COURSE UNIT (MODULE) DESCRIPTION

Course unit (module) title	Code
Effective scientific discourse / Mokslinio diskurso įtaigumas	

Lecturer(s)	Department(s) where the course unit (module) is delivered
Coordinator: dr. Jolanta Šinkūnienė	Department of English Philology Faculty of Philology

Study cycle	Type of the course unit (module)
2nd (MA)	Compulsory

Mode of delivery	Period when the course unit (module) is delivered	Language(s) of instruction
Seminars	Autumn term	English

Requirements for students	
Prerequisites: English (C1-C2)	Additional requirements (if any):

Course (module) volume in credits	Total student workload	Contact hours	Self-study hours
5 ECTS	140	32	108

Purpose of the course unit (module): programme competences to be developed
The purpose of the course unit is to acquaint students with the features of contemporary academic discourse and with the newest research in the field of EAP (English for Academic Purposes)/ESP (English for Specific Purposes). The course unit develops the following competences: Generic competences: - find, analyse, synthesise and evaluate data needed for studies and for professional, cultural, and creative activities; integrate knowledge, apply the acquired knowledge in practice, recognise problems, and propose possible solutions;   - generate ideas and knowledge, independently find appropriate forms of expressing them, seek new knowledge and skills, and apply them in solving tasks in a new environment and in the implementation of innovations;   - identify differences between one's own and others' cultural identities and attitudes, explore others' ideas despite cultural differences, express one's ideas in ways that are understandable and acceptable to different people;   - set realistic goals, identify all the steps and effective strategies needed to fulfil such goals within the time available; meet deadlines, make necessary decisions, and flexibly adapt to the circumstances;   - take initiative and carry out one's activities, rationally assess the strengths and weaknesses of one's work, reflect and be responsible for one's decisions and actions, be aware of the impact of one's activities and their outcomes on society and the environment;   Subject-specific competences: - will acquire knowledge about the major branches of linguistics and contemporary linguistic theories and

research methods; will be able to see links between various linguistic schools of thought; will appropriately use general and specific terms in linguistics and be able to explain various linguistic phenomena in a wider linguistic and cross-cultural context; will be able to define linguistics as a discipline in the context of other disciplines;

- will be able to effectively communicate in English in writing and orally; analyse and produce scholarly, critical or other kinds of texts in English fitting the specificity of the communicative situation and conventions;
- will be able to independently formulate a relevant research question in linguistics, literature, culture or interdisciplinary studies and design a research study; will be able to critically evaluate the application of research methods and approaches and selection of the theoretical framework(s), methodology and empirical material;
- will be able to conduct a research study by adopting innovative methods of data collection and processing, interpret findings of the study, draw conclusions and evaluate the results of the research within the context of other studies;
- will be able to present the results of research in writing and orally to a variety of audiences and demonstrate the ability to provide logical arguments in discussions.

Learning outcomes of the course unit (module)	Teaching and learning methods	Assessment methods
• <u>Critical and analytical thinking</u>: ability to analyze academic text from semantic and pragmatic perspectives; • <u>Ability to apply knowledge in practical situations</u>: ability to establish adequate relations between knowledge of academic English and its practical applicability; • <u>Knowledge and understanding of the subject area and understanding of the profession</u>: fundamental understanding of linguistics, rhetoric and ESP/EAP; • <u>Knowledge and understanding of the structure of English specific genre (research articles)</u>.	Seminars, group discussions, individual work (reading and analysis of research articles, written texts by other students). Writing task (describing the niche and novelty of an MA paper). Written exam.	Writing task. Written exam.

Content: breakdown of the topics	Contact hours							Self-study work: time and assignments	
	Lectures	Tutorials	Seminars	Exercises	Laboratory work	Internship/work placement	Contact hours	Self-study hours	Assignments
Introduction to the course unit: aims, structure, assessment scheme. Effectiveness *a la carte*. Big and small cultures and their influence on scientific discourse and its effectiveness. Evolving patterns of scientific rhetoric.			4				4	**8**	Atkinson 2004: 277-289; Hyland 2002: 385-395. Hyland & Jiang 2018: 18-30.
Structural text patterns revisited.			2				2	**4**	Ryvitytė 2003: 93-100. Swales (1990: 137-166)
Caution, modesty, self-promotion and a convincing argument.			2				2	**4**	Dahl 2009: 370-391; Hyland 2004: 87-112; Šinkūnienė

