

**COURSE DATA****Data Subject**

Code	44235
Name	Interpersonal communication across genres
Cycle	Master's degree
ECTS Credits	3.0
Academic year	2023 - 2024

Study (s)

Degree	Center	Acad. year	Period
2196 - M.D. in Advanced English Studies	Faculty of Philology, Translation and Communication	1	First term
2243 - M.D. in Advanced English Studies	Faculty of Philology, Translation and Communication	1	First term

Subject-matter

Degree	Subject-matter	Character
2196 - M.D. in Advanced English Studies	12 - Interpersonal communication across genres	Obligatory
2243 - M.D. in Advanced English Studies	12 - Interpersonal communication across genres	Obligatory

Coordination

Name	Department
IVORRA PEREZ, FRANCISCO MIGUEL	155 - English and German
SUAU JIMENEZ, FRANCISCA ANTONIA	155 - English and German

SUMMARY

This subject deals with discourse referring to the interpersonal communication between individual or collective speakers/writers in different genres and modes in everyday, institutional and professional contexts which can be either public or private (e.g. website discourses, socio-political speeches, online discussion forums about professional and/or private topics; learners' interactions, etc.). Different frameworks for interpersonal communication will be reviewed and different conversational structures (monologues, dialogues, polylogues, etc.) will be studied. Through interpersonal communication, understood as a contextual practice of individual and social interaction, certain rhetorical functions are conveyed (explanation, argumentation, narration, persuasion, evaluation, opinion, etc.) as well as several



specific pragmatic strategies. This is because through explicit or implicit discursive interaction, speakers and writers are able to negotiate, maintain a cooperative relationship, etc. Its study will allow for an in-depth understanding and characterization of these genres, modes and discourses, at times hybrid, as well as a grasp of complex communicational skills in the English language.

PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE

Relationship to other subjects of the same degree

There are no specified enrollment restrictions with other subjects of the curriculum.

Other requirements

OUTCOMES

2196 - M.D. in Advanced English Studies

- Students should demonstrate self-directed learning skills for continued academic growth.
- Students should possess and understand foundational knowledge that enables original thinking and research in the field.
- Advanced ability to understand from a more complex perspective than that of undergraduate studies those concepts, principles, theories, or models related to different areas of English Studies.
- Advanced ability to understand from a more complex perspective than that of undergraduate studies the methodology required for solving problems specific to the field of English Studies.
- Ability to publicly present from an advanced and more complex perspective than that of undergraduate studies experiences, ideas, or reports within the field of English Studies.
- Ability to make informed judgments using established criteria and personal reflections. Achievement of proficiency in academic and scientific-technical English, both in written and oral forms.
- Ability to identify fundamental methodologies, theories, topics, and terminological, theoretical, formal, and ideological principles necessary for initiating linguistic or literary research in English Studies.
- Ability to interpret and analyze texts that represent the linguistic and cultural diversity of contemporary English-speaking societies. Students should be able to reflect on their significance, considering their sociolinguistic, historical, political, and cultural contexts, as well as the impact of globalization on culture, within the field of English Studies.
- Ability to apply theoretical knowledge and skills to conduct critical, rigorous analysis using various tools, including printed and digital formats (ICT), within English Studies.
- Ability to develop autonomy in learning, including resource and information search, and to access bibliographic and documentary sources in different areas of English Studies.



- Ability to organize, structure, and develop ideas in various academic documents, such as essays, technical reports, and advanced research projects masters theses within the field of English Studies.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. To become familiar with current research in interpersonal communication across individual, collective, private and public genres, modes and discourses.
2. To understand the differences between different theoretical frameworks of interpersonal communication and apply the methodological analysis tools of each of these.
3. To learn the conversational features of different types of interpersonal interaction: dialogues, polylogues, etc.
4. To be able to assess structures of interpersonal communication in concrete and sometimes hybrid genres and modes.
5. To distinguish the voices which interact in a stretch of interpersonal communication and draw functional and/or pragmatic-discursive conclusions.
6. To be able to characterise discursive genres, modes and phenomena through the analysis of interpersonal interaction and its traits.
7. To be able to draw discursive conclusions about interpersonal interaction and perceive its implications and influence in social and/or professional activities, media and fields.
8. To know and be able to deal with complex discursive structures which are created through communicational interaction on the English language.

DESCRIPTION OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

- 1.What is interpersonal communication?
- 2.Discursive interpersonality as a global perspective for interpersonal analysis. Supporting article (excerpt, with class discussion): Suau-Jiménez et al. (2021).
- 3.Construction and achievement of rhetorical functions. The importance of genre, discipline, language and register.
- 4.Interpersonal communication from a cross-cultural perspective.
- 5.The influence of culture, genre and discipline in interpersonal discourse.



