**offered by Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2019/20**

---

**Part I    Course Overview**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Course Title:** | Intercultural Organizational Communication and Institutional Interaction |
| **Course Code**: | EN4505 |
| **Course Duration:** | 1 semester |
| **Credit Units**: | 3 |
| **Level**: | B4 |
| **Proposed Area:** *(for GE courses only)* | ☐ Arts and Humanities <br> ☐ Study of Societies, Social and Business Organisations <br> ☐ 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)*

Interaction with others is fundamental to any institution and social life. The competencies to interact precede language competence. They enable novices to become participants in new settings and learn new languages. Also, with the increasing trend toward a global institution and business environment, international firms have come to realize the importance of intercultural communication competence. In the course we will examine what constitutes intercultural competence and institutions from a social perspective and how they can be systematically investigated and developed by reading and critically discussing relevant literature. Selection from the research literature will address institutionality and/or intercultural competence in various institutional contexts including but not limited to service encounters, language learning contexts, multi-party meetings, and so on. A guiding question will be how people use socially and culturally available practices to interact in diverse institutional contexts. Also, this course aims to apply interaction analysis to help students to develop knowledge of interaction, culture, and institutions. Developing the analytical lens on how people carry off their work in various institutions will increase students' knowledge and sensitivities on how people organize their conduct in institutional and culturally specific ways. Apart from readings, an in-class quiz, and classroom activities, students will generate a research review and an interaction analysis report on topics related to institutional practices. In all, the course helps students develop a systematic approach to examine how institutions are 'talked into being'.

### 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. | Examine what constitutes intercultural competence and institutions from a social perspective and how they can be systematically investigated and developed by reading and critically discussing relevant literature | | X | X | |
| 2. | Apply interaction analysis to understand how people organize their conduct in institutional settings and in culturally specific ways | | X | X | X |
| 3 | Generate a research review and an interaction analysis report on topics related to institutional and cultural practices | | X | X | X |
| *\* If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.* | | 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 | | |
| Interactive lecturing and discussion | Each week students will be introduced to a text relevant to the course and will be encouraged to discuss and analyze them in pairs and in groups. | X | X | | | Throughout the semester |
| Workshops | Students will in small groups practice and learn how to transcribe and analyze interactional data as well as to write a research review. | X | X | | | Throughout the semester |
| Research review | In pairs or groups of three, students will choose and read two to three scholarly interaction analysis papers from the lists provided by the instructor and write a brief review report. The review should include (1) introduction, (2) detailed summary of the interactional practices from the studies of their choice, and (3) the discussions of the findings. | X | X | X | | 4weeks |
| Interaction analysis | Individually, students will make use of interaction analysis learned in class to investigate how the institution from the video-data prepared by the instructor is talked into being; that is, students will examine how the participants in the data orient to their construction of the institutional setting. | X | X | X | | Throughout the semester / 4weeks |
| In-class Quiz | Students will learn and develop their understandings of interaction, culture, and institutions. Students will be tested on their knowledge of what they learned by taking a quiz. | X | X | | | Throughout the semester |

### 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 | | | |
| Continuous Assessment:    100 % | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assignment #1: Research Review | X | X | X | | 30% | Assessed in pairs |
| Assignment #2: Interaction Analysis | X | X | X | | 20% | Individual work |
| Assignment #3: In-class Quiz | X | X | | | 40% | Individual work |
| In-class Participation | X | X | X | | 10% | |
| Examination: ____% (duration: _____, if applicable) | | | | | | |

*\* The weightings should add up to 100%.*  100%

4

**5. Assessment Rubrics**

**Assignment Task 1: Research Review (Pair/Group Work) 30%**

**Description:** This research review consists of reviewing two to three scholarly interaction analysis papers from the lists provided by the instructor. The students will reflect critically upon and discuss the findings of the literature on interaction while developing knowledge on how the participants in the articles use socially and culturally available practices to interact in their own institutional contexts.

| Criteria for Assessment | Excellent (A+,A,A-) | Good (B+,B,B-) | Fair (C+,C,C-) | Marginal (D) | Failure (F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Content & Organization | Able to identify and describe while showing excellent understandings of most of the key interactional practices studied in the articles; make excellent reasoned and supported interpretations of the findings; and make excellent discussions of the articles.<br><br>Review format is correctly and effectively used in an outstanding | Able to identify and describe while showing good understandings of most of the key interactional practices studied in the articles; make good reasoned and supported interpretations of the findings; and make good discussions of the articles.<br><br>Review format is correctly and effectively used. | Able to identify and describe while showing fair understandings of most (some) of the key interactional practices studied in the articles; make fair reasoned and supported interpretations of the findings; and make fair discussions of the articles.<br><br>Review format is somewhat correctly and effectively used. | Able to identify and describe while showing marginal understandings of few of the key interactional practices studied in the articles; make marginal reasoned and supported interpretations of the findings; and make marginal discussions of the articles.<br><br>Review format is not so much correctly and effectively used. | Unable to identify and describe key interactional practices studied in the articles; make poor to no reasoned and supported interpretations of the findings; and make poor discussions of the articles.<br><br>Review format is not correctly and effectively used. |

| Language | Exceptionally well composed. Words are used with precision and accuracy. A wide variety of sentence structures are used. | Strong control of language and a wide lexical range. Grammatical structures are varied and well constructed. Small errors may persist but the meaning is sharp and clear. | Effective and functional control. Basic ideas are communicated effectively. Errors cause minimal distraction. | There is a high density of errors, causing strain for the reader. The meaning is sometimes lost or unclear | Almost every sentence has some kind of error, which causes serious problems for the reader. The meaning is often lost or distorted. |

