

UCUG1600 (L01) - Intercultural Communication

[Jump to Today](#)

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

UG Course Syllabus

[Course Title] Cultures and Values: Intercultural Communication

[Course Code] UCUG 1600

[No. of Credits] 3

[Any pre-/co-requisites] NO

Name: ZHU Junhua, CES-PGE

Email: junhuazhu@hkust-gz.edu.cn (<mailto:dongyelyu@hkust-gz.edu.cn>)

Room, Days & Times: Rm 223, W1, Tuesday, 06:00PM - 08:50PM

Office Hours: Wednesday, 15:00-16:00, E3 309 (By Appointment Only)

Co-instructors: LYU Dongye, CES-PGE

Teaching Assistant: Cultie (chatbot) & Pending (human)

-

Course Description

Intercultural Communication is an applied, interdisciplinary course encompassing subjects like anthropology, sociology, linguistics, psychology, culture and folklore. This course will present cross-cultural and multi-cultural communication scenes through various forms of teaching such as case analysis, scene exercises, group discussions and lectures, using teaching methods of illustration, text, sound and scenes, based on the teaching of cross-cultural knowledge and communicative skills, develop students' adaptability to cross-cultural environment and insight into cultural diversity, values, and worldview; identities, self and 'othering', establish cross-cultural thinking, and gradually improve intercultural communication skills, especially in multicultural environments to cope with conflicts and solve problems. In the process of expanding the multicultural perspectives, students' awareness and confidence in mother-culture will be enhanced.

This course adopts an experiential learning approach; by integrating concrete experience into humanities knowledge and understanding, it aims to bridge classroom learning and real-life practice and encourage students to experience "intercultural communication" by approaching, observing, and partaking in multicultural or intercultural scenes through project-based work, and to make sense of such experience with close reference to the concepts and theories introduced in the course.

Intercultural Communication is an applied, interdisciplinary course encompassing subjects like anthropology, sociology, linguistics, and psychology. This course will present cross-cultural and multi-cultural communication scenes while adopting an experiential learning approach; This course aims to bridge classroom learning and real-life practice and encourage students to experience "intercultural communication" through project-based work.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

ILO#1: Understand the concept of "self and others", and the key role of cultural consciousness in intercultural communication;

ILO#2: Demonstrate the sensitivity to other cultures and insights into cultural differences in intercultural communication;

ILO#3: Improve cross-cultural language and non-verbal communication literacy and abilities;

ILO#4: Develop storytelling skills with cultural consciousness among international audiences;

ILO#5: Demonstrate intercultural communication and problem-solving skills to respond to cultural conflicts.

Weekly schedule & Weekly ILOs

Week	Date	Topics	Weekly ILOs	Tutorial Activity
1	January 27, 2026	Why study Intercultural Communication?	ILO#1&2	Course Orientation
2	February 3, 2026	Stereotypes in Intercultural Communication	ILO#1&2&4	Project discussion (theme & content) and team formation
3	February 10, 2026	How to Develop Ability to Ferry Knowledges between East and West?	ILO#1&2&4	Desk research workshop

4	February 24, 2026	Cultural Relativism	ILO#3&4&5	Drama discussion
5	March 3, 2026	Non-Verbal Intercultural Communication	ILO#1-5	Field research workshop
6	March 10, 2026	Turandot: Cross-Cultural Opera Through the Lens of Code	ILO#1&2&3&5	Drama rehearsal
7	March 17, 2026	Group Performance (mid-term): Intercultural Communication Scenario	ILO#3&4&5	Mid-term group performance
8	March 31, 2026	Reshaping Cultural Narratives through Disney's "Mulan"	ILO#1&2&4	Research planning and interview design
9	April 7, 2026	Who May Represent The Country? Examining Identity and Sport in The Globalization Context	ILO#3&4	Submission and first presentation of project plans
10	April 14, 2026	The Comparison of Chinese and Western Traditional Poetry	ILO#1&2&4	Two-week research time for field research and project development
11	April 21, 2026	Self, Other and Beyond in Confucius, Buddhism, Lao Zi and Zhuang Zi	ILO#1&2&4	
12	April 28, 2026	Cultural Intersections and Conflicts in "Chinese School"	ILO#1&2&5	Data analysis, report refinement, and Q&A
13	May 12, 2026	Group Presentation	ILO#1-5	Final group presentations