2. Interpersonal discourse in professional genres

1. Professional genres and their characteristics. Implied rhetorical function: persuasion.
2. Voices: stance and engagement.
3. Interpersonal markers and voices in hotel websites and job adverts. Exercises and conclusions, with socio-linguistic implications.
4. Supporting article (excerpt, with class discussion): Hyland, K. (2008).

3. Interpersonal discourse in social genres.

1. Online forums and political speeches. Characteristics of dialogues, polylogues, monologues. Implied rhetorical functions: persuasion/ evaluation/ peer-solidarity.
2. Supporting article (excerpt, with class discussion): Suau-Jiménez (2014).
3. Individual task (written test): theoretical questions on the three article excerpts (Suau-Jiménez et al. 2021, Hyland 2008, and Suau-Jiménez 2014) and small practical analysis of interpersonal communication on a professional and a social genre.

4. Interactional metadiscourse applied to professional genres: Culture, genre or/and discipline.

1. Introduction: The impact of culture, genre or/and discipline on the use of interpersonal markers in professional genres (Ivorra-Pérez, 2014; Suau-Jiménez, 2016).
2. Hylands model (2008). A cross-cultural approach. Towards a new conceptualization.
3. Differences and similarities in the use of interpersonal markers in British-English/American English professional genres: the movie review.
4. Supporting article (excerpt, with class discussion): Ivorra-Pérez (2016).
5. Individual task (written test): theoretical questions on the article excerpt discussed and small practical analysis of interpersonal communication on the movie review genre.

5. Towards a multimodal perspective of interpersonal metadiscourse

1. Interpersonal metadiscourse on social media: The role of readers as active participants
2. Supporting article (excerpt, with class discussion). Suau-Jiménez, F. & Ivorra-Pérez, F.M. (2022)
3. An analytical approach to visual interpersonal metadiscourse in social media. Yus-Ramos, F. (2019)/ Suau-Jiménez, F. & Ivorra-Pérez, F.M. (2023)
4. Supporting article (excerpt, with class discussion). Logi, L. & Zappavigna, M. (2021)
5. Individual task (written test): theoretical questions on the article excerpts discussed and small practical analysis of visual interpersonal markers in social networking sites.

6. Final examination: theory and practice



1. Theory: 4 questions on theoretical aspects discussed in class.
2. Practice: Analyse various excerpts from different genres and domains, applying the framework indicated. Provide conclusions that help to characterize each text and genre from a discursive interpersonality viewpoint, with socio-linguistic implications.

WORKLOAD

ACTIVITY	Hours	% To be attended
Theory classes	24,00	100
Attendance at events and external activities	5,00	0
Development of group work	5,00	0
Development of individual work	5,00	0
Study and independent work	10,00	0
Readings supplementary material	5,00	0
Preparing lectures	10,00	0
Preparation of practical classes and problem	11,00	0
TOTAL	75,00	

TEACHING METHODOLOGY

TM2_Pair or group work.

TM3_ Set readings (autonomous reading or with classroom discussion, selecting relevant information, relating concepts, studying, completing work sheets, writing outlines or summaries).

TM4_Oral presentation of set readings, oral or written summaries.

TM5_Theoretical and practical problem solving (exercises, compilation of data for analysis, analysis of written, oral, audiovisual, digital and/or multimodal texts from different genres).

EVALUATION



ASSESSMENT BREAKDOWN FOR FIRST CALL

- Assessment of class attendance and active participation 20%
- Assessment of competences acquired from written and/or oral TASKS 30%
- Assessment of competences through a written final TEST 50%

ASSESSMENT BREAKDOWN FOR SECOND CALL

- Assessment of competences acquired through an oral presentation 30%
- Assessment of competences through a written final TEST 70%

Having another person or company do the writing of an assignment for you, which includes using artificial intelligence tools like ChatGPT, is considered plagiarism, thus a violation of academic integrity. It will automatically lead to a failing grade and MAES instructors reserve the right to conduct an investigation and reassess students who are suspected of having resorted to any sort of plagiarism in their work.

