

**City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus**

**offered by the Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2019 / 2020**

Part I Course Overview

Course Title: English for Academic Research and Publication in Social Sciences and Humanities

Course Code: EN8014

Course Duration: One semester

Credit Units: 3

Level: R8

Medium of Instruction: English

Medium of Assessment: English

Prerequisites: Nil
(Course Code and Title)

Precursors: Nil
(Course Code and Title)

Equivalent Courses: Nil
(Course Code and Title)

Exclusive Courses: Nil
(Course Code and Title)

Part II Course Details

1. Abstract

The course aims to provide students of social sciences and humanities with the language skills and strategies necessary for the production of a variety of high level spoken and written scholarly texts, which include conference paper proposals, oral academic presentations, research proposals, theses and research publications for international-refereed journals.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

No.	CILOs	Weighting* (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	A2	A3
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;	25%	✓	✓	✓
3	describe and employ various linguistic and non-linguistic conventions as well as 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 high level academic presentations in international conferences, seminars and oral defences.	15%	✓	✓	✓
6	identify and apply existing online resources to facilitate the development of knowledge, skills and strategies described in CILOs 1-5	5%	✓	✓	✓
* If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.		100%			

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)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Lecture	Teacher-fronted presentation of material	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tutorial	Language tasks and activities Small group discussions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.						Weighting*	Remarks
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Continuous Assessment: 100%								
<p><i>1. Producing a research text</i></p> <p>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.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	70%	
<p><i>2. Delivering an oral presentation</i></p> <p>Students will be asked to write the abstract of a conference paper and deliver an oral presentation of the paper to their colleagues.</p>	✓		✓		✓	✓	30%	
							100%	

* The weightings should add up to 100%.

5. Assessment Rubrics

The research text

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing displays a very clear and meaningful goal(s) appropriate to the genre/genre part. It also conveys a very clear and a specific message about the research described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal(s) is quite appropriate to the genre/genre part. Conveys quite a clear and specific message about the research described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal is somewhat appropriate to the genre/genre part. The message about the described research is somewhat clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal is somewhat appropriate to the genre/genre part. The message about the described research is not very clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal is not appropriate to the genre/genre part. There is no specific message conveyed about the research described.
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing carries all essential information expected of the genre/genre-part that the writing represents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing carries most essential information expected of the genre/genre-part that the writing represents. Some minor details are missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some essential details are missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many essential details are missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All essential details are missing.
Citation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive reading is evident as reflected by the impressive number of sources cited. Source ideas are meaningfully engaged and are very well-synthesized to advance the goal of writing. Authorial voice over source ideas is strategically enacted. Sources are properly cited and documented using a recognized citation style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfils the minimal number of sources required for the writing. Source ideas are mostly meaningfully engaged and are quite well-synthesized to advance the goal of writing. Stray source ideas are evident but do not affect much the flow of discussion. Authorial voice over source ideas is evident and is enacted somewhat strategically. Sources are properly cited and documented using a recognized citation style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfils the minimal number of sources required for the writing. Evident attempts at engaging source ideas to advance the goal writing though not entirely successful. A noticeable number of source ideas are not synthesized A noticeable amount of stray source ideas. Some attempts at establishing authorial voice are evident though not very successful. Sources are properly cited and documented using a recognized citation style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfils the minimal number of sources required for the writing. Rather unsuccessful attempts at engaging source ideas to advance the goal of writing Few attempts at synthesizing source ideas. Many stray source ideas that significantly obscure the goal of writing. Sources are properly cited and documented using a recognized citation style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to fulfil the minimal number of sources required for the writing. Very few attempts at engaging source ideas to advance the goal of writing Source ideas are not synthesized at all. Source ideas are not related to the goal of writing at all. Sources are not cited nor documented properly using a recognized citation style.