Group Project-based Learning Remarks

This course emphasizes the application of theories and concepts through a group project. You will form groups of five to six students to engage with a cultural group that may be unfamiliar to you. This group could belong to an ethnic, religious, social, or cultural community within the broader society. The project aims to explore the intersection of culture and communication, intercultural interaction, and social life, focusing on topics directly relevant to the course. Supporting materials will be provided to assist you in selecting a site and identifying key issues to explore.

The project will require significant out-of-class commitment and active participation. Your group will collect various data and materials, such as photographs, video documentaries, and interviews. From the beginning, each group is encouraged to create and maintain an online folder to document progress. This folder should include your project proposal, presentation materials, reflections from tutorial sessions and workshops, and your final report and self-reflections. Tutorials, project workshops, and office-hour consultations will provide ongoing guidance and support throughout the semester.

Field Research Time and Optional Routes

As part of the group project-based learning design, the course allocates a two-week research period (Weeks 10–11) for field research and project development. During this period, several optional instructor-supported field research routes will be available. Each group may choose one of the following time slots and locations:

1. **Shenzhen Bay Port, Saturday**, April 18, 2026, 9:00 AM – 7:00 PM
2. **Yongqingfang, Guangzhou**, Sunday, April 19, 2026, 9:00 AM – 7:00 PM
3. **Hengqin Port, Zhuhai, Saturday, April 25, 2026, 9:00 AM – 7:00 PM**

These field sites are selected to offer authentic intercultural communication settings related to cross-border mobility, tourism, urban renewal, and everyday cultural interactions. After the mid-term group performance, each group is required to register their chosen field research route with the Teaching Assistant (TA). Groups may also propose alternative field sites relevant to their project themes, subject to instructor approval.

To ensure a fair and comprehensive assessment, a diversified evaluation method will be used:

4. **In-Group Peer Review:** Members of each group will evaluate their peers' contributions.
5. **By-Group Review:** Other groups will provide feedback on your group performance.
6. **Instructor(s) Review:** Instructor(s) will assess the project process, final report, and self-reflections.

Individual grades will reflect your engagement, contributions, and performance, including participation during oral presentations.

The primary goal of this project is to foster collaborative learning and gain a deeper understanding of your chosen cultural group, while also building meaningful interpersonal connections across cultures. Regular tutorial sessions will ensure the project remains on track, and students are encouraged to seek instructor feedback to refine and improve their work.

As you carry out this project, please be respectful of the community members you engage with and remain mindful of the limits of your experience and knowledge. We hope this project will be one of the most interesting, challenging, and rewarding experiences of your undergraduate studies.

Assessment and Grading

This course utilizes criterion-referenced assessment to ensure fairness and transparency. A diversified evaluation approach will be adopted, incorporating In-group Peer Review, By-group Review, and Instructor(s) Review to comprehensively evaluate individual and group contributions.

Assessment Tools	Weighting (%)	ILOs Assessed	Remarks	Assessment Schedule
In-group peer review	10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Evaluates individual contributions and performances in group activities	Several times
Mid-term group performance	20	2, 3, 4, 5	Students perform a drama in groups to demonstrate understanding of key intercultural concepts	Week 7
By-group review	10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Assesses overall group performance of the project plan	Week 9
Portfolio & report on the learning process	10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Tracks project progress and development during the middle of the course	Week 9
Final presentation	20	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Assesses the culmination of the group project, focusing on clarity, depth, and intercultural insights	Week 13
Final report	20	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Includes the group's final project report, supported by multimedia materials	Within one week after the final presentation
Self-reflection	10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Encourages students to reflect on their learning journey, using multimodal formats such as writing, photographs, or video clips, etc.	Within one week after the final presentation

Grading Rubrics

The clear grading criteria are outlined below. Detailed rubrics for each assignment will be provided, helping students understand how their work will be assessed. These standards clearly specify the evaluation criteria, ensuring that students are fully aware of the expectations and requirements for each assessment.

