

GENDER IN LOW-IMPOSITION EMAIL REQUESTS

EL GÉNERO EN CORREOS ELECTRÓNICOS DE PETICIÓN CON BAJO NIVEL DE IMPOSICIÓN

PATRICIA SALAZAR CAMPILLO
Universitat Jaume I de Castelló
csalazar@uji.es

Fecha de recepción: 12-09-2023
Fecha de aceptación: 28-09-2023

ABSTRACT

For some years now, communication between university students and faculty members has favoured the use of emails as opposed to face-to-face consultations. Previous research has pointed out the difficulties students may face to write an email to a professor since sociopragmatic variables have to be taken into account to show deference. This study investigates whether students' gender influences the structure, framing moves and pronouns of address in naturally-occurring requestive emails written in the students' L1. Our results show that both male and female students started their emails with a greeting. Females also identified themselves more and used more pre-closing formulas and their signature to end the emails. Contrary to the general stereotype that females are more polite, the emails written by female students included the informal Spanish pronoun *tú* to address their professor for the first time. In contrast, males used *usted* and *tú* in a more balanced way in their emails.

KEYWORDS: closings; emails; gender; openings; pragmatics

RESUMEN

Desde hace ya unos años, la comunicación entre estudiantes universitarios y el profesorado se ha decantado por el correo electrónico frente a las tutorías presenciales. Estudios anteriores subrayan las dificultades que estos estudiantes pueden encontrar al escribir correos a un profesor ya que hay que tener en cuenta variables sociopragmáticas para mostrar respeto. Este estudio investiga si el género de los estudiantes tiene influencia en la estructura, enmarcadores y pronombres de segunda persona en correos electrónicos de petición auténticos escritos en la L1 de los estudiantes. Los resultados muestran que ambos géneros comenzaron sus correos con un saludo. Por otro lado, las mujeres se identificaron más, usaron más fórmulas de pre-cierre y firma para acabar sus correos. Contrariamente al estereotipo de que las mujeres son más educadas, los correos escritos por las estudiantes incluyeron el pronombre informal *tú* para dirigirse a su profesora por primera vez, y los hombres usaron *usted* y *tú* más equilibradamente en sus correos.

PALABRAS CLAVE: aperturas; cierres; correos electrónicos; género; pragmática

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the use of email is widespread in the communication between professors and students, almost replacing face-to-face interaction in this specific context. Previous studies (e.g., Chejnová 2014; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011) point to the asymmetric relationship between students and professors, since variables such as power and distance are at stake. Yet, some of these studies also highlight that students may not take the above-mentioned sociopragmatic variables into account (Zarei and Mohammadi, 2012) or they do not perceive the relation with the professors as unequal (Alcón-Soler, 2013). For these reasons, students may violate politeness features, which may cause a negative reaction on the professors' part. Despite the vast number of studies on emails in academia, mostly focusing on requests from the students to their professors (e.g., Deveci and Hmida, 2017; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2015), fewer studies have addressed the influence of gender not only on request realizations but also on some other features in emails (for example, openings), which may contribute to politeness.

In 1975, Lakoff argued that women were linguistically more polite than men, showing more elaborate and indirect speech. In the same line, Holmes (1995) argued that women were expected to use more forms of gratitude and leave-takings, thus showing more politeness.

However, later research (e.g., Antonopoulou, 2001: 242) has challenged this general claim by stating that “social and relational context is disregarded”. The author called into question general conclusions on different language behaviour depending on the speaker’s gender. Therefore, there seems to be no absolute consensus in the research on linguistic differences based on gender. The present study aims to make a contribution to the field of enquiry by examining whether email structure, framing moves and Spanish address pronouns (formal *usted* and informal *tú*) differ based on the gender of the sender (i.e., the student).

