, presentations, research articles, thesis formats, thesis writing, writing for publication.

Recommended reading:

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.

Basturkmen, H. (2002). Negotiating Meaning in Seminar-Type Discussion and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes* 21, 3, 233-242.

Belcher, D. 2007. Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, no. 1: 1–22.

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

Kwan, B.S.C. (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*.

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 Oaks, 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.

Williams, H.C. 2004. How to reply to referees' comments when submitting manuscripts for publication. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 51, no.1:79-83.

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

Phone/email: 8850 & 9781 Date: April 28, 2011