1. In-Group Peer Review Rubric (100 Points)

• Preparation (20 Points)

- 20: Fully prepared with readings and assignments, and notes/questions.
- 15: Mostly prepared, completed most readings/assignments.
- 10: Somewhat prepared but incomplete.
- 5: Unprepared.

○ Participation (20 Points)

- 20: Actively contributes valuable insights throughout.
- 15: Regularly participates, though less insightful.
- 10: Occasionally participates, not consistently engaged.
- 5: Rarely participates.

○ Communication Skills (20 Points)

- 20: Clear, concise communication with appropriate tone.
- 15: Generally clear, minor clarity issues.
- 10: Struggles with clarity or tone.
- 5: Poor communication skills.

○ Collaboration (20 Points)

- 20: Actively listens, provides constructive feedback, facilitates discussion.
- 15: Listens and provides feedback, but inconsistently.
- 10: Limited engagement and feedback.
- 5: Rarely listens or contributes positively.

○ Critical Thinking (10 Points)

- 10: Consistently analyzes and evaluates ideas deeply.
- 7: Often demonstrates critical thinking.
- 5: Basic critical thinking, lacks depth.
- 3: Rarely analyzes or evaluates ideas.

○ Respect for Opinions (10 Points)

- 10: Always respectful, encourages diverse viewpoints.
- 7: Usually respectful, occasional lapses.
- 5: Sometimes dismissive of others.
- 3: Frequently interrupts or dismisses others.

2. Mid-term Group Performance Rubric (100 Points)

Intercultural Communication Scenario (20 points)

- Excellent (16-20 points): Demonstrates profound understanding and engagement; authentic, respectful interactions.
- Good (12-15 points): Shows clear understanding and participation; generally respectful interactions.
- Satisfactory (8-11 points): Basic understanding and participation; shows some cultural awareness.
- Needs Improvement (4-7 points): Limited understanding and participation; minimal cultural awareness.
- Unsatisfactory (0-3 points): No understanding or participation; lacks cultural sensitivity.

Dramaturgy (20 points)

- Excellent (16-20 points): Effective use of cultural elements, clear storyline, authentic portrayal.
- Good (12-15 points): Good use of cultural elements, coherent storyline, proper portrayal.
- Satisfactory (8-11 points): Adequate use of cultural elements, understandable storyline.
- Needs Improvement (4-7 points): Limited cultural elements, unclear storyline.
- Unsatisfactory (0-3 points): Poor or no use of cultural elements, incoherent storyline.

Performance (20 points)

- Excellent (16-20 points): Engaging delivery, expressive body language, captivates audience.
- Good (12-15 points): Good delivery and body language, holds audience attention.
- Satisfactory (8-11 points): Adequate delivery and body language.
- Needs Improvement (4-7 points): Limited engagement, unclear body language.
- Unsatisfactory (0-3 points): Unengaging, poor use of body language.

Lines and Lyrics (20 points)

- Excellent (16-20 points): Clear, articulate delivery, culturally relevant, effective conveyance of concepts.
- Good (12-15 points): Mostly clear delivery, some cultural relevance, somewhat effective.
- Satisfactory (8-11 points): Understandable delivery, minimal cultural relevance.
- Needs Improvement (4-7 points): Unclear delivery, lacks cultural relevance.
- Unsatisfactory (0-3 points): Inarticulate, no cultural relevance.

Teamwork (20 points)- For individuals, peer review

- Excellent (16-20 points): Excellent collaboration, communication, and respect.
- Good (12-15 points): Good team effort, effective communication.
- Satisfactory (8-11 points): Adequate teamwork and communication.
- Needs Improvement (4-7 points): Limited collaboration, issues in communication.
- Unsatisfactory (0-3 points): Poor teamwork, lack of communication.