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
Argumentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sharp awareness of readers' refutations about the research. • An impressive range of strategies are effectively /successfully employed o defend/justify most/all major aspects of the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An awareness of readers' refutations. • A range of rhetorical strategies are employed quite effectively to defend/justify a few major aspects of the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited awareness of readers' refutations. • Attempts at defending/justifying a few specific aspects of research using a rather limited range of rhetorical strategies though not all attempts are successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very limited awareness of readers' refutations. • Very few attempts at defending/justifying the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lack of awareness of readers' refutations. • Writing is entirely descriptive and no attempts at defending/justifying the research.
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing is very effectively sectioned. • Very effective signposting is employed. • The piece is on the whole very easy to navigate. • Ideas within and across sections are well-connected and well-aligned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing is quite effectively sectioned. • Signposting is quite effectively employed. • The piece is on the whole quite easy to navigate. • Non-intrusive ruptures are evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing is somewhat effectively sectioned and the sectioning needs some revision. • Some signposting is employed though not entirely effective. • Requires some efforts to navigate the writing. • Intrusive ruptures are evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing is ineffectively sectioned. • Very limited signposting is employed. • Quite difficult to navigate the writing. • Frequent intrusive ruptures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing is extremely difficult to navigate. • It is extremely poorly organized.
Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ideas are communicated very clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The writing displays an outstanding mastery of the English language (syntax, lexis, collocations, etc.), punctuation, and the scholarly register. • Very few errors are evident. • No plagiarism is detected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ideas are communicated quite clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The writing displays an advanced mastery of the English language (syntax and lexis) and the scholarly register • Some non-intrusive errors are evident. • No plagiarism is detected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusive errors / limited lexicon are evident which affect the clarity, the succinctness and effectiveness of the writing. • No plagiarism is detected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent intrusive errors / a very limited lexicon are evident which seriously affect the clarity, the succinctness and effectiveness of the writing. • No plagiarism is detected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious and very intrusive errors / an extremely limited lexicon are evident which render the piece almost unintelligible. OR • Evidence of serious plagiarism is detected which disqualifies the piece and calls for disciplinary actions.

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
Visuals (where needed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very effective employment of visuals to complement / supplement textual descriptions. • Visuals are very easy to comprehend and well-labelled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite effective employment of visuals to complement / supplement textual descriptions. • Visuals are mostly easy to comprehend and quite well-labelled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat effective employment of visuals to complement / supplement textual descriptions. • Some visuals require some efforts to comprehend. • Some are not labelled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ineffective employment of visuals. • Many of the visuals are difficult to comprehend and/or not labelled. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No visuals are employed <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomprehensible visuals.

