

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Subject Code</b>                         | ENGL562  |
| <b>Subject Title</b>                        | Communication  |
| <b>Credit Value</b>                         | 3  |
| <b>Level</b>                                | 5  |
| <b>Pre-requisite/Co-requisite/Exclusion</b> | N/A  |
| <b>Objectives</b>                           | The subject provides opportunities for students to examine scholarship concepts and theories in interpersonal communication, persuasion, group communication, mass/mediated communication, non-verbal communication, as well as an introduction to the cognitive and psychological processes underlying language and communication. It encourages students to apply the concepts and theories in the description, interpretation, and explanation of the salient factors, processes and products in real-life communicative events in professional discourse contexts, with a view to enhancing the students' communicative competencies.  |
| <b>Intended Learning Outcomes</b>           | <p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <p><b>Category A: Professional/academic knowledge and skills</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. learn and understand scholarship communication theories which have strong pragmatic value to communicators</li> <li>b. appreciate the functions, value and relevance of scholarship communication theories to students' professional and personal lives</li> <li>c. learn and apply research methods in communication</li> <li>d. apply the understanding of scholarship communication theories to the analysis of a variety of discourse, in particular to research a chosen topic that is of interest, relevance, or importance to students' professional or personal lives.</li> </ol> <p><b>Category B: Attributes for all-roundedness</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. develop analytical reasoning, critical thinking, and problem solving skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>analytical reasoning</u>: to think in a logical manner, supporting ideas with well-reasoned arguments and evidence</li> <li>▪ <u>critical thinking</u>: to evaluate information and evidence critically, able to recognize flaws or inconsistency in an argument</li> <li>▪ <u>problem solving</u>: to understand the problem, explore plausible answers, and select the most appropriate decision/solution for the problem</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |
| <b>Subject Synopsis</b>                     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Communication audit to maximize performance: definitions, functions, instruments, and process</li> <li>2. Communication theories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theories of interpersonal communication: The Co-operative Principle, and Politeness Theory</li> <li>• Theories of persuasion: • Theories of group communication: Function Group Decision Making</li> <li>• Theories of mass/mediated communication: Semiotics, Cultural Studies and Agenda-Setting Theory</li> </ul> </li> </ol>  |

|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Theories of non-verbal communication: Visual grammar, kinesics, chronemics, and proxemics</li> <li>Psycholinguistic theories of language and communication disorders: Aphasia, anomia</li> <li>Cognitive linguistic models of communication: Conceptual Metaphor Theory</li> </ul> <p>3. Applications of communication theories to the study of communication in different contexts of situation</p> <p>4. Qualitative and quantitative methods for communication research</p>   |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|--------|-----------------------------|--|--|---------|----------------------------|----------|---|---|------------------|-----|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---------------------|-----|--|---|---|---|---|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Teaching/Learning Methodology</b>                                   | The subject will utilise lecture inputs, student-led seminars, on-line sessions, and guided reading to help students understand and apply the scholarship communication theories and concepts.  |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes</b> | <table border="1" data-bbox="504 674 1307 981"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="5">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th>d</th> <th>e</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. In-class test</td> <td>30%</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Group presentation</td> <td>30%</td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Individual essay</td> <td>40%</td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Assessment is both for and of learning. The three assignments are designed to help students to achieve all the intended learning outcomes.</p>  | Specific assessment methods/tasks | % weighting | Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed |        |                             |  |  | a       | b                          | c        | d | e | 1. In-class test | 30% | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  | 2. Group presentation | 30% |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 3. Individual essay | 40% |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Total | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specific assessment methods/tasks                                      | % weighting   |                                   |             | Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | a                                 | b           | c   | d      | e                           |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. In-class test   | 30%   | ✓                                 |             |   | ✓      |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Group presentation  | 30%   |                                   | ✓           | ✓   | ✓      | ✓                           |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Individual essay  | 40%   |                                   | ✓           | ✓   | ✓      | ✓                           |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total  | 100%  |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Student Study Effort Required</b>                                   | <p>Class contact:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="496 1211 1393 1420"> <tbody> <tr> <td>▪ Lecture</td> <td>39 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Seminar</td> <td>0 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Other student study effort:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Reading, preparation for assignments, working on assignments</td> <td>66 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total student study effort</td> <td>105 Hrs.