3. By-Group Peer Review Rubric (100 Points)

Content and Logic (25 Points)

- Excellent (20 - 25 Points): The presentation content is comprehensive and logically clear. The problem statement is explicit, the research objectives are specific, the method design is rational, and the expected results are promising. The various parts of the content are closely connected and have strong logic.
- Good (15 - 19 Points): The presentation content is relatively complete and has strong logic, but there may be some lack of tight connection in certain parts.
- Average (10 - 14 Points): The presentation content is basically complete, but the logic is relatively weak, and some parts lack clear logical relationships.
- Needs Improvement (5 - 9 Points): The presentation content is incomplete, the logic is chaotic, and it is difficult to understand the core points of the project.
- Unsatisfactory (0 - 4 Points)**: The presentation content is in disarray, lacks logic, and fails to convey the core content of the project.

- Suggestion Template

- Regarding Problem Statement: Is the problem clear and of research value? Is there room for further refinement?

- Regarding Research Objectives: Are the objectives specific and measurable? Do they need further clarification or adjustment?

- Regarding Research Methods: Are the methods rational and feasible? Do they need to be supplemented or optimized?

- Regarding Expected Results: Are the expected results clear and achievable? Is there potential for further expansion or refinement?

Depth and Details (25 Points)

- Excellent (20 - 25 Points): The presentation content is in-depth and detailed, with comprehensive and thorough elaboration on aspects such as project background, literature review, research methods, and expected results, demonstrating a profound understanding of the project.
- Good (15 - 19 Points): The presentation content is relatively in-depth, but may lack comprehensiveness in some details.
- Average (10 - 14 Points): The presentation content meets the basic requirements, but lacks depth and some details are not clear.
- Needs Improvement (5 - 9 Points): The presentation content is superficial, lacking depth and details, and fails to reflect the complexity and importance of the project.
- Unsatisfactory (0 - 4 Points): The presentation content is overly brief, lacking necessary details and depth, and fails to reflect the value of the project.

- Suggestion Template

- Regarding Background Information: Is it necessary to supplement more relevant background information to strengthen the project's background framework?
- Regarding Literature Review: Is it necessary to further supplement relevant studies to better position the research gap of the project?
- Regarding Method Details: Is it necessary to further refine the specific steps of data collection and analysis?
- Regarding Result Details: Is it necessary to further clarify the specific form and application scenarios of the expected results?

Planning and Feasibility (25 Points)

- Excellent (20 - 25 Points): The project plan is detailed and feasible, with a reasonable time schedule, clear resource requirements, and a thorough risk assessment, demonstrating comprehensive consideration of project implementation.
- Good (15 - 19 Points): The project plan is relatively detailed, but there may be some room for improvement in certain aspects.
- Average (10 - 14 Points): The project plan is basically complete, but there may be some obvious shortcomings or omissions.
- Needs Improvement (5 - 9 Points): The project plan is vague, lacking specific implementation steps and time schedules.
- Unsatisfactory (0 - 4 Points): The project plan is unclear, lacks feasibility, and cannot effectively guide the implementation of the project.

- Suggestion Template

- Regarding Time Schedule: Is the timeline reasonable? Is it necessary to further refine the time arrangement for each stage?
- Regarding Resource Requirements: Is it necessary to further evaluate the availability of the resources needed for the project?
- Regarding Risk Assessment: Is it necessary to supplement or optimize the risk assessment and response strategies?
- Regarding Implementation Steps: Is it necessary to further clarify the specific implementation steps of the project?

Presentation and Interaction (15 Points)

- Excellent (12 – 15 Points): The presentation process is smooth, the language is clear, the visual aids are well-designed and closely integrated with the content, effectively attracting the audience's attention and maintaining high engagement.
- Good (9 - 11 Points): The presentation process is relatively smooth, the visual aids are relatively complete, and can attract the audience's attention well, but may be slightly lacking in interactivity in some parts.
- Average (6 - 8 Points): The presentation process meets the basic requirements, but the language expression is not smooth, the design of visual aids is average, and the interactivity is weak.
- Needs Improvement (3 - 5 Points): The presentation process has obvious problems, the language expression is unclear, the design of visual aids is rough, and the interactivity is poor.
- Unsatisfactory (0 - 2 Points): The presentation process is in disarray, fails to effectively convey the project content, and lacks interactivity.

- Suggestion Template

- Regarding Presentation Content: Is it necessary to further optimize the organization of the presentation content to enhance logic?
- Regarding Visual Aids: Is it necessary to further improve the design of visual aids to better support the presentation content?
- Regarding Interaction: Is it necessary to add more interactive elements to increase audience participation?