**Overall comments:**

**Assignment Task 2: Interaction Analysis (Individual Work) 20%**
**Description:** This Interaction Analysis project consists of analyzing actual interaction data of a particular institution. The primary purpose of the analysis is to develop analytical lens on how an institution manages to carry off its work.

| Criteria for Assessment | Excellent (A+,A,A-) | Good (B+,B,B-) | Fair (C+,C,C-) | Marginal (D) | Failure (F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Content & Organization | Excellent accuracy of analysis; Excellent accurate interpretation of the | Good accuracy of analysis; Good accurate interpretation of the analysis; | Fair accuracy of analysis; Fair accurate interpretation of the analysis; Demonstrates fair | Marginal accuracy of analysis; Marginal accurate interpretation of the | Poor accuracy of analysis; Poor accurate interpretation of the |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | analysis;<br>Demonstrates an in-depth understanding of how participants orient to their construction of the institutional businesses in the setting;<br>Demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the meanings and aims of interaction analysis;<br>Interaction analysis format is correctly and effectively used in an outstanding manner. | Demonstrates good understanding of how participants orient to their construction of the institutional businesses in the setting;<br>Demonstrates good understanding of the meanings and aims of interaction analysis;<br>Interaction analysis format is correctly and effectively used. | understanding of how participants orient to their construction of the institutional businesses in the setting;<br>Demonstrates fair understanding of the meanings and aims of interaction analysis;<br>Interaction analysis format is somewhat correctly and effectively used. | analysis;<br>Demonstrates marginal understanding of how participants orient to their construction of the institutional businesses in the setting;<br>Demonstrates marginal understanding of the meanings and aims of interaction analysis;<br>Interaction analysis format is not so much correctly and effectively used. | analysis;<br>Demonstrates poor understanding of how participants orient to their construction of the institutional businesses in the setting;<br>Demonstrates poor understanding of the meanings and aims of interaction analysis;<br>Interaction analysis format is not correctly and effectively used. |
| Language | Exceptionally well composed. Words are used with precision and accuracy. A wide variety of sentence structures are used. | Strong control of language and a wide lexical range. Grammatical structures are varied and well constructed. Small errors may persist but the meaning is sharp and clear. | Effective and functional control. Basic ideas are communicated effectively. Errors cause minimal distraction. | There is a high density of errors, causing strain for the reader. The meaning is sometimes lost or unclear | Almost every sentence has some kind of error, which causes serious problems for the reader. The meaning is often lost or distorted. |

Overall Comments:

**Assignment 3: In-class Quiz (40%)**

**Description:** In-class quiz will be conducted to test the students' knowledge on institutional interaction, intercultural competence, and interaction analysis learned throughout the course.

| Criteria for Assessment | Excellent (A+,A,A-) | Good (B+,B,B-) | Fair (C+,C,C-) | Marginal (D) | Failure (F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Content | Excellent accuracy of the answers; Demonstrates an in-depth understandings of contents learned in this class. | Good accuracy of the answers; Demonstrates good understandings of contents learned in this class. | Fair accuracy of the answers; Demonstrates fair understandings of contents learned in this class. | Marginal accuracy of the answers; Demonstrates marginal understandings of contents learned in this class. | Poor accuracy of the answers; Demonstrates poor understandings of contents learned in this class. |
| Language / Mechanics | Language, spelling, punctuation, and other mechanical issues are not formally evaluated on the Quizzes. However, significant errors in which negatively affect readability will have an impact. | | | | |

**In-class Participation 10%**

| Criteria for Assessment | Excellent (A+,A,A-) | Good (B+,B,B-) | Fair (C+,C,C-) | Marginal (D) | Failure (F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participation | Makes significant contribution to in-class discussion and completes tasks satisfactorily. | Makes occasional contribution to in-class discussion and completes the tasks satisfactorily. | Seldom makes adequate contribution to in-class discussion and in class tasks. | Little evidence of participation in class; completes very few in-class tasks. | Fails to sufficiently participate in in-class activities (including discussion and other tasks) |

**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.)*

   Intercultural Competence; Institutional Interaction; Interaction Analysis

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. | Varner, I., &Beamer, L., (2011). *Intercultural Communication in the Global Workplace*. (5th Ed.) New York, NY: McGraw-Hill |
| 2. | Nguyen, H. t., & Ishitobi, N. (2012). Ordering fast food: Service encounters in real-life interaction and in textbook dialogs. *Japan Association for Language Teaching Journal, 34*, 151–185. |
| 3. | Mori, J. (2003). The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36, 143–184. |
| 4. | Nguyen, H. t. (2011). Achieving recipient design longitudinally: Evidence from a pharmacy intern in patient consultations. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *Interactional competence and development* (pp. 173–205). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. |
| 5. | Svennevig, J., & Djordjilovic, O. (2015). Accounting for the right to assign a task in meeting interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 78*, 98–111. |
| 6. | Weilenmann, A., & Lymer, G. (2014). Incidental and essential objects in interaction: Paper documents in journalistic work. In M. Nevile, P. Haddington, T. Hinemann, & M. Rauniomaa (Eds.), *Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity* (319–338). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. |
| 7. | Jung, H. (2018). Focus group interaction in evaluation research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 9*, 563–588. |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | Antaki, C. (2011). *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. |
| 2. | Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. |
| 3. | Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (Eds.) (1997). *Culture in action*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America. |
| 4. | Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103–137). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. |
| 5. | Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. |
| 6. | Nguyen, H. t., & Kasper, G. (2009). *Task-in-interaction: Multilingual perspective*. Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center. |
| 7. | Nguyen, H. t. (2012). *Developing interactional competence: A conversation-analytic study of patient consultations in pharmacy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. |