

# EN6941: DISSERTATION

---

**Effective Term**

Semester B 2025/26

## Part I Course Overview

**Course Title**

Dissertation

**Subject Code**

EN - English

**Course Number**

6941

**Academic Unit**

English (EN)

**College/School**

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CH)

**Course Duration**

One Semester

**Credit Units**

6

**Level**

P5, P6 - Postgraduate Degree

**Medium of Instruction**

English

**Medium of Assessment**

English

**Prerequisites**

EN6471 Research Methods in English Studies (1) or EN6508 Critical Approaches to Literature (2)(3)

**Precursors**

Nil

**Equivalent Courses**

Nil

**Exclusive Courses**

EN6943 Capstone Project

**Additional Information**

This is a dissertation-type course with supervision only.

Notes on prerequisites

- (1) For students planning to study a TESL/Applied Linguistics topic. See also requirements about choice of research topics in Part 2: Paragraph 4 Assessment Tasks and Activities.
- (2) For students planning to study on a literary research topic. See also requirements about choice of research topics.
- (3) 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

### Abstract

This course aims to develop academic skills and expertise to carry out independent research in a chosen area of language studies through the application of theory and techniques provided in the programme.

### Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

CILOs	Weighting (if app.)	DEC-A1	DEC-A2	DEC-A3
1 design, conduct, manage and report (on) a substantial piece of individual research and development work	25	x	x	x
2 search, select and critically evaluate literature and other materials relevant to the chosen area	25	x	x	x
3 apply suitable research methods and sound scholarly principles to investigate the chosen topic	25	x	x	x
4 communicate the results of the research effectively in a logical, precise and coherent manner in the form of a dissertation	25	x	x	x

#### 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 real-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.

### Learning and Teaching Activities (LTAs)

LTAs	Brief Description	CILO No.	Hours/week (if applicable)
1 Consultation	Students will meet a designated supervisor for individual consultation. Students, through independent study, will write the literature review, collect & analyse data, and then write up the dissertation.	1, 2, 3, 4	

### Assessment Tasks / Activities (ATs)

	ATs	CILO No.	Weighting (%)	Remarks ("-" for nil entry)	Allow Use of GenAI?
1	A dissertation reporting an independent research project (10,000- 15,000 words, excluding references and appendices).	1, 2, 3, 4	100	-	No

**Continuous Assessment (%)**

100

**Minimum Continuous Assessment Passing Requirement (%)**

0

**Additional Information for ATs**

The following requirements apply to the choice of research topic:

- Students are required to pursue a stream-specific research topic (e.g., a literature topic for students of the LLC stream or a TESL or a discourse analysis topic for the TESL stream). Students on the General Track are allowed to work on a literature or a TESL or an applied linguistics topic.
- Students need to have completed a relevant prerequisite before their research topics are approved.

**Assessment Rubrics (AR)****Assessment Task**

The Dissertation

**Criterion**

Quality of the research

**Excellent**

(A+, A, A-)

An excellent piece of original research, with (a) an in-depth and critical engagement with the literature on the topic, (b) a clear fit between literature review, research questions, methodology, and the research outcomes, and (c) a clearly identified and potentially significant contribution to knowledge in its topic area.

Shows a sophisticated understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in research.

**Good**

(B+, B, B-)

A good piece of research, with (a) a critical with the literature on the topic, (b) clear fit between literature review, research questions, methodology, and the research outcomes, and (c) clearly identified findings, which make a contribution to knowledge.

Shows a good understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in research.

**Fair**

(C+, C, C-)

An adequate piece of research with (a) a fair engagement of the literature on the topic, (b) a reasonable fit between literature review, research questions, methodology, and the research outcomes (although some flaws may be evident), and (c) clearly identified findings which make a limited contribution to knowledge.

Shows a basic understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in research.

**Marginal**

(D)

A barely adequate piece of research, in which there is evidence of an attempt to investigate a problem.

The work displays a poor engagement with the literature on the topic and is flawed in the research design or application of research procedures. The research outcomes or conclusions are reasonable.

Shows limited or minimal understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in research.

**Failure**

(F)

An inadequate piece of research, in which there may be evidence of an attempt to address a problem.

The work displays no engagement with the literature and serious flaws in research design and/or methodologies.

The findings or conclusions, if present, do not relate well to the writer's own research.

Shows little or no understanding of theoretical and methodological frameworks and their application in research.

---

**Assessment Task**

The Dissertation

**Criterion**

Ethical review of research

**Excellent**

(A+, A, A-) Applicable (if the project involved human participants and sensitive data) & approved

**Good**

(B+, B, B-) Applicable (if the project involved human participants and sensitive data) & approved

**Fair**

(C+, C, C-) Applicable (if the project involved human participants and sensitive data) & approved

**Marginal**

(D) Applicable but not approved or no approval sought

**Failure**

(F) Applicable but not approved or no approval sought

---

**Assessment Task**

The Dissertation

**Criterion**

Organisation of the dissertation

**Excellent**

(A+, A, A-)

Has a clear organizational plan appropriate to a report of an original piece of research.

Includes a thorough, focused and concise review of relevant literature; clearly stated and answerable research questions; and detailed but concise statement of methodology; logically presented research outcomes in a format appropriate to the research methodology; and a discussion and/or conclusion drawing out the significance of the research. All of these sections should be present in an A range dissertation.