Team Collaboration and Division of Labor (10 Points)

- Excellent (8 - 10 Points): Team members have clear divisions of labor, good collaboration, and everyone can fully leverage their strengths to actively participate in all aspects of the project.
- Good (6 - 7 Points): There is a certain division of labor and collaboration among team members, and they can complete project tasks well, but there may be some minor coordination issues during the collaboration process.
- Average (4 - 5 Points): The division of labor and collaboration among team members are basically clear, but there may be some members with insufficient participation or loose collaboration.
- Needs Improvement (2 - 3 Points): There are obvious problems in the division of labor and collaboration among team members, and some members may lack collaborative tasks during the project process.
- Unsatisfactory (0 - 1 Point): Team members lack basic collaborative spirit and team awareness, the division of labor is chaotic, and they may not be able to effectively complete the project tasks.

- Suggestion Template

- Regarding Division of Labor: Is it necessary to further optimize the team division of labor to improve efficiency?
- Regarding Collaboration: Is it necessary to enhance communication and collaboration among team members to strengthen team cohesion?

4.

Presentation (100 Points)

Content Delivery (50 Points)

Group (30 Points)

- Excellent (24-30): Presentation is exceptionally well-organized, with a clear logical flow and comprehensive coverage of all key points. Content is presented in a way that demonstrates deep understanding and excellent preparation.
- Good (21-23): Presentation is well-organized and covers most key points with good clarity and logical flow. Content shows a solid understanding of the topic.
- Satisfactory (15-20) : Presentation is somewhat organized but may miss some key points or have minor logical gaps. Content is adequate but could be more comprehensive.

- Needs Improvement (9-14) : Presentation is poorly organized with significant gaps in content coverage. Logical flow is unclear and may confuse the audience.
- Unsatisfactory (0-8) : Presentation is highly disorganized with major omissions in content. Logical flow is severely lacking, making it difficult to follow.

Individual (20 Points)

- Excellent (16-20) : Individual delivery is exceptionally confident, clear, and highly engaging. Speaker demonstrates excellent command of the material, maintains strong eye contact, uses effective gestures, and speaks at a well-paced rhythm.
- Good (13-15) : Individual delivery is clear and engaging. Speaker shows good understanding of the material, maintains adequate eye contact, and uses some gestures effectively.
- Satisfactory (9-12) : Individual delivery is adequate but may lack confidence or engagement. Speaker may need to improve eye contact, pacing, or use of gestures.
- Needs Improvement (5-8) : Individual delivery is unclear or lacks engagement. Speaker may struggle with eye contact, pacing, volume, or clarity of speech.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4) : Individual delivery is very unclear and lacks engagement. Speaker has significant issues with delivery, making it difficult to understand the content.

Time Management (10 Points) - Group

- Excellent (8-10) : Presentation is perfectly paced and stays within the allotted time, with smooth transitions between sections.
- Good (6-7) : Presentation has minor timing deviations but stays close to the allotted time, with only slight adjustments needed.
- Satisfactory (4-5) : Presentation is somewhat rushed or overextended in parts but still within a reasonable time frame.
- Needs Improvement (2-3) : Presentation has noticeable timing issues, such as spending too much time on some sections and rushing others.
- Unsatisfactory (0-1) : Presentation has significant timing issues that severely impact the overall quality and coherence of the presentation.

Visual Aids (20 Points) - Group

- Excellent (16-20) : Visual aids are exceptionally high-quality, professional, and highly relevant. They significantly enhance the presentation and are easy to understand.
- Good (13-15) : Visual aids are effective and contribute positively to the presentation. They are mostly relevant and well-designed.
- Satisfactory (9-12) : Visual aids are of average quality or have limited relevance. They may need some improvement in design or clarity.
- Needs Improvement (5-8) : Visual aids are minimal or poorly designed. They may distract from the presentation or lack clarity.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4) : Visual aids are lacking or completely irrelevant to the presentation.

