

**City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus**

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

Part I Course Overview

Course Title:	Capstone Project
Course Code:	EN6943
Course Duration:	The normal duration is 2 semesters (Semester B and Summer Term) ¹ .
Credit Units:	6
Level:	P6
Medium of Instruction:	English
Medium of Assessment:	English
Prerequisites: (Course Code and Title)	EN6471 Research Methods in English Studies ² or EN6508 Critical Approaches to Literature ^{3,4}
Precursors: (Course Code and Title)	Nil
Equivalent Courses: (Course Code and Title)	
Exclusive Courses: (Course Code and Title)	EN6941 Dissertation

¹ Scheduled lessons are held in the first semester.

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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	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%			

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: 100%							
Capstone Project Proposal A proposal specifying a) the aims of the project, b) the expected output and c) an action plan to achieve the output.	✓	✓	✓	✓		10%	
Essay A critical review of the literature related to the project of the project, with implications drawn for the development of the project output,	✓	✓	✓	✓		20%	
Presentation An interim presentation reporting the progress made, discusses issues and challenges encountered, and summarizes the remaining work.		✓	✓	✓		20%	
Project output A creative or applied artefact(s) that is developed based on the critical literature review	✓	✓	✓	✓		20%	
Project output commentary An essay explaining and evaluating the output, including a personal reflection on the project	✓	✓	✓	✓		25%	
Class participation Active participation in class activities			✓	✓		5%	
Examination: 0%						100%	

5. Assessment Rubrics

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

Capstone Project Proposal (10%)

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project has a very clear research focus, identifies a significant issue(s) to address, and is very well designed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project has a clear research focus, identifies an issue to address, and is quite well designed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major parts of the proposed project, its focus, the issue(s) to address, its description, action plan need to be reconsidered and/or further elaborated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project study lacks a focus, is poorly designed/described,
Research ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives a clear and thorough discussion of potential ethical issues and where applicable proposes fully sensible and appropriate measures to address them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives a generally clear and thorough discussion of potential ethical issues and where applicable provides sensible and appropriate measures to address them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives a partial/sketchy discussion of potential ethical issues and/or measures to address them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No potential ethical considerations are discussed and/or no measures to address potential issues are proposed.
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan . All of the required are present Ideas are very logically developed in sufficient detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan . 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 mostly presented logically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a recognizable proposal structure, but the overall organization plan and/or its implementation is not appropriate. Includes some but not all of the sections specified for an A-C range proposal; or one or more of the sections is present but fails to achieve its purpose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks a recognizable and appropriate structure. The aims and expected outcomes are very poorly described. The methodology and the plan of action is not included or is not achievable at all. May include some or all of the sections specified for an A-C range proposal, but most fail to achieve their purpose. May be significantly below the recommended word limit.

Language and style	Lexicogrammar is extremely accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is usually accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Minor issues do not negatively affect comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is frequently accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Relatively few issues have only a limited, negative effect on comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is inaccurate and/or unidiomatic and/or lacks appropriate variation or control of register, significantly disrupting comprehension.
---------------------------	---	--	---	---

Essay (20%)

Criteria	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes all required information; Demonstrates an in-depth and critical engagement with relevant published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Original with a clear fit between its aims, literature review, approach/methods, and expected outcomes Shows a sophisticated understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project. Key concepts and theory are discussed in depth and critically. The expected outcomes demonstrate a potentially significant contribution the topic area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most required information is included; Demonstrates a critical engagement with relevant published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Quite original, with (a) a clear fit between its aims, literature review, approach/method, and expected outcomes. Shows a good understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project. Key concepts and theory are discussed in some depth and quite critically; The expected outcomes demonstrate some contributions to the topic area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quite a large amount of crucial information is missing Displays a poor engagement with relevant published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Attempts at achieving the aims but not very successfully Literature review is under-developed Shows a lack of fit between the aims, the research approach/methods, the expected outcomes and the conclusion. Shows limited or minimal understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project. Methodology somewhat flawed or under-reported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required information is missing Shows little or no engagement with relevant published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Seriously flawed in the approach / methods. Serious misalignment in the aims, the methods, the outcomes and conclusion. Shows little or no understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in the project. No evidence of ethic review approval (for projects involving human participants)
Research ethic review	Applicable (if the project involved human participants and sensitive data) & approved			Applicable but not approved or no approval sought
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan . All of the required are present Ideas are very logically developed in sufficient detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan . Includes all the sections specified for an A range proposal, but there are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a recognizable structure, but the overall organization and/or its implementation is not appropriate. Includes some but not all of the sections specified for an A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks a recognizable capstone project report structure. May include some or all of the sections specified for an A-C range capstone project