A list of references is included, which covers the most relevant titles to the research, and the APA (or similar) referencing and citation format is followed with care.

### **Good**

(B+, B, B-)

Has a clear organizational plan appropriate to a report of an original piece of research.

Includes all the sections specified for an A range dissertation, but there are weaknesses in one or two of the sections. In contrast to a C range dissertation, the research questions, methodology and research outcomes are reported logically and in detail.

A list of references is included, which covers the most relevant titles to the research. APA (or similar) referencing and citation format is followed with care, although occasional inconsistencies and errors are present.

### **Fair**

(C+, C, C-)

Has a clear organizational plan appropriate to a report of an original piece of research.

Includes all the sections specified for an A/B range dissertation, but there are weaknesses in most or all of the sections. In particular, the organization of the research questions, methodology and research outcomes is such that the dissertation does not give a clear picture of how the research was conducted or how its findings were arrived at.

A list of references is included, which may be brief, off- - topic or contain significant omissions, or inconsistencies between in-text references and reference list.

An attempt is made to apply APA (or similar) referencing and citation format, but there are some inconsistencies and errors.

### **Marginal**

(D)

Has a recognizable dissertation structure, but the overall organization plan and/or its implementation is not appropriate to a report of an original piece of research.

Includes some but not all of the sections specified for an A-C range dissertation; 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 research methodology).

The list of references is inadequate for the purposes of the dissertation in that significant sources are missing and/or mis-referenced.

An attempt is made to apply APA (or similar) referencing and citation format, but there are frequent inconsistencies and errors.

### **Failure**

(F)

Lacks a recognizable dissertation structure, appropriate to a report of an original piece of research.

May include some or all of the sections specified for an A-C range dissertation, but most fail to achieve their purpose. May be significantly below the recommended word limit.

The list of references is inadequate for the purposes of the dissertation. APA (or similar) referencing and citation format are applied inconsistently or not at all.

---

## **Assessment Task**

The Dissertation

### **Criterion**

Language and style

#### **Excellent**

(A+, A, A-)

A high standard of written English, although occasional errors in grammar or word choice may occur but do not interfere with understanding.

Appropriate use of academic writing conventions. Technical terms are used accurately and clearly defined or explained. Ideas are expressed accurately and with appropriate use of modality, tense, and specification (articles or other determiners). Generally, free of errors that would be picked up by a careful proof- - reader.

#### **Good**

(B+, B, B-)

A good standard of written English, although some errors in grammar or word choice are in evidence but do not interfere with understanding.

Appropriate use of academic writing conventions. Technical terms are used with reasonable accuracy and are adequately defined or explained. Ideas are largely expressed accurately and with appropriate use of modality and tense. Free of serious errors.

#### **Fair**

(C+, C, C-)

A reasonable standard of written English, although frequent errors in grammar or word choice are evident. Errors sometimes affect the intelligibility at some points.

There may be uneven use of academic writing conventions. Technical terms may sometimes not always be used accurately, and may sometimes not be adequately defined or explained. Ideas are sometimes expressed accurately and with appropriate use of modality and tense, but errors sometimes affect clear expression of meaning.

Contains a considerable number of errors that would be picked up by a careful proof - reader. Some of which are more than minor mechanical errors.

#### **Marginal**

(D)

A low standard of written English. Frequent errors in grammar or word choice make parts of the dissertation difficult to understand.

Academic writing conventions are not followed correctly or consistently. Technical terms are used inaccurately, and are often inadequately defined or explained. Ideas are expressed inaccurately and without appropriate use of modality and tense.

Errors often affect clear expression of meaning. Improvement would require substantial rewriting, rather than proofreading alone.

#### **Failure**

(F)

The grammar, word choice, use of academic writing convention, technical terms, modality and tense make the dissertation largely unintelligible.

The standard of English in the dissertation overall or in a major part of it is so low that the research is obscured and uninterpretable.

## Part III Other Information

### Keyword Syllabus

Independent work, student-directed topic, individual research, consultations with supervisor

### Reading List

#### Compulsory Readings

	Title
1	Barry, P. (1995). <i>Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory</i> . Manchester: Manchester UP.
2	Cooley, L. & Lewkowicz, J. (2003). <i>Dissertation writing in practice: Turning ideas into text</i> . Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
3	Costello, P. J. M. (2011). <i>Effective action research: Developing reflective thinking and practice</i> . New York: Continuum International Pub.
4	Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (2020). <i>Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language : a handbook for students and their supervisors (2nd ed.)</i> . New York, NY : Routledge, 2020.
5	Ridley, D. (2012). <i>The literature review: A step-by-step guide for students (2nd ed.)</i> . London: Sage
6	Simon Eliot and W.R. Owens (ed). (1998). <i>A Handbook to Literary Research</i> . New York: Routledge, The Open University.
7	Strunk, W. Jr., & White, E. B. (1972). <i>The Elements of Style</i> . Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
8	Fabb, N. & Durant, A. (2014). <i>How to Write Essays and Dissertations: A Guide for English Literature Students. (2nd ed.)</i> New York, NY: Routledge.

#### Additional Readings

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