Response to Questions (20 Points)

Group (10 Points)

- Excellent (8-10) : Group collectively provides exceptionally clear, concise, and thorough responses to all questions. They demonstrate a deep understanding of the topic and can address even challenging follow-up questions.
- Good (6-7) : Group provides clear and informative answers to most questions. They show a good understanding of the topic and can handle most questions effectively.
- Satisfactory (4-5) : Group provides adequate responses but may lack depth or clarity in some answers.
- Needs Improvement (2-3) : Group provides unclear or incomplete answers to several questions. They may struggle with understanding the topic or addressing follow-up questions.
- Unsatisfactory (0-1) : Group provides unsatisfactory responses, showing limited understanding of the topic and inability to address most questions.

Individual (10 Points)

- Excellent (8-10) : Individual provides exceptionally clear, concise, and thorough responses to questions. They demonstrate a deep understanding of the topic and can address challenging follow-up questions effectively.
- Good (6-7) : Individual provides clear and informative answers. They show a good understanding of the topic and can handle most questions.

- Satisfactory (4-5) : Individual provides adequate responses but may lack depth or clarity in some answers.
- Needs Improvement (2-3) : Individual provides unclear or incomplete answers to several questions. They may struggle with understanding the topic or addressing follow-up questions.
- Unsatisfactory (0-1) : Individual provides unsatisfactory responses, showing limited understanding of the topic and inability to address most questions.

5. 5. Project Report (100 Points)

Clarity and Coherence (20 Points)

- Excellent (16-20): Exceptionally clear, with seamless logical flow.
- Good (13-15): Mostly clear, with minor lapses in coherence.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Understandable, but some sections lack logical flow.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Lacks clarity, affecting overall coherence.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): Consistently unclear and poorly structured.

Writing Style and Quality (20 Points)

- Excellent (16-20): Engaging, professional, error-free writing.
- Good (13-15): Clear and professional, with minimal errors.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Understandable, despite noticeable errors.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Frequent errors, distracting content.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): Riddled with errors, hindering understanding.

Depth of Content (10 Points)

- Excellent (9-10): Comprehensive details, demonstrating deep understanding.
- Good (7-8): Thorough details for most sections.
- Satisfactory (5-6): Adequate details, showing satisfactory understanding.
- Needs Improvement (3-4): Superficial content, lacking depth.
- Unsatisfactory (0-2): Insufficient details, reflecting poor understanding.

Research and Accuracy (20 Points)

- Excellent (16-20): In-depth research with accurate information.
- Good (13-15): Solid research, with minor inaccuracies.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Adequate research, with some generalities or inaccuracies.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Insufficient research, with noticeable inaccuracies.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): Minimal research, with significant inaccuracies.

Originality and Creativity (20 Points)

- Excellent (16-20): Highly original and creative.
- Good (13-15): Considerable originality and creativity.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Some original elements and creativity.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Limited originality and creativity.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): Unoriginal and lacking creativity.

Contribution Ranking (10 points – ranking may be in no particular order and ties are allowed)

- 1st Place: 10 points
- 2nd Place: 9 points
- 3rd Place: 8 points
- 4th Place: 7 points
- 5th Place: 6 points
- 6th Place: 5 points

6. 6. Self-reflection Rubric (100 points)

Leadership (30 Points)

- Excellent (17-20): Demonstrated a high level of initiative by actively taking on roles such as group leader, presentation leader, or topic leader during the course. Effectively engaged peers in classroom activities, exhibited strong organizational and leadership skills, and presented ideas with clarity and logical coherence.
- Good (13-16): Proactively assumed roles such as group leader, presentation leader, or topic leader. Successfully guided peers in participating in class discussions and facilitated group dialogue and reflection.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Took on leadership roles (e.g., group leader, presentation leader, or topic leader) at least once during the course. Showed the ability to involve peers in discussions and support group reflection.
- Needs Improvement (0-8): Did not take on any leadership roles throughout the course and did not demonstrate effective leadership skills.

Depth of Reflection (20 Points)

- Excellent (17-20): Deep, insightful connections with intercultural concepts.
- Good (13-16): Thoughtful reflection, lacks deeper insight.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Basic connections, surface-level reflection.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Weak or unclear connections.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): No meaningful reflection.

