City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus

offered by Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2017 /2018

Part I   Course Overview

Course Title: Research Writing in Business Administration

Course Code: EN8011D

Course Duration: Equivalent of 13 weeks (Summer plus Semesters A and B)

Credit Units: 3 (Total contact hours: 39)

Level: R8

Proposed Area:
(for GE courses only)

☐ Arts and Humanities

☐ Study of Societies, Social and Business Organisations

☐ Science and Technology

**Medium of
Instruction:** English

**Medium of
Assessment:** 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 Course Details

1. Abstract
(A 150-word description about the course)

This course aims to help DBA students to cope with the demands imposed on them by the tasks of reading, understanding, and 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)
(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

No.	CILOs#	Weighting* (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	*A2*	*A3*
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 the rhetorical strategies needed in the writing of a journal article 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%	√	√	√
	If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.	100%			

* If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.
 # Please specify the alignment of CILOs to the Gateway Education Programme Intended Learning outcomes (PILOs) in Section A of Annex.

A1: *Attitude*
 Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.
A2: *Ability*
 Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.
A3: *Accomplishments*
 Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)
(TLAs designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs.)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No. 1	2	3	4	5		Hours/week (if applicable)
1	Guided group discussions;	√	√	√	√	√		
2	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;	√	√	√	√	√		
3	Guided writing tasks in specific genres or part-genres.	√	√	√	√	√		

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)
(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No. 1	2	3	4	5		Weighting*	Remarks
Continuous Assessment: __100__%								
Assignment 1 needs to carry a complete version of the Introduction and a part-draft of the Literature Review in which one part(s) of the theoretical framework of the proposed research is presented. (2000-2500 words)	√	√	√	√	√		40%	
Developed from Assignment 1, Assignment 2 needs to carry an updated Introduction, a fully-developed Literature Review, and a Methodology chapter which provides an overview of the paradigm and method(s) to be used in the thesis work, and a summary of the different parts of the study (e.g., research instrument, data collection method(s), sampling and treatment of data). (4000-6000 words)	√	√	√	√	√		60%	
Examination: ____% (duration: , if applicable)								

The weightings should add up to 100%. | 100% |

5. Assessment Rubrics
(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
Assignment 1: Introduction and Literature Review		***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.	***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.	***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.	***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	***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.

			revision.	
Citations	***Citations***	***Citations***	***Citations***	***Citations***
• Extensive reading is evident as reflected by the impressive number of recognized sources cited (above 30).	• Somewhat extensive reading is evident as reflected by a substantial amount of recognized sources cited (20-29 references provided).	• Only 10-19 recognized sources have been cited.	• Very few sources have been cited.	• No reading is evident.
• Cited ideas are very well integrated.	• Ideas cited are fairly integrated and arranged.	• Ideas cited somewhat lacks integration.	• Many of the ideas cited are not integrated at all.	
• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• 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.	• The piece reflects a somewhat advanced mastery of citation conventions.	• The piece reflects a partial mastery of citation conventions.	• The piece displays a poor mastery of citation conventions.	
Language	***Language***	***Language***	***Language***	***Language***
• Ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly.	• Ideas are mostly communicated clearly and effectively though not entirely succinctly.	• Ideas are somewhat vaguely communicated.	• Ideas in general are very vaguely communicated.	• Signs of plagiarism are detected. OR
• The piece displays a close-to- perfect and	• The piece displays a good mastery of the	• The piece displays a somewhat partial and	• The piece displays a	• Ideas are all vaguely communicated.

		very sophisticated mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language.	syntax and the vocabulary of the English language with only minor errors evident.	unsophisticated mastery of the English language.	poor mastery of the English	
		• The piece reflects an advanced mastery of the academic register.	• The piece reflects a good mastery of the academic register.	• The piece displays a satisfactory mastery of the academic register.	• The piece displays a poor mastery of the academic register.	• The piece displays an extremely poor mastery of the English language and the academic register.
		• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• No sign of plagiarism is evident.	• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• The piece is extremely difficult to comprehend owing to the great number of language errors.
Assignment 2: Introduction, Literature Review and Methodology		Same as the above for the content and organization, citations, and language of the introduction and literature review.	Same as the above for the content and organization, citations, and language of the introduction and literature review.	Same as the above for the content and organization, citations, and language of the introduction and literature review.	Same as the above for the content and organization, citations, and language of the introduction and literature review.	Same as the above for the content and organization, citations, and language of the introduction and literature review.
		Methodology:	**Methodology:**	**Methodology:**	**Methodology:**	**Methodology:**
		Content & organization	***Content & organization***	***Content & organization***	***Content & organization***	***Content & organization***
		• The writing provides a succinct, well-developed and well-integrated discussion of research actions to be undertaken.	• The writing provides a fairly well-developed discussion of research actions to be undertaken.	• The writing provides a weakly-developed discussion of research actions to be undertaken.	• The writing provides an under-developed discussion of research actions to be undertaken.	• The writing provides a very skimpy discussion of research actions to be undertaken.
		• The discussion is well-linked to the literature survey and the concept map.	• The discussion is fairly well-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. The link can be made more explicit at some points.	• The discussion is weakly-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. The link needs to be made much more explicit.	• The discussion is poorly-linked to the literature survey and the concept map. The link needs to be made much more explicit.	• There is no link built at all between the literature survey and the concept map.