2. STUDENT-FACULTY EMAILS

A vast body of research has been conducted on emails between students and professors. Some studies have focused on issues such as requests, level of imposition, social variables and (im)politeness, among other topics. Crystal (2006) claimed that opening and closing moves in email were optional elements, as the main part of an email is the content. However, their presence helps to keep the social relationships between the sender and the recipient, and omitting them may result in too direct or impolite messages, especially if social variables such as power or distance exist between both parties and the sender lacks this sociopragmatic knowledge. Even though emails are an asynchronous medium of communication, in a quick exchange of emails the interactants may simply focus on content and ignore openings and/or closings. A lack of these framing moves may result in too direct, non-deferential or abrupt emails, as attested by Zarei and Mohammadi’s (2012) study on professors’ perceptions. Similarly, in a study on professors’ perceptions of students’ requestive emails in Iran, Hashemian and Farhang-Ju (2019) claim that structural components of emails show politeness. Del Saz (2010) also argued that emails showing the four components of a writing structure, that is, “an opening or salutation, the body of the message, a close, and a signature” (p. 234), are the most formal emails in terms of structure. On the contrary, those emails including only the body of the message are regarded as more informal.

In the Spanish context, deference towards the email recipient may be substantiated by means of *usted*, the formal variant of the second-person pronoun *tú*. According to Hofstede’s (2001) analysis of cross-cultural communication, Spain obtains a high score (57), which means that it is a high-power culture and authority should not be questioned. This power asymmetry should be taken into account when students address their professors, especially in first-contact requestive emails. This is in line with Bou-Franch (2011), who reported that students employed the expected discourse practices to their higher-ups. However, it has also been claimed (Zarei

and Mohammadi, 2012) that the nature of emails, which fuses oral and written characteristics, may contribute to their directness, even in academic contexts, where social distance and power are variables to be taken into account in student-professor online communication.

3. GENDER IN COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION

Computer-mediated Communication (CMC, henceforth) includes a series of interactions such as blogs, emails or discussion groups. In this type of online setting, the issue of anonymity should be borne in mind as one cannot be sure who the interlocutor really is (Herring, 2003; Miller and Durndell, 2004). The lack of social cues may result in disinhibited behaviour and less personal communication. In the academic context, when L2 learners engage in CMC, their pragmatic inability may result in breakdown, since they may sound too abrupt or impolite, partly due to the fact that they may either ignore L2 pragmatic conventions or transfer the ones from their L1.

Drawing on Tannen's (1990, p. 42) claim that men and women speak different "genderlects", Herring (2000) argued that gender differences could be transferred to CMC. In this sense, in an online discussion forum, Miller and Durndell (2004) found that female students attenuated their postings by means of hedges and apologies, whereas males showed assertiveness and an adversarial tone. In an Iranian context, Tajeddin and Malmir (2014) did not find any impact of gender on the production of different speech acts by EFL learners. More recently, Pham and Yeh (2020) claim that, in their study with Vietnamese students, females tend to use more conventionally indirect strategies whereas males favour indirect forms and imperatives.

Despite some previous research on gender and emails written in Spanish as L1 (e.g., Bou-Franch, 2011 on Peninsular Spanish; Safont-Jordà (2023) on Spanish in a multilingual setting), inconclusive findings have been reported. Safont-Jordà (2023) showed no gender differences in the opening section of the emails (the closing move was not included in her analysis), unlike Félix-Brasdefer (2012) and Waldvogel (2007), who found gender differences in the use of greetings.

In light of previous studies on gender and email requests, there is a need for more research to widen the scope of analysis of this variable (Félix-Brasdefer, 2012). For example, del Saz (2010) claims that more data are also needed to ascertain how students structure their emails. The present study aims to address this gap in that it specifically focuses on the

relationship between low-imposition email requests in the Spanish context and gender in student-faculty communication.

4. THE STUDY

The novelty of the present study lies in the fact that little research has been conducted on L1 requestive emails considering the variables of gender, email structure (framing moves) and address forms (see Safont-Jordà, 2023, for an exception). Therefore, the goal of this exploratory study is to analyse the relationship between gender and naturally-occurring emails containing a low-imposition request. To this aim, the following research questions were put forward:

- 1.- How do male and female students structure their emails?
- 2.- Is there any difference between males' and females' use of framing moves (i.e., openings and closings) in requestive emails written in their L1?
- 3.- Do male and female students use second-pronoun form of address (*tú* and *usted*) differently in their first-contact email to a professor?