Application of Concepts (20 Points)

- Excellent (17-20): Creative, effective application to real-world scenarios.
- Good (13-16): Appropriate applications, lacks depth.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Basic application, lacks creativity.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Limited or shallow application.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): Misunderstood or irrelevant application.

Critical Thinking (20 Points)

- Excellent (16-20): Deep analysis with evidence-based strategies.
- Good (13-15): Insightful analysis, strategies lack depth.
- Satisfactory (9-12): Basic analysis, limited insight.
- Needs Improvement (5-8): Superficial analysis or unclear strategies.
- Unsatisfactory (0-4): No meaningful analysis.

Personal Insights (10 Points)

- Excellent (9-10): Genuine, thoughtful insights with constructive suggestions.
- Good (7-8): Relevant insights, less specific suggestions.
- Satisfactory (5-6): Basic insights, lacking depth.
- Needs Improvement (3-4): Minimal, vague insights.
- Unsatisfactory (0-2): No insights or suggestions.

Final Grade Descriptors

Each assessment score will be based on the average of multiple evaluations. For group-related tasks, the score will be shared equally among all members, while individual assessments will be assigned solely to the student based on their performance. The final score for each student will be the sum of the average scores from all categories, reflecting both group and individual contributions.

Grades	Short Description	Elaboration on subject grading description
A	Excellent Performance	Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of intercultural communication theories and concepts, with exceptional ability to apply them in real-world contexts. Exhibits creativity in analyzing cultural dynamics, strong critical thinking, and exceptional collaboration skills in group work and projects. Goes beyond core requirements to deliver insightful reflections and innovative solutions to intercultural challenges.
B	Good Performance	Shows solid knowledge of intercultural communication principles and competence in applying them to practical scenarios. Demonstrates the ability to analyze cultural differences and evaluate communication strategies effectively. Displays motivation to engage with course material and contribute meaningfully to group discussions and projects.
C	Satisfactory Performance	Possesses adequate understanding of intercultural communication concepts and the ability to address familiar problems with appropriate solutions. Shows basic analytical and critical thinking skills when examining cultural issues. Participates in group activities and shows consistent effort to meet the learning objectives.
D	Marginal Pass	Demonstrates threshold knowledge of intercultural communication and a limited ability to analyze or apply concepts. Effort is evident but may lack depth or critical insight. Contributions to group work and projects meet minimal expectations, with some potential for improvement in understanding and engagement.
F	Fail	Exhibits insufficient understanding of intercultural communication concepts and lacks the ability to apply them effectively. Fails to demonstrate critical thinking, engagement with course materials, or meaningful participation in group work. Does not meet the basic standards required for achieving the course learning objectives

Course AI Policy

The use of generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT and similar technologies, is permitted only under the following conditions:

1. Explicit Permission: Students may use generative AI tools for completing assessment tasks if explicitly allowed by the instructor for a specific assignment or activity. In such cases, the instructor will provide detailed guidelines on how these tools can be utilized.
2. Attribution and Transparency: If generative AI tools are used, students must clearly disclose their usage in their submissions. This includes specifying: The name(s) of the tool(s) used; The purpose for which the tool was used (e.g., idea generation, drafting text, creating visuals, coding assistance); A brief explanation of how the output was incorporated into the final work.
3. Academic Integrity: The use of AI tools must comply with the principles of academic integrity. Misrepresentation of AI-generated content as entirely one's own work, without proper attribution, will be treated as plagiarism or academic misconduct.
4. Critical Engagement: Students are expected to critically engage with the output of AI tools, ensuring that their submissions reflect their understanding of the subject matter. Blindly accepting AI-generated content without review or modification is not acceptable.
5. Restrictions on Unauthorized Use: Unless explicitly permitted, using AI tools to automate the completion of assessments, bypass academic effort, or create fraudulent content is strictly prohibited and will result in disciplinary actions.
6. Instructor's Discretion: The course instructor reserves the right to determine the appropriateness of AI tool usage for specific tasks. If unsure about whether the use of an AI tool is permissible, students are required to consult the instructor before proceeding.

*Please note that the course will employ ChatGPT as an auxiliary tool for preliminary review in some homework/report reviews.