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | ▪ Lecture                         | 39 Hrs.     | ▪ Seminar   | 0 Hrs. | Other student study effort: |  | ▪ Reading, preparation for assignments, working on assignments | 66 Hrs. | Total student study effort | 105 Hrs. |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ Lecture  | 39 Hrs.   |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ Seminar  | 0 Hrs.  |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other student study effort:  |   |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ Reading, preparation for assignments, working on assignments         | 66 Hrs.   |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total student study effort   | 105 Hrs.  |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Reading List and References</b>                                     | <p><b>Recommended reading</b></p> <p>Canagarajah, S. (2004). Multilingual writers and the struggle for voice in academic discourse. In A. Pavlenko &amp; A. Blackledge (Eds.), <i>Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts</i> (pp. 266–289). Multilingual Matters.</p> <p>Carroll, D. W. (2008). <i>Psychology of language</i>. Thomson.</p> <p>Cooper, S., &amp; Patton, R. (2000). <i>Writing logically, thinking critically</i> (3 ed.). Longman.</p> <p>Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 9(2), 119–161.</p> <p>Danielewicz-Betz, A., &amp; Graddol, D. (2014). Varieties of English in the urban landscapes of Hong Kong and Shenzhen. <i>English Today</i>, 30(3), 22–32.</p> <p>Du-Babcock, B., &amp; Tanaka, H. (2013). A comparison of the communication behaviors of Hong Kong Chinese and Japanese business professionals in intracultural and intercultural decision-making meetings. 27(3), 263–287.</p> |                                   |             |   |        |                             |  |  |         |                            |          |   |   |                  |     |   |  |  |   |  |                       |     |  |   |   |   |   |                     |     |  |   |   |   |   |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>Duncombe, C. (2019). The politics of Twitter: Emotions and the power of social media. <i>International Political Sociology</i>, 13(4), 409–429.</p> <p>Eckert, P. (2012). Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. <i>Annual Review of Anthropology</i>, 41, 87–100.</p> <p>Friginal, E., &amp; Cullom, M. (2014). Saying “no” in Philippine-based outsourced call center interactions. <i>Asian Englishes</i>, 16(1), 2–18.</p> <p>Gasiorek, J. (2016). The “dark side” of CAT: Nonaccommodation. In H. Giles (Ed.), <i>Communication accommodation theory: Negotiating personal relationships and social identities across contexts</i> (pp. 85–104). Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Holmes, J. (2009). Humour, power and gender in the workplace. In N. Coupland &amp; A. Jaworski (Eds.), <i>The new sociolinguistics reader</i> (pp. 631–645). Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride &amp; J. Holmes (Eds.), <i>Sociolinguistics</i>. Penguin Books.</p> <p>Jacoby, S., &amp; Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. <i>Research on Language and Social Interaction</i>, 28(3), 171–183.</p> <p>Joseph, M. (2002). <i>The trivium: The liberal arts of logic, grammar, and rhetoric</i>. Paul Dry Books.</p> <p>Kim, H., &amp; Penry Williams, C. (2021). <i>Discovering intercultural communication: From language users to language use</i>. Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Kress, G., &amp; van Leeuwen, T. (1998). Front pages: (The critical) analysis of newspaper layout. In A. Bell &amp; P. Garrett (Eds.), <i>Approaches to media discourse</i> (pp. 186–219). Blackwell.</p> <p>Leech, G. N. (1983). <i>Principles of pragmatics</i>. Longman.</p> <p>Levinson, S. C. (1983). <i>Pragmatics</i>. Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Longaker, M. G., &amp; Walker, J. (2010). <i>Rhetorical analysis: A brief guide for writers</i>. Longman.</p> <p>Nakane, I. (2012). Silence. In C. B. Paulston, S. F. Kiesling, &amp; E. S. Rangel (Eds.), <i>The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication</i> (pp. 158–179). Wiley-Blackwell.</p> <p>Sayer, P. (2010). Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. <i>ELT Journal</i>, 64(2), 143–154.</p> <p>Tay, D. (2016). Words and neuro-psychological disorders. In J. R. Taylor (Ed.), <i>The Oxford handbook of the word</i> (pp. 508–517). Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Trenholm, S. (2010). <i>Thinking through communication: An introduction to the study of human communication</i> (6th ed.). Allyn &amp; Bacon.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Voorveld, H. A. M. (2019). Brand communication in social media: A research agenda. <i>Journal of Advertising</i>, 48(1), 14–26.</p> <p>Yao, X., &amp; Gruba, P. (2020). A layered investigation of Chinese in the linguistic landscape. <i>Australian Review of Applied Linguistics</i>, 43(3), 302–336.</p> <p>Yule, G. (1996). <i>Pragmatics</i>. Oxford University Press.</p> |
|--|---|