

**City University of Hong Kong  
Course Syllabus**

**offered by College/School/Department of English  
with effect from Semester A 2022 / 2023**

---

---

**Part I Course Overview**

<b>Course Title:</b>	Capstone Project
<b>Course Code:</b>	EN6943
<b>Course Duration:</b>	The normal duration is 2 semesters (Semester B and Summer Term) <sup>1</sup> .
<b>Credit Units:</b>	6
<b>Level:</b>	P6
<b>Proposed Area:</b> <i>(for GE courses only)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Arts and Humanities <input type="checkbox"/> Study of Societies, Social and Business Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Science and Technology
<b>Medium of Instruction:</b>	English
<b>Medium of Assessment:</b>	English
<b>Prerequisites:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	EN6471 Research Methods in English Studies <sup>2</sup> or EN6508 Critical Approaches to Literature <sup>3,4</sup>
<b>Precursors:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
<b>Equivalent Courses:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	
<b>Exclusive Courses:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	EN6941 Dissertation

---

<sup>1</sup> Scheduled lessons are held in the first semester.

<sup>2</sup> For students planning to study a TESL/Applied Linguistics topic. See also requirements about stream-specific choice of research topics in Part 2: Paragraph 4 Assessment Tasks and Activities.

<sup>3</sup> For students planning to work on a literary research topic. See also requirements about stream-specific choice of research topics in Part 2: Paragraph 4 Assessment Tasks and Activities.

<sup>4</sup> Students need to have gained at least 12 credit units in the programme before being allowed to enrol in the course.

## Part II Course Details

### 1. Abstract

(A 150-word description about the course)

This course aims to develop students' expertise to carry out a capstone project involving the research base in a chosen area of English studies through the application of concepts, theories, research approaches and methods acquired in the programme.

### 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.)

By the end of the course, students are expected to complete a capstone research project. In the process, they are expected to develop the following competences and demonstrate them as outcomes of learning.

No.	CILOs <sup>#</sup>	Weighting* (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	A2	A3
1.	search, select and critically evaluate literature and other materials in order to develop a sound understanding of the topic under investigation, relevant research approaches and methods applicable to a capstone project;	20%	✓	✓	✓
2.	design, conduct and manage the project rigorously by applying knowledge gained in CILO 1 and observing the University's research ethic guidelines;	25%	✓	✓	✓
3.	discuss different aspects of the project in a logical, precise, and coherent manner;	30%	✓	✓	✓
4.	reflect critically on and communicate the experience gained through the project	25%	✓		✓
		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.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4			
Seminars and workshops	Students attend seminars / workshops and engage in tasks such as group discussions, text analysis, reading and writing.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Reading	Students acquire specialist knowledge on a focused area of inquiry.	✓			✓			
Project definition	Students formulate and execute a project related to their area of inquiry. Examples of projects include a systematic review of the literature, planning and implementing a pedagogical approach, etc.		✓		✓			
Writing	Students keep logs of their work and reflect on their work in the project.		✓	✓	✓			
Consultation	Students meet up with their supervision the first and the second semester to discuss their projects and receive advice on their projects and the assessed written products.	✓	✓	✓	✓			

#### 4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.					Weighting*	Remarks
	1	2	3	4			
Continuous Assessment: ____%							
<b>Capstone Project Proposal</b> A proposal specifying a) the aims of the project, b) the theory or concepts on which it builds, c) the approaches to be used, d) the expected outcomes and e) an action plan to achieve the outcomes. (2,500-4,000 words, excluding references and appendices)	✓	✓	✓	✓		20%	
<b>Interim Project Submission</b> An interim report presents the progress made, discusses issues and challenges encountered, and summarizes the remaining work. (1,200-1,500 words, excluding references and appendices)		✓	✓	✓		40%	
<b>Final Project Submission</b> A written final report suitable for the nature of the project, describing relevant learning activities and outcomes while engaging with a body of academic research and demonstrating a knowledge of key issue (15,000-20,000 words)	✓	✓	✓	✓		40%	
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.)