REFERENCES

Basic

- Hyland, Kenneth. 2008. Disciplinary voices. Interactions in research writing. English Text Construction 1:1: 5-22.
- Oskoz, A.; Pérez-Broncano, O. (2016). What Did You Say? How Did You Say It? Linguistics Choices in Online Discussions. Foreign Language Annals 49 (4): 772-788. DOI:10.Un/flan.12240
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2005). The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Suau Jiménez, F. 2014. Dialogic voices of writers and readers in traveller forums through interpersonality. In: Gil Salom, L. and Soler Monreal, C. (eds). Dialogicity in written specialised genres. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, Chapter 5: 137-163.
- Suau Jiménez, F. y Dolón Herrero, R. 2007. The Importance of Metadiscourse in the genre 'Promotion of Touristic Services and Products': Differences in English and Spanish. In: Galová, D. (ed.) Languages for Specific Purposes: Searching for Common Solutions. Cambridge Scholars Publishings
- Hofstede, G. (1991). Culture and Organizations: Software of the Mind. London: Profile Books.
- Hall, E.T. (1976). Beyond Culture. New York: Anchor Books.
- Ivorra-Pérez, Francisco Miguel (2014). Cultural values and their correlation with interactional metadiscourse strategies in Spanish and US business websites Atlantis, 36 (2): 73-95.
- Ivorra-Pérez, Francisco Miguel (2015). The impact of cultural dimensions on the engagement markers of Spanish, British and US toy selling websites in Hernández---López, M. & Fernández-Amaya, L. (Eds.) A Multidisciplinary Approach to Service Encounters. Leiden/Boston: Brill.



- Ivorra-Pérez, Francisco Miguel (2016). Interpersonality and culture: an approach to the movie review genre *Odisea*, 17: 159-183.
- Logi, L. & Zappavigna, M. (2021). A social semiotic perspective on emoji: How emoji and language interact to make meaning in digital messages. *New Media & Society*, 1-34
- Suau-Jiménez, F. & Ivorra-Pérez, F.M. (2023). Intentional dialogicity and users co-creation of promotion in tourism social media. Paper presented at the 40th International Conference Spanish Society for Applied Linguistics, Mérida, Spain.
- Suau-Jiménez, F. & Ivorra-Pérez, F.M. (2022). Reader comments agentive power in Covid-19 digital news articles. Challenging Parascienific Information? *MDPI Publications*, 10(1),2
- Yus-Ramos, F. (2019). Emoji: A full cyberpragmatic approach. Paper presented at 16th China Pragmatics Conference.

Additional

- Antos, Gerd; Ventola, Eija (eds). 2010. *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter/Mouton.
- Bhatia, Vijay. 1993. *Analysing Genre Analysis Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman.
- Breeze, Ruth; Gotti, Maurizio; Sancho Guinda, Carmen (eds).2014. *Interpersonality in Legal Genres*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Crismore, Avon. 1989. *Talking with Readers: Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dafouz Milne, Emma. 2008. The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: a cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40 (1), 95-113.
- Elly A. Konijn; Sonja Utz; Martin Tanis & Susan B. Barnes. 2008. *Mediated Interpersonal Communication*. Routledge.
- Herring, Susan (ed.) 1996. *Computer-Mediated Communication. Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Herring, S. C. (2013). Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, reconfigured, and emergent. In D. Tannen & A. M. Tester (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 2011: Discourse 2.0: Language and new media* (pp. 1-25). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. Prepublication version: <http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/GURT.2011.prepub.pdf>
- Hyland, K. & Sancho, C. (eds). 2012. *Stance and voice in written academic genres*. Palgrave.
- Linell, Per. 1998. Discourse across boundaries: On recontextualizations and the blending of voices in professional discourse. *Text* 18, 143-157.
- Locher, Miriam A. / Graham, Sage L.(eds). *Interpersonal Pragmatics*. Walter de Gruyter
- Lorés-Sanz, R./Mur-Dueñas, P./Lafuente-Millán, E. 2010. *Constructing Interpersonality: Multiple Perspectives on Written Academic Genres*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Swales, John. 1990. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Varga, Cristina. 2011. Knowledge Transmission in Cyberspace. Ph.D. Dissertation. Universitat Pompeu Fabra. <http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/24900/tcv.pdf?sequence=1>
- Wright, Kevin B. / Webb, Lynne M. (eds). 2011. Computer-Mediated Communication in Personal Relationships. Bern: Peter Lang
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), Evaluation in text (pp. 142175). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- RyshinaPankova, M. (2014). Exploring academic argumentation in course-related blogs through ENGAGEMENT. In G. Thompson & L. Alba (Eds.), Evaluation in context (pp. 281302). Philadelphia: PA: John Benjamins.
- White, P. (2015). Introductory tour through appraisal theory. <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/Framed/Frame.htm>