The oral presentation

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very intellectually engaging • Very clearly and succinctly presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite intellectually engaging. • Quite/fairly clearly and quite/fairly succinctly presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat intellectually engaging. • Some major ideas are not clearly and/or succinctly presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not very intellectually engaging. • Most ideas are unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are not intellectually engaging at all. • Very unclear and difficult to understand
Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas cohere very well all the time. • Very effective use of sign-posting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas cohere most of the time. • Minor/non-intrusive logical and or topic ruptures. • Quite effective use of sign-posting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few intrusive logical or thematic ruptures that makes some parts of the speech difficult to follow. • Some use of signposting and more is needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major intrusive logical and/or thematic ruptures which make some key parts of the speech difficult to follow. • Little/ineffective use of signposting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas don't cohere at all. • Lack of use of signposting. • The speech is very difficult to follow.
Visuals and other materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides are all very professionally and effectively designed. • Other materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides are quite effectively designed. • Other materials _____ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some slides are not very effectively designed. • Other materials _____ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ineffective design of most slides. • Other materials _____ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides are all very poorly designed. OR • no materials prepared.
Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spontaneous all the time without reading from slides and/or notes. • Clear signs of preparation and rehearsal including non-verbal language and use of visuals. • An outstanding ability to engage in sustained discussions with the audience. • Very confident throughout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained and spontaneous most of the time. • Occasional reading from slides and/or notes. • Signs of preparation and rehearsal including non-verbal language and use of visuals. • A good ability to engage in sustained discussions most of the time. • Quite/fairly confident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained and spontaneous in some parts. • Quite a lot of reading from slides/notes. • Signs of preparation and rehearsal including non-verbal language and use of visuals. • An adequate ability to participate in sustained discussions • Lacks confidence somewhat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading from slides/notes most of the time. • Not quite able to hold sustained discussions. • Few signs of preparation and rehearsal. • Lacks confidence in general 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scripted speech • Inability to engage in sustained discussions. • A serious lack of rehearsal and confidence.
Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly fluent all the time. • An outstanding mastery of English. • Use of a wide range of grammatical forms and vocabulary with flexibility. • A very appropriate register used. • Very few non-intrusive errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite fluent most of the time, with some minor pauses, repairs, etc. • An advanced mastery of English. • Use of a range of grammatical forms and vocabulary • Register quite appropriate. • A noticeable number of non-intrusive errors but speech is still highly intelligible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat fluent some of the time only, with quite a few pauses, repairs, etc. • Use of simple grammatical forms and some complex structures (despite some inaccuracies) and appropriate vocabulary. • Adequate register. • A noticeable number intrusive errors which • Still intelligible most of the time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not very fluent, with major pauses, repairs, etc. • Only use of simple grammatical forms and basic vocabulary to convey very basic meaning. • Speech is still somewhat intelligible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many major pauses and repairs which disrupt the flow of the speech. • Use of very limited grammatical forms and vocabulary. • Unintelligible most of the time.

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

1. Keyword Syllabus

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

2. Reading List

2.1 Compulsory Readings

1. Cargill, M. & O'Connor, P. (2013). <i>Writing Scientific Research Articles: Strategy and Steps (2nd ed)</i> . Chichester, West Sussex, UK : Wiley-Blackwell.
2. Fabb, N. & Durant, A. (2014). <i>How to Write Essays and Dissertations: A Guide for English Literature Students</i> . (2nd ed.) New York, NY: Routledge.
3. Lunenburg, F.C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). <i>Writing a Successful Thesis or Dissertation: Tips and Strategies for Students in the Social and Behavioral Sciences</i> . Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin Press (Sage).
4. Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (2016). <i>Getting Published in Academic Journals: Navigating the Publication Process</i> . Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
5. Ridley, D. (2008). <i>The Literature Review: A Step-by-Step Guide for Students</i> . Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
6. Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. (2000). <i>English in Today's Research World</i> . Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

2.2 Additional Readings and Online Resources

Readings

1. Artemeva, N. (2000). Revising a research article: Dialogic negotiation. In P. Dias & A. Paré (eds.), <i>Transitions: Writing in Academic and Workplace Settings</i> (pp.74-87). Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press Inc.
2. Belcher, D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. <i>Journal of Second Language Writing</i> , 16, 1–22.
3. Casanave, C. & Vandrick, S. (eds.) (2003). <i>Writing for Scholarly Publication: Behind the Scenes in Language Education</i> . Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.
4. Flowerdew, J. & Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). Genre analysis of editorial letters to international journal contributors. <i>Applied Linguistics</i> , 23, 463-489.
5. Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. (2000). <i>English in Today's Research World</i> . Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
6. Weissberg, R. & Buker, S. (1990). <i>Writing up Research: Experimental Research Report Writing for Students of English</i> . Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.
7. Williams, H.C. (2004). How to reply to referees' comments when submitting manuscripts for publication. <i>Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology</i> , 51, 79-83.

Online resources

1. Sample theses: On-line theses (CityU library)
2. Concordancing tool: AntConc (http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html)
3. Sample academic English (spoken): Licensed EAP corpus MICASE (https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/micase/)
4. Sample academic English (written): BNC (http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/)
5. Citation management tools: Endnote (CityU library) & Zotero (https://www.zotero.org/)
6. Citation style guides: https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_style_introduction.html