### Project Proposal

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
<b>Knowledge about and analysis of topic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a thorough critical engagement with the literature;</li> <li>• Shows an excellent understanding of the topic, key concepts, theory, and their application to the proposed study;</li> <li>• Key concepts and theory are discussed in depth and critically.</li> <li>• The proposed project has a very clear research focus, identifies a significant issue(s) to address, is very well designed, and thoroughly describes an appropriate approach which demonstrates strong engagement with the literature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a good critical engagement with the literature;</li> <li>• Shows sufficient understanding of the topic, key concepts, theory, and their application to the proposed study;</li> <li>• Key concepts and theory are discussed in some depth and quite critically;</li> <li>• The proposed project has a clear research focus, identifies an issue to address, is quite well designed, and describes an appropriate project which demonstrates engagement with the literature .</li> <li>• Some parts of the design are grounded in the literature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displays a fair engagement with the literature;</li> <li>• Shows partial understanding of the topic, some of the key concepts and their application to the proposed study;</li> <li>• The discussion of the key concepts and theory is adequate in depth and criticality;</li> <li>• The proposed project has a fairly clear research focus, is adequately designed.</li> <li>• The approach is adequately described and a fairly described approach and displays some evidence of engagement with the research literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displays a poor engagement with the literature;</li> <li>• Shows inadequate understanding of the topic, the key concepts and/or their application to the proposed study;</li> <li>• Discussion of key concepts and theory is limited in depth and/or criticality</li> <li>• Major parts of the proposed project, its focus, the issue(s) to address, its description, and/or its grounding in the research literature need to be reconsidered and/or further elaborated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows little or no engagement with the literature;</li> <li>• Shows inaccurate or poor understanding of the topic, the concepts and/or their application to the proposed study.</li> <li>• Discussion of key concepts and theory is missing, shallow, and/or uncritical.</li> <li>• The proposed project study lacks a focus, is poorly designed/described, and/or is not grounded in the research literature.</li> </ul>
<b>Research ethics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives a clear and thorough discussion of potential ethical issues and where applicable proposes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives a generally clear and thorough discussion of potential ethical issues and where</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives a minimal discussion of potential ethical issues and where applicable measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives an inadequate discussion of potential ethical issues and/or measures to address them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No potential ethical considerations are discussed and/or no measures to address potential issues are</li> </ul>