Communication and Feedback

Assessment results for individual tasks will be provided on Canvas within two weeks of submission. If students have any questions regarding the feedback or marks, they should consult the instructor within five working days after receiving the feedback.

Required Texts and Supplementary Materials

More details will be available on Canvas to guide your project development.

Recommended Readings:

Martin, J. N. & Nakayama, T. K. (2021). *Intercultural Communication in Contexts* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Chapter 3.

Scollon, Ron, Suzanne Wong Scollon, and Rodney H. Jones. *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Samovar, Larry A., et al. *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Cengage Learning, 2014.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. ([1971], 2016). The sounds of silence. In Ferraro, G. (ed.), *Classic Readings in Cultural Anthropology* (4th ed.), pp. 27-35. New York, NY: Anchor.

Sorrells, K. (2020). *Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zhu, H. (2018). "What are culture-specific ways of communication and why?" In *Exploring Intercultural Communication: Language in Action* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 103-119.

Yum, J. O. (2015). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. In Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R., & 23 Aug 2022

Koester, Jolene, and Myron Lustig. *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. Pearson Prentice Hall, 2012.

Palfreyman, David, and Dawn McBride, eds. *Learning and teaching across cultures in higher education*. Springer, 2007.

Fromkin V., Rodman, R. & Hyams, N. (2018). "Brain and the language," pp. 446-456, and "Language and brain development," pp. 459-464, in *An Introduction to Language* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Deutscher, G. (August 2010). Does your language shape how you think? *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/magazine/29language-t.html?_r=0

Mooney, A. & Evans, B. (2019). *Language, Society, and Power: An Introduction* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge, Chapter 2.

Jackson, J. (2020). *Introducing Language and Intercultural Communication* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Moore, N., Hickson, M. & Stacks, D. M. (2014). Foundations of nonverbal communication. In *Nonverbal Communication: Studies and Applications* (6th ed.), pp. 3-32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ruth Benedict. (2014). "The Chrysanthemum and the Sword" (Belencre Classics; 027). Nanjing: Yilin Press.

《我者与他者：中国历史上的内外分际》，许倬云著. 中文大学出版社, 2009年

Xu, Zhuoyun. *Myself and the other: Internal and external divisions in Chinese history*. Chinese University Press, 2009.

费孝通. (2010). *文化与文化自觉*. 北京: 群言出版社.

Fei Xiaotong. (2010). "Culture and Cultural Self-Awareness." Beijing: Qunyan Press.

乐黛云. (2015). *多元文化中的中国思想 21世纪跨文化流通十六讲*. 北京: 中华书局.

Yue Daiyun. (2015). "Chinese Thought in Multiculturalism: Sixteen Lectures on Cross-Cultural Exchange in the 21st Century." Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

李欧梵. (2012). *人文六讲 (天窗文化 文化系列 洞见 11)*. 北京: 中国人民大学出版社.

Li Oufan. (2012). "Six Lectures on Humanities (Skylight Culture Series: Insights 11)." Beijing: China Renmin University Press.

芥川龙之介, & 林少华. (2010). *罗生门 (译文经典)*. 上海: 上海译文出版社.

Ryunosuke Akutagawa & Lin Shaohua. (2010). "Rashomon (Translated Classics)." Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.

本尼迪克特, & 童一. (2016). 菊与刀. 北京: 北京时代华文书局.

Benedict, R., & Tong Yi. (2016). "The Chrysanthemum and the Sword." Beijing: Beijing Times Chinese Bookstore.

Recommended Audiovisual Materials:

American Factory 《美国工厂》 (2019)

Mulan 《花木兰》 (1998)

Kung Fu Panda 《功夫熊猫》 (2008、2011、2016)

My Fair Lady 《窈窕淑女》 (1964)

The Wedding Banquet 《喜宴》 (1993)

Gua Sha Treatment 《刮痧》 (2001)

Pushing Hands 《推手》 (1991)

Outsourced 《世界是平的》 (2006)

The Terminal 《幸福终点站》 (2004)

My Big Fat Greek Wedding 《我的盛大希腊婚礼》 (2002、2016)

Crash 《撞车》 (2004)

Course Summary:

Date	Details	Due
------	---------	-----