

Course Syllabus

offered by the Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2022/ 2023

Part I Course Overview

Course Title: Research Methods in English Studies

Course Code: EN6471

Course Duration: 1 semester

Credit Units: 3

Level: P6

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 will teach students to research, analyze, evaluate, and apply critical approaches and methods in the field of English studies. The main aim is to prepare them to conduct their own independent research study.

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.	make use of library and online resources to conduct literature searches and to review the literature in order to guide the direction and the design of a study	5%	✓	✓	✓
2.	analyse and evaluate a range of research questions in English Studies	10%	✓	✓	✓
3.	analyse and evaluate a set of basic concepts, theories and research methods in English Studies	20%	✓	✓	✓
4.	analyse, evaluate, compare and contrast both the advantages and disadvantages of different research methods, with reference to different kinds of research questions in English Studies	30%	✓	✓	✓
5.	discuss ethical issues in research	5%	✓	✓	✓
6.	apply the knowledge and skills gained from CILOs 2-4 to design a research study	30%	✓	✓	✓
		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	5	6	
Lectures	Interactive lectures delivered by the instructor and guest speakers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2
Group discussions	Guided small group discussions		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1
Analysis tasks	Guided exploratory tasks that involve the use of authentic research texts representing various research methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1
Reading	Guided out-of-class reading tasks	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	3

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	5	6		
Continuous Assessment: <u>100</u> %								
Each student will write a part draft of a research proposal or a part draft of a critical survey of the research literature on a chosen topic.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	30%	
Each student will write a complete research proposal or a complete critical survey of the literature on a chosen topic.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	70%	
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)
1. Part draft of a research proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic • Content & analysis • Organization • Language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows full understanding of the topic; • Shows full understanding of main concepts and their application; • All relevant information is included in discussion and analysis; • The purpose of the analysis of concepts is completely achieved; • Effectively sectioned and organized • Style and tone are highly appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows sufficient understanding of the topic; • The main concepts are competently discussed and applied; • The information included in discussion and analysis of concepts is sufficient; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is achieved; • Quite effectively sectioned and organized • Style and tone are appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows partial understanding of the topic • The concepts selected for analysis are sufficient, and partially applied; • Only partial information is included in discussion and analysis of concepts; • Only partial analysis is provided; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is partially achieved; • Adequately sectioned and organized • Style and tone are somewhat appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows inadequate understanding of the topic • The concepts selected for analysis are sketchy and inadequate; • Incomplete information is included in discussion and analysis of concepts; • The analysis is not informative or comprehensive; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is not adequately achieved; • Inadequately sectioned and organized • Style and tone are inappropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows inaccurate understanding of the topic • The concepts selected for analysis are highly inadequate; • Very limited or inaccurate information is incorporated in conceptual analysis; • The analysis is not at all comprehensible; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is not achieved in any way; • Poorly sectioned and organized • Style and tone are completely inappropriate