	fully sensible and appropriate measures to address them.	applicable provides sensible and appropriate measures to address them.	to address them		proposed.
<b>Engagement with the research literature</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates engagement with an extensive body of literature.</li> <li>• All sources are highly relevant.</li> <li>• Source ideas are accurately presented, very well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument.</li> <li>• Appropriate referencing conventions are accurately followed throughout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates engagement with a substantial body of literature.</li> <li>• Sources are relevant;</li> <li>• Most source ideas are accurately presented, well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument.</li> <li>• Appropriate referencing conventions are followed, generally accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates engagement with an adequate body of literature.</li> <li>• Sources are generally relevant;</li> <li>• Source ideas are accurately presented and integrated and contribute to the argument..</li> <li>• Appropriate referencing conventions are applied with only minor inaccuracies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates engagement with only a small portion of the literature.</li> <li>• Most of the sources are not immediately relevant;</li> <li>• Source ideas are partially inaccurately presented and/or poorly integrated, cause disruption to the flow of discussion and/or do not contribute to the argument..</li> <li>• Appropriate referencing conventions are not used or significant inaccuracies occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates little or no engagement with the literature.</li> <li>• All or most of the sources are not relevant.</li> <li>• Source ideas are inaccurately presented, and/or poorly integrated, significantly disrupting the flow of discussion, and do not succeed in supporting the argument.</li> <li>• Appropriate referencing is lacking.</li> </ul>
<b>Organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan .</li> <li>• Includes a thorough, focused and concise review of relevant literature; clearly stated aims and achievable expected outcomes.</li> <li>• Has a detailed but concise statement of methodology and action plan;</li> <li>• All of these sections should be present in an A range proposal.</li> <li>• Ideas are very logically developed in sufficient detail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan .</li> <li>• Includes a rather thorough and focused review of relevant literature; quite clearly stated aims and quite achievable expected outcomes.</li> <li>• Includes a detailed but concise statement of methodology and an action plan but some minor parts need reconsideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan;</li> <li>• Includes a rather loosely developed literature review; adequately stated aims and some expected outcomes some of which may not be achievable.</li> <li>• A few crucial parts of the methodology and the action plan need some elaboration or reconsideration.</li> <li>• Includes all the sections specified for an A/B range proposal, but there</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a recognizable proposal structure, but the overall organization plan and/or its implementation is not appropriate.</li> <li>• Includes an under-developed literature review; some aims and expected outcomes that are either vaguely described or not achievable at all.</li> <li>• Many parts of the methodology and the action plan need some elaboration or reconsideration.</li> <li>• Includes some but not all of the sections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks a recognizable and appropriate structure.</li> <li>• The aims and expected outcomes are very poorly described.</li> <li>• The literature review is poorly developed.</li> <li>• The methodology and the plan of action is not included or is not achievable at all.</li> <li>• May include some or all of the sections specified for an A-C range proposal, but most fail to achieve their purpose.</li> <li>• May be significantly below the recommended word</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes all the sections specified for an A range proposal, but there are weaknesses in one or two of the sections. In contrast to a C range proposal, the focus of the project, and action plan all are presented logically.</li> </ul>	are weaknesses in most or all of the sections. In particular, the organization of the focus of the project, and action plan does not give a clear picture of how the research will be conducted,	specified for an A-C range proposal; or one or more of the sections is present but fails to achieve its purpose (e.g., the literature review does not review relevant literature, the methodology does not describe a methodology).	limit.
<b>Language and style</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A high standard of written English, although occasional errors in grammar or word choice may occur but do not interfere with understanding.</li> <li>Appropriate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>A very consistent style of writing throughout</li> <li>Ideas are expressed clearly and effectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A good standard of written English, although some errors in grammar or word choice are in evidence but do not interfere with understanding.</li> <li>Appropriate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>A consistent style of writing in most parts</li> <li>Ideas are clearly and somewhat effectively expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable standard of written English with somewhat frequent errors in grammar or word choice are evident that sometimes affect the intelligibility at some points.</li> <li>Adequate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>A fairly consistent style of writing in most parts</li> <li>Ideas are somewhat effectively expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A low standard of written English. Very frequent errors in grammar or word choice make parts of the proposal rather difficult to understand.</li> <li>Academic writing conventions are not followed correctly or consistently.</li> <li>Very inconsistent in the style of writing in most parts</li> <li>Requires substantial revisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard of English in the proposal overall or in a major part of it is so low that the research is obscured and uninterpretable.</li> <li>Extremely inconsistent style of writing throughout</li> <li>A poor mastery of the academic conventions.</li> </ul>

## Interim Submission

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
<b>A summary of the action plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very clearly and succinctly described</li> <li>Achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite clearly and succinctly described</li> <li>Quite achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequately described need some clarification</li> <li>Fairly achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequately described</li> <li>Not quite achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not clear at all</li> <li>Not achievable at all</li> </ul>
<b>Progress made</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly reported</li> <li>Actions well-implemented</li> <li>Excellent progress made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite clearly reported</li> <li>Actions quite properly implemented</li> <li>Some good progress made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly clearly reported</li> <li>Actions adequately implemented</li> <li>Satisfactory progress made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear description (details missing)</li> <li>Inadequately implemented</li> <li>Inadequate progress made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extreme unclear</li> <li>Very poorly implemented</li> <li>Poor progress</li> </ul>
<b>Issues/challenges Reflection</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-articulated</li> <li>Very appropriately addressed</li> <li>Critical and meaningful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite clearly articulated</li> <li>Quite appropriately addressed</li> <li>Quite critical and quite meaningful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly clearly articulated</li> <li>Adequately addressed</li> <li>Not critical enough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear description</li> <li>Inadequately addressed</li> <li>Not critical at all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mention of issues</li> <li>Issues poorly addressed</li> <li>No reflection</li> </ul>
<b>Remaining work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accomplishable</li> <li>Very sensible</li> <li>Well-thought out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite accomplishable</li> <li>Some minor adjustments needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly accomplishable</li> <li>Need a few major adjustments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not quite accomplishable</li> <li>Need major adjustments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not accomplishable</li> </ul>
<b>Organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very organized</li> <li>Effectively sectioned</li> <li>Ideas are well-connected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite organized</li> <li>Quite effectively sectioned</li> <li>Ideas are quite well-connected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequately organized</li> <li>Adequately sectioned</li> <li>Some obvious problems with coherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poorly organized</li> <li>Poorly sectioned</li> <li>Major problems with coherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very poorly organized</li> <li>No sectioning at all</li> <li>Ideas do not cohere at all.</li> </ul>
<b>Language and style</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A high standard of written English, although occasional errors in grammar or word choice may occur but do not interfere with understanding.</li> <li>Appropriate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>Ideas are expressed clearly and effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A good standard of written English, although some errors in grammar or word choice are in evidence but do not interfere with understanding.</li> <li>Appropriate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>Ideas are clearly and somewhat effectively expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable standard of written English with somewhat frequent errors in grammar or word choice are evident that sometimes affect the intelligibility at some points.</li> <li>Adequate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>Ideas are somewhat effectively expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A low standard of written English. Very frequent errors in grammar or word choice make parts of the proposal rather difficult to understand.</li> <li>Academic writing conventions are not followed correctly or consistently.</li> <li>Requires substantial revisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard of English in the proposal overall or in a major part of it is so low that the research is obscured and uninterpretable.</li> <li>A poor mastery of the academic conventions.</li> </ul>