		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 mostly presented logically.	to B range capstone project 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.	report, but most fail to achieve their purpose. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be significantly below the recommended word limit.
Engagement with the research literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates engagement with an extensive body of literature. • All sources are highly relevant. • Source ideas are accurately presented, very well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument. • Appropriate referencing conventions are accurately followed throughout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates engagement with a substantial body of literature. • Sources are relevant; • Most source ideas are accurately presented, well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument. • Appropriate referencing conventions are followed, generally accurately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates engagement with only a small portion of the literature. • Most of the sources are not immediately relevant; • Source ideas are partially/inaccurately presented and/or poorly integrated, which causes disruption to the flow of discussion and/or do not contribute to the argument.. • Adequate referencing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates little or no engagement with the literature. • All or most of the sources are not relevant. • Source ideas are inaccurately presented, and/or poorly integrated, significantly disrupting the flow of discussion, and do not succeed in supporting the argument. • Appropriate referencing is lacking.
Language and style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is extremely accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is usually accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Minor issues do not negatively affect comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is frequently accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Relatively few issues have only a limited, negative effect on comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is inaccurate and/or unidiomatic and/or lacks appropriate variation or control of register, significantly disrupting comprehension.

Presentation (20%)

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
A summary of the action plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clearly and succinctly described • Achievable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite clearly and succinctly described • Quite achievable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequately described need some clarification • Fairly achievable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear at all • Not achievable at all
Progress made	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly reported • Actions well-implemented • Excellent progress made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite clearly reported • Actions quite properly implemented • Some good progress made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairly clearly reported • Actions adequately implemented • Satisfactory progress made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme unclear • Very poorly implemented • Poor progress
Issues/challenges Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-articulated • Very appropriately addressed • Critical and meaningful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite clearly articulated • Quite appropriately addressed • Quite critical and quite meaningful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairly clearly articulated • Adequately addressed • Not critical enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of issues • Issues poorly addressed • No reflection
Remaining work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplishable • Very sensible • Well-thought out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite accomplishable • Some minor adjustments needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairly accomplishable • Need a few major adjustments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not accomplishable
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very organized • Effectively sectioned • Ideas are well-connected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite organized • Quite effectively sectioned • Ideas are quite well-connected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequately organized • Adequately sectioned • Some obvious problems with coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poorly organized • No sectioning at all • Ideas do not cohere at all.
Language and style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is extremely accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. • Pronunciation is extremely accurate and clear. • Very spontaneous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is usually accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. • Pronunciation is usually accurate and clear. • Minor issues do not negatively affect comprehension. • Usually spontaneous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is frequently accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. • Pronunciation is frequently accurate and clear. • Relatively few issues have only a limited, negative effect on comprehension. • Somewhat spontaneous; some frequent reading from a script or slides 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexicogrammar is inaccurate and/or unidiomatic and/or lacks appropriate variation or control of register, • Pronunciation is inaccurate and very unclear. • Major issues significantly disrupting comprehension. • Not spontaneous at all; reading from a script or slides only.

Visual communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A variety of visuals/media used. • Very concise • Very focused • Appropriate sizes of images/fonts used • Effectively illustrating, supporting or complementing what the presenter orally presents • Creatively designed • Very professionally designed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fair amount/variety of visuals/media used • A few visuals somewhat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ wordy ○ cluttered • Somewhat appropriate sizes of images/fonts • Somewhat redundant • Visuals fairly creatively designed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very limited variety used • Few images/graphics used • A noticeable number of visuals somewhat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ wordy ○ cluttered • Somewhat inappropriate sizes images/fonts • Visuals mostly redundant • Little creativity reflected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few visuals/media used. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visuals all <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ very wordy ○ extremely cluttered • Sizes of images and fonts too small/inappropriate • Visuals all redundant • No creativity reflected
Engagement with the audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very assertive, relaxed and natural throughout • Effective and explicit reference made to specific parts of visuals • Audience allowed enough time to browse crucial parts of the visuals • Natural /sufficient eye contact and body language • Providing very effective back channels, and doing so in very assertive/sophisticated manner • Very well-composed when responding to questions from the audience • Very effective non-verbal communication throughout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite assertive and natural most of the time • Explicit references made to their specific parts somewhat frequently • Rushing through some visuals. • Attempts made to communicate with the audience through eye contact and body language • Quite well-composed when responding to questions from the audience • Providing somewhat effective back channels • Somewhat effective non-verbal communication in certain parts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat nervous and quite unnatural • Reading somewhat frequently from slides / notes • Occasional explicit references made to specific parts of visuals • Rushing through most visuals • Infrequent eye contact and little body language • Somewhat uneasy, nervous and defensive at times when responding to questions. • Displaying somewhat limited or inappropriate back channels • Somewhat ineffective non-verbal communication in a noticeable number of parts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenter seriously lacking confidence and appearing extremely uneasy • Reading from slides / notes throughout • No explicit reference made to specific parts of visuals • A severe lack of eye contact and body language • Extremely uneasy and nervous; or extremely defensive • Displaying no back channel at all or displaying inappropriate back channels all the time • Lacking non-verbal communication with the audience throughout.