• Ideas are very well-sectioned and well-connected with very few minor logical jumps.	•Ideas are fairly well-connected with some minor logical jumps that need to be fixed.	• Ideas are weakly-connected with some major logical jumps that need to be fixed.	• Ideas are weakly-connected with a number of major logical jumps that need to be fixed.	
• The writing needs very little revision.	•The writing needs some very minor revision.	• The writing needs some major revision.	• The writing needs substantial major revision.	• The writing displays a large number of logical jumps and needs to be rewritten completely.
Language	*Language*	*Language*	*Language*	*Language*
• Ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly.	• Ideas are mostly communicated clearly and effectively though not entirely succinctly.	• Ideas are somewhat vaguely communicated.	• Ideas in general are very vaguely communicated.	• Signs of plagiarism are detected. OR • Ideas are all very vaguely communicated.
• The piece displays a close-to- perfect and very sophisticated mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language.	• The piece displays a good mastery of the syntax and the vocabulary of the English language with only minor errors evident.	• The piece displays a somewhat partial and unsophisticated mastery of the English language.	• The piece displays a poor mastery of the English language.	• The piece displays an extremely poor mastery of the English language and the academic register.
• The piece reflects an advanced mastery of the academic register.	• The piece reflects a good mastery of the academic register.	• The piece displays a satisfactory mastery of the academic register.	• The piece displays a poor mastery of the academic register.	• The piece is extremely difficult to comprehend owing to the great number of language errors.
• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	• No sign of plagiarism is evident.	• No sign of plagiarism is detected.	

Part III   Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1.   Keyword Syllabus
(An indication of the key topics of the course.)

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

2.   Reading List
2.1   Compulsory Readings
(Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

1.	Lecture handouts and supplementary materials provided by the instructor.

2.2   Additional Readings
(Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

1.	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.
2.	Bhatia, Vijay K. (1993): *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London, Longman.
3.	Bhatia, Vijay K., (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-Based view*, London, Continuum.
4.	Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 1, 47-59.
5.	Casanave, C. & Vandrick, S. (eds.) (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.
6.	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.
7.	Flowerdew, J. & Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). Genre analysis of editorial letters to international journal contributors. *Applied Linguistics*, 23/4, 463-489.
8.	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.
9.	Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination.* London: Sage.
10.	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.
11.	Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33, 3, 283-294.

12.	Kanoksilapatha, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 269-292.
13.	Kourilova, M. (1998). Communicative characteristics of reviews of scientific papers written by non-native users of English. *Endocrine Regulations*, 32, 107-114.
14.	Kwan, B. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 30-55.
15.	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.
16.	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.
17.	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.
18.	Lim, J. M. H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. English for Specific Purposes, 25, 282-309.
19.	McNabb, R. (2001). Making the gesture: Graduate student submissions and the expectation of journal referees. *Composition Studies*, 29, 1, 9-26.
20.	Meloy, J. M. (2002). *Writing the qualitative dissertation: Understanding by doing* (second edition). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
21.	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.
22.	Peacock, M. (2000). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, 30, 479-497.
23.	Peters, R. L. (1997). *Getting What You Came For* (revised edition). New York: Noonday.
24.	Ridley, D. (2008). *The literature review: A step-by-Step guide for students*. U.S.: Sage.
25.	Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. (2000). *English in today's research world*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
26.	Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
27.	Weissberg, R. & Buker, S. (1990). *Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.
28	On-line theses available at the CityU library website
29	Free-downloading concordancing tool: AntConc (http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html)
30	Licensed EAP corpus: MICASE