## Final Submission

Criteria	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
<b>Quality of the project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes all required information;</li> <li>Demonstrates an in-depth and critical engagement with the literature;</li> <li>Original with a clear fit between its aims, literature review, approach/methods, outcomes and conclusion</li> <li>Shows a sophisticated understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project.</li> <li>Key concepts and theory are discussed in depth and critically.</li> <li>The outcomes demonstrate a potentially significant contribution the topic area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most required information is included;</li> <li>Demonstrates a critical engagement with the literature;</li> <li>Quite original, with (a) a clear fit between its aims, literature review, approach/method, outcomes and conclusion.</li> <li>Shows a good understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project.</li> <li>Key concepts and theory are discussed in some depth and quite critically;</li> <li>The outcomes demonstrate some contributions to the topic area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some crucial information is missing</li> <li>Displays a fair engagement with the literature;</li> <li>Adequate with (a) a reasonable fit between its aims, literature review, approach/methods, outcomes and the conclusion.</li> <li>Shows a basic understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project.</li> <li>Discussions of key concepts and theory lacks depth and critical thinking;</li> <li>The outcomes show a limited contribution to the topic area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite a large amount of crucial information is missing</li> <li>Displays a poor engagement with the literature;</li> <li>Attempts at achieving the aims but not very successfully</li> <li>Literature review is under-developed</li> <li>Shows a lack of fit between the aims, the research approach/methods, the outcomes and the conclusion.</li> <li>Shows limited or minimal understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project.</li> <li>Methodology somewhat flawed or under-reported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All required information is missing</li> <li>Shows no engagement with the literature;</li> <li>Seriously flawed in the approach / methods.</li> <li>Serious misalignment in the aims, the methods, the outcomes and conclusion.</li> <li>Shows little or no understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project.</li> <li>No evidence of ethic review approval (for projects involving human participants)</li> </ul>
<b>Research ethic review</b>	Applicable (if the project involved human participants and sensitive data) & approved				Applicable but not approved or no approval sought
<b>Organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a clear organizational plan</li> <li>Includes a thorough, focused and concise review of relevant literature; clearly stated and answerable topic; and detailed but concise statement of approaches; logically presented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a clear organizational plan</li> <li>Includes all the sections specified for an A range capstone project report, but there are some minor weaknesses in one</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a clear organizational plan</li> <li>Includes all the sections specified for an A/B range capstone project report, but there are some major weaknesses in in one or two sections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a recognizable structure, but the overall organization plan and/or its implementation is not appropriate.</li> <li>Includes some but not all of the sections specified for an A-C range capstone project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks a recognizable capstone project report structure.</li> <li>May include some or all of the sections specified for an A-C range capstone project report, but most fail to achieve their purpose.</li> </ul>