Project output (20%)

Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization of the output is effective, compelling, and well considered Components are well-connected and integrated The design enhances the central ideas of the topic Effective and creative use of multimodal elements as appropriate to the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization of the output is functional and effective Components are generally well-connected and integrated The design is generally effective in terms of conveying meaning and relevant ideas Good use of multimodal elements as appropriate to the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization of the output is effective, with some inconsistency. Components are adequately connected and integrated The design is generally effective in terms of conveying meaning and relevant ideas with some inconsistency. Adequate use of multimodal elements as appropriate to the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poorly organized and little effort to design the output into a coherent and attractive form. Ideas are not clearly presented in relation to the project organization. Insufficient or inadequate use of multimodal elements
Language and style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is extremely accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is usually accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Minor issues do not negatively affect comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is frequently accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Relatively few issues have only a limited, negative effect on comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is inaccurate and/or unidiomatic and/or lacks appropriate variation or control of register, significantly disrupting comprehension.
Fulfilment of Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims and objectives, as outlined in the output commentary, are effectively achieved The output offers a complex and thoughtful realization of relevant ideas, approaches, or principles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims and objectives, as outlined in the output commentary, are generally well achieved The output offers an effective realization of relevant ideas, approaches, or principles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims and objectives, as outlined in the output commentary, are only partially achieved The output offers an adequate realization of relevant ideas, approaches, or principles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The output does not appear to address or effectively achieve the project objectives. The main ideas, approaches, or principles that inform the output remain unclear.

Project Output commentary (25%)

Criteria	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes all required information; Provides a detailed and effective description of the project output Demonstrates an in-depth and critical engagement with published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Output aims and objectives succinctly and clearly explained and well-defended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most required information is included; Provides a good description of the project output Demonstrates a critical engagement published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Output aims and objectives quite succinctly explained and quite well-defended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some crucial information is missing Provides an adequate description of the project output Displays a fair engagement with published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Output aims and objectives adequately explained but some parts need more elaboration; Output adequately defended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required information is missing Does not adequately describe the output Shows little or no engagement published scholarship and primary texts as appropriate to the project; Output poorly explained and defended
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commentary provides a thoughtful description of the learning process, with relevant support and details. The commentary effectively explains how aims and objectives developed throughout the learning experience The commentary offers valuable perspectives on the project in relation relevant professional, social, or personal contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commentary provides a good description of the learning process, with relevant support and details. The commentary explains how aims and objectives developed The commentary provides consideration of the aims and objectives in relation relevant professional, social, or personal contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commentary provides adequate description of the learning process, with some support and details. The commentary explains, in basic terms, how aims and objectives changed and developed The project's relevance to wider professional, social, or personal contexts is basically justified but may lack in detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commentary does not adequately describe the learning process, relevant issues, or learning experiences
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan . All of the required are present Ideas are very logically developed in sufficient detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear and appropriate organizational plan . 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a recognizable structure, but the overall organization and/or its implementation is not appropriate. Includes some but not all of the sections specified for an A to B range capstone project report; or one or more of the sections is present but fails to achieve its purpose (e.g., the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks a recognizable capstone project report structure. May include some or all of the sections specified for an A-C range capstone project report, but most fail to achieve their purpose. May be significantly below the recommended word limit.

		project, and action plan all are mostly presented logically.	literature review does not review relevant literature, no approach is described.	
Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source ideas are accurately presented, very well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument. Appropriate referencing conventions are accurately followed throughout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources are relevant; Most source ideas are accurately presented, well integrated and contribute to the development of the argument. Appropriate referencing conventions are followed, generally accurately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the sources are not immediately relevant; Source ideas are partially/inaccurately presented and/or poorly integrated, which causes disruption to the flow of discussion and/or do not contribute to the argument. Adequate referencing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All or most of the sources are not relevant. Source ideas are inaccurately presented, and/or poorly integrated, significantly disrupting the flow of discussion, and do not succeed in supporting the argument. Appropriate referencing is lacking.
Language and style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is extremely accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is usually accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Minor issues do not negatively affect comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is frequently accurate, idiomatic, varied and appropriate to the register. Relatively few issues have only a limited, negative effect on comprehension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexicogrammar is inaccurate and/or unidiomatic and/or lacks appropriate variation or control of register, significantly disrupting comprehension.

Class participation (5%)

Criteria	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
Attendance & participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend all classes Participate proactively in class activities Make meaningful contributions in discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend all classes Participate proactively in some of the class activities Make somewhat meaningful contributions in discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend some of the classes Participate in very few class activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Miss most of the classes Or no participation in class activities

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.