<p>2. A complete research proposal draft</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic • Content & analysis • Research ethics • Organization • Language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows full understanding of the topic; • Shows full understanding of main concepts and their application; • All relevant information is included in discussion and analysis; • The purpose of the analysis of concepts is completely achieved; • Gives a thorough discussion, grounded in the scholarly literature on ethics, of the ethical considerations relevant to the project and clearly explaining how they could be addressed • Effectively sectioned and organized • Style and tone are highly appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows sufficient understanding of the topic; • The main concepts are competently discussed and applied; • The information included in discussion and analysis of concepts is sufficient; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is achieved; • Gives a generally clear discussion, grounded in the scholarly literature on ethics, of the ethical considerations relevant to the project and explaining how they could be addressed. • Quite effectively sectioned and organized • Style and tone are appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows partial understanding of the topic • The concepts selected for analysis are sufficient, and partially applied; • Only partial information is included in discussion and analysis of concepts; • Only partial analysis is provided; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is partially achieved; • Gives a rather brief discussion of the ethical considerations relevant to the project and explaining how they could be addressed, with some reference to the scholarly literature on ethics • Adequately sectioned and organized • Style and tone are somewhat appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows inadequate understanding of the topic • The concepts selected for analysis are sketchy and inadequate; • Incomplete information is included in discussion and analysis of concepts; • The analysis is not informative or comprehensive; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is not adequately achieved; • Raises some ethical considerations relevant to the topic but gives an inadequate discussion of them and/or inadequately describes how they could be addressed and/or makes insufficient reference to the scholarly literature on ethics • Inadequately sectioned and organized • Style and tone are inappropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows inaccurate understanding of the topic • The concepts selected for analysis are highly inadequate; • Very limited or inaccurate information is incorporated in conceptual analysis; • The analysis is not at all comprehensible; • The purpose of the conceptual analysis is not achieved in any way; • Does not discuss ethical considerations relevant to the project and/or does not describe how they could be addressed and/or is not informed by the scholarly literature on ethics • Poorly sectioned and organized • Style and tone are completely inappropriate
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

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 Searches, Research Questions, Research Paradigms and Methodologies

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.	Paltridge, B. & Phakiti, A. (2018). <i>Research methods in applied linguistics: A practical resource</i> . New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
2.	McKinley, J. & Rose, H. (2019). <i>The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics</i> . New York: Routledge.
3.	Towheed, S (2010). Tools and techniques for literary research: using online and printed sources. In Correa, D. and Owens, W.R. (Eds.), <i>The handbook to literary research</i> (pp. 9-36). London, New York: Routledge.
4.	Correa, D. & Owens, W.R. (2009), <i>The handbook to literary research</i> . (2 nd edition). New York: Routledge.
5.	Eagleton, T. (2011). "Introduction: What is Literature?" in <i>Literary Theory: An Introduction</i> . John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
6.	Castle, Gregory. "The Rise of Literary Theory" in <i>The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory</i> . Blackwell Publishers, 2007.
7.	Michael A. Elliott and Claudia Stokes. "Introduction: What Is Method and Why Does It Matter?" in <i>American Literary Studies : a Methodological Reader</i> . New York University Press, 2003.
8.	Yood, Jessica. "Writing the Discipline: A Generic History of English Studies." <i>College English</i> , vol. 65, no. 5, 2003, pp. 526–540. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3594251 .
9.	Olsen, Stein Haugom. "Progress in Literary Studies." <i>New Literary History</i> , vol. 36, no. 3, 2005, pp. 341–358. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/20057900 .

2.2 Additional Readings

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

1.	Andrews, R. (2003). <i>Research questions</i> . London, UK: Continuum.
2.	Zhang, L. J. & Zhang, D. (2019) Think-aloud protocols. In J. McKinley & H. Rose (Eds.). <i>The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics</i> . (pp. 302 – 311) New York: Routledge.
3.	Sato, M. & Ballinger, S. (2016) <i>Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda</i> . Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
4.	Hyon, S. (2018). <i>Introducing genre and English for specific purposes</i> . New York: Routledge.
5.	Owens, W.R. (2010). Editing literary texts. In Correa, D. and Owens, W.R. (Eds.), <i>The handbook to literary research</i> (pp. 69-86). London, New York: Routledge.
6.	Gutpa, S. (2010). The place of theory in literary disciplines. In Correa, D. and Owens, W.R. (Eds.), <i>The handbook to literary research</i> (pp.109-130). London, New York: Routledge.
7.	Johnson, D. (2010). <i>Literary research and interdisciplinarity</i> . In Correa, D. and Owens, W.R. (Eds.), <i>The handbook to literary research</i> (pp.131-147). London, New York:

	Routledge.
8.	Creswell, J. W. (2015). <i>Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research</i> . Boston: Pearson.
9.	Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N.(2018). <i>Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches</i> . Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
10.	Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). <i>Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches</i> . Thousand Oaks: Sage.