	outcomes in an appropriate format; and a discussion and/or conclusion drawing out the significance of the project. All of these sections should be present in an A range capstone project report.	or two of the sections. In contrast to a C range capstone project report, the topic approaches and outcomes are reported logically and in detail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic and approaches are reported somewhat logically.</li> </ul>	report; or one or more of the sections is present but fails to achieve its purpose (e.g., the literature review does not review relevant literature, no approach is described.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be significantly below the recommended word limit.</li> </ul>
<b>Engagement with the research literature</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates engagement with an extensive body of literature.</li> <li>All sources are highly relevant.</li> <li>Source ideas are accurately presented, very well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument.</li> <li>Appropriate referencing conventions are accurately followed throughout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates engagement with a substantial body of literature.</li> <li>Sources are relevant;</li> <li>Most source ideas are accurately presented, well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument.</li> <li>Appropriate referencing conventions are followed, generally accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates engagement with an adequate body of literature.</li> <li>Sources are generally relevant;</li> <li>Source ideas are accurately presented and integrated and contribute to the argument..</li> <li>Appropriate referencing conventions are applied with only minor inaccuracies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates engagement with only a small portion of the literature.</li> <li>Most of the sources are not immediately relevant;</li> <li>Source ideas are partially inaccurately presented and/or poorly integrated, cause disruption to the flow of discussion and/or do not contribute to the argument..</li> <li>Appropriate referencing conventions are not used or significant inaccuracies occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates little or no engagement with the literature.</li> <li>All or most of the sources are not relevant.</li> <li>Source ideas are inaccurately presented, and/or poorly integrated, significantly disrupting the flow of discussion, and do not succeed in supporting the argument.</li> <li>Appropriate referencing is lacking.</li> </ul>
<b>Language and style</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A high standard of written English, although occasional errors in grammar or word choice may occur but do not interfere with understanding.</li> <li>Appropriate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>A very consistent style of writing throughout</li> <li>Ideas are expressed clearly and effectively</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A good standard of written English, although some errors in grammar or word choice are in evidence but do not interfere with understanding.</li> <li>Appropriate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>A consistent style of writing in most parts</li> <li>Ideas are clearly and somewhat effectively expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable standard of written English with somewhat frequent errors in grammar or word choice are evident that sometimes affect the intelligibility at some points.</li> <li>Adequate use of academic writing conventions.</li> <li>A fairly consistent style of writing in most parts</li> <li>Ideas are somewhat effectively expressed.</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A low standard of written English. Very frequent errors in grammar or word choice make parts of the proposal rather difficult to understand.</li> <li>Academic writing conventions are not followed correctly or consistently.</li> <li>Very inconsistent in the style of writing in most parts</li> <li>Requires substantial revisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard of English in the proposal overall or in a major part of it is so low that the research is obscured and uninterpretable.</li> <li>Extremely inconsistent style of writing throughout</li> <li>A poor mastery of the academic conventions.</li> </ul>

## **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.)*

research, capstone project

### **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. Costello, P. J. M. (2011). *Effective action research: Developing reflective thinking and practice*. New York: Continuum International Pub.
2. Ridley, D. (2012). *The literature review: A step-by-step guide for students* (2nd ed.). London: Sage
3. Simon Eliot and W.R. Owens (ed). (1998). *A handbook to literary research*. New York: Routledge, The Open University.
4. Fabb, N. & Durant, A. (2014). *How to write essays and dissertations: A guide for English literature students*. (2nd ed.) New York, NY: Routledge.

#### **2.2 Additional Readings**

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

Generic research methods

1. Andrews, R. (2003). *Research questions*. New York, NY: Continuum.
2. Bamberg, M., & Andrews, M. (2004). *Considering counter narratives: Narrating, resisting, making sense*. Philadelphia : J. Benjamins.
3. Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
4. Klein, S.R. (ed.) (2012). *Action research methods: Plain and simple*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.
6. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
7. Hyland, K., & Paltridge, B. (eds.) (2011). *Continuum companion to discourse analysis*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
8. Johnson, R., Chambers, D, Raghuram, P., & Tincknell, E. (2004). *The practice of cultural studies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.