

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: (<i>Course Code and Title</i>) | Nil |
| Precursors: (<i>Course Code and Title</i>) | Nil |
| Equivalent Courses: (<i>Course Code and Title</i>) | Nil |
| Exclusive Courses: (<i>Course Code and Title</i>) | 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Interactive lectures▪ Small group discussions▪ Guided analyses of different types of research texts▪ Short writing tasks▪ Language exercises | 25 hours |
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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 | <p>1. <i>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% |
| 5 | <p>2. <i>Delivering an oral presentation</i></p> <p>Students will be asked to write the proposal of a conference paper and deliver an oral presentation of the paper to their colleagues.</p> | 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 | <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing carries the essential ideas expected of the genre/genre-part that the writing represents. The ideas are communicated clearly, effectively and succinctly. <p>Use of citations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Development of arguments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arguments are well-supported and well-developed. <p>Organization and format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing is effectively sectioned. Ideas within and across sections are well-connected. <p>Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing displays an appropriate mastery of the English language the scholarly register. No plagiarism is detected. |

| | |
|---|--|
| F | <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The piece is on the whole incomplete and many essential ideas are missing. • Ideas are vaguely communicated. <p>Use of citations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Development of arguments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments are poorly supported or under-developed. <p>Organization and format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sectioning is ineffectively done. • Continuity of ideas within/across sections is lacking. <p>Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation carries essential ideas expected of a paper presented at a conference. <p>Organization and format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation is effectively organized. • Ideas are well-connected. <p>Handling the Q/A time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presenter is confident and displays an appropriate command of the pragmatic skills / strategies when handling questions from the audience. <p>Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Use of visuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visuals are appropriately designed and effectively presented. <p>Assertiveness and eye contact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presenter is assertive, relaxed and natural throughout. • The presenter maintains natural /sufficient eye contact with the audience. |

| | |
|---|---|
| F | <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many essential ideas expected of a paper presented at a conference are missing. <p>Organization and format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation is poorly organized. • Ideas are mostly unconnected. • There is a general lack of signposts. <p>Handling the Q/A time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presenter is nervous and displays a poor command of pragmatic skills / strategies when handling questions from the audience. <p>Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Use of visuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visuals are inappropriately designed and poorly presented. <p>Assertiveness and eye contact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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., & Wignnins, 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