Topic					References
					2018.
Dialogue, community and persuasion in research writing.	2		2	**4**	Hyland 2014: 1-20.
The role of citation in building an effective scientific argument.	2		2	**4**	Thomson & Ye 1991: 365-382; Hyland 2001: 115-130.
How to write an effective *student* paper? The reviewer's perspective.	2		2	**4**	Analytical individual tasks
Identifying effective features of scientific discourse.	9		9	**40**	Analytical individual tasks
Presenting the niche and novelty of the MA paper.	8		8	**40**	Analytical work and individual writing tasks
Summary and course evaluation	1		1		
Total	**32**		**32**	**108**	

Assessment strategy	Weight, %	Deadline	Assessment criteria
Cumulative assessment			
Attendance			The attendance of seminars is compulsory. Students who have missed more than 35% of the seminars with no justifiable reason will not be admitted to the written exam.
(a) continuous assessment and	(a) 20%	(a) throughout the term	(a) active participation in class discussions, performance of analytical tasks.
(b) written task (300-400 words)	(b) 10%	(b) November 14, 2023	(b) Evaluation criteria for the writing task: effectiveness of structure and argument & language use
(c) written exam	(c) 70%	(c) **January 8-9, 2024**	The written exam is a take-home exam during which you will have to do a practical analysis of effective scientific discourse markers. The exam will be marked for content (60%) and language accuracy (10%).

Author	Year of publication	Title	Issue of a periodical or volume of a publication	Publishing place and house or web link
Compulsary reading				
Atkinson, D.	2004	Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conceptualization of culture.	*Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3: 277-289.	
Dahl, T.	2009	The Linguistic Representation of Rhetorical Function: A Study of How Economists Present Their Knowledge Claims	*Written Communication* 26(4): 370-391.	
Hyland, K. & Jiang, F. K.	2018	"In this paper we suggest": Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse.	*English for Specific Purposes* 21: 385-395.	
Hyland, K.	2001	Activity and evaluation: Reporting practices in academic writing.	In J.Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Discourse.* 115-130.	London: Longman.
Hyland, K.	2002	Specificity revisited: how far	*English for Specific*	

		should we go now?	*Purposes* 51: 18-30.	
Hyland, K.	2004	A convincing argument: Corpus analysis and academic persuasion.	In U. Connor & T. A. Upton (eds), *Discourse in the Professions: Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics.* 87-112.	Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hyland, K.	2014	Dialogue, community and persuasion in research writing	In L. Gil-Salom & C. Soler-Monreal (eds), *Dialogicity in Written Specialised Genres.* 1-20.	Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Ryvitytė, B.	2003	Research article introductions: variations across disciplines and cultures	*Kalbotyra* 53(3): 93-100.	
Swales, J.	1990	*Genre Analysis*		Cambridge: CUP
Šinkūnienė, J.	2018	The power of English: *I* and *we* in Lithuanian, Lithuanian English and British English research writing	Pilar Mur Dueñas, & Jolanta Šinkūnienė (Eds.). *Intercultural perspectives on research writing*.	Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 59-79.
Thompson, G. & Y. Ye	1991	Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers	*Applied Linguistics* 12: 365-382.	
Optional reading				
Berkenkotter, C. & Huckin, T.	1995	*Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication.*		Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Charles, M., D. Pecorari & S. Hunston (eds.)	2009	Academic Writing: At the in interface of corpus and discourse.		London/New York: Continuum
Fløttum, K., T. Dahl & T. Kinn	2006	*Academic voices: across languages and disciplines.*		Amsterdam/Philadelphia: JohnBenjamins
Harwood, N.	2005	'We do not seem to have a theory … The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap': Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing.	*Applied Linguistics* 26 (3): 343–375.	
Hyland, K.	2005	*Metadiscourse*		London: Continuum
Swales, J.	1986	Citation analysis and discourse analysis	*Applied Linguistics* 7: 39-56.	
Šinkūnienė, J.	2014	*Lietuviškojo humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų diskurso ypatybės*:		Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla

Updated August 31, 2023