4.1 Subjects and data collection

50 natural emails (25 from male students and 25 from female students) addressed to a female professor over the course of several semesters are the data for the present study. All of them were first-contact emails which contained a low-imposition request (i.e., request for information on issues related to an MA programme). The reason for examining only low-imposition requestive emails lies in the fact that they abound in student-faculty communication. For example, Salazar-Campillo (2019) found that 80% of the emails were requests for information, that is to say, low-imposition requests addressed to their professor. In the academic context for the present study, some degree of deference and politeness towards the professor was expected for two reasons: (1) the relationship between the students and the professor was strictly academic, so there was high social distance and status and (2) it was the students who initiated the email exchange. The graduate students wrote their emails in their L1 (Spanish), and their age ranged from 22 to 28 years old. The professor asked the students for permission to use their emails for research purposes, and only those who consented were included for analysis. The professor and researcher was a Spanish female in her late 40s at the time of data collection with over 20 years of teaching experience at university.

4.2 Data analysis

In order to examine possible gender differences, the students' emails were analysed according to overall structure, framing moves in the email (i.e., openings and closings) and address terms to the professor (*tú* vs *usted*). As mentioned above, the requests fell into the category of low imposition (Félix-Brasdefer, 2012), which included requests for information (86%, see Example 1) and for an online or face-to-face appointment (14%, see Example 2):

Example 1, male student: *Me gustaría obtener información sobre el máster que imparte. ¿Podría cursar el máster completamente a distancia? ¿Tiene exámenes?*¹

'I'd like to get some information about the Master's programme you coordinate. Could I study the master fully online? Are there any exams?'

Example 2, female student: *Quería pedirte una tutoría para hablar sobre el paper de la asignatura XX.*

'I'd like to ask for a meeting to discuss the paper for subject XX'.

Previous taxonomies have been developed for the analysis of framing moves (e.g., Bou-Franch, 2011). For the purposes of the present study, we will use a more recent one (i.e., Salazar-Campillo and Codina-Espurz, 2018, see Appendix 1) which incorporates a move in the Salutation termed as *Pleasantry*, which functions as phatic communication (Bloch, 2002). A subsample of 20 emails (10 written by female students and 10 by male students) were coded by a researcher with wide expertise in email requests and framing moves. Inter-coder agreement was reached for 98% of this subsample.

4.3 Results and discussion

RQ1 addressed the structure of emails, which, according to previous research (e.g., Hashemian and Farhang-Ju, 2019; Waldvogel, 2007) should incorporate an opening and a closing, among other components which are not the focus of the present research (e.g., subject line). Even though openings and closings have been claimed to be optional elements (Crystal, 2006; Vinagre and González-Lloret, 2018), some structural conventions were expected in the emails under analysis, given the unequal power relationship between the addresser and the recipient and the fact that they were first-contact emails. In terms of structure, our students' emails

¹The examples are extracted from the data of the current study.

display different degrees of formality. As illustrated in Table 1 below, there is variation in the framing moves of emails (i.e., openings and closings) as regards gender.

Table 1. Structure of emails

		Male students	Female students
Openings		Frequency (percentage)	Frequency (percentage)
	Salutation	25 (100%)	24 (96%)
	Pleasantry	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Identification of self	8 (32%)	19 (76%)
Closings			
	Pre-closing	19 (76%)	25 (100%)
	Complimentary Close	20 (80%)	15 (60%)
	Signature	17 (68%)	25 (100%)

In the opening moves, 100% of male data contained a salutation, decreasing to 96% in the emails written by female students. The high percentages for salutation resemble traditional letter-writing (del Saz, 2010), that is, the expected way to start correspondence. All students, regardless of gender, included some of the elements conforming openings and closings in their emails, thus avoiding abruptness (Zarei and Mohammadi, 2012) and showing deference to the recipient (Patrama, 2019). This result is in line with Félix-Brasdefer's (2012) and Bou-Franch's (2011) findings, since the presence of openings and closings reflects deference, which may point to the fact that students perceived their relationship with their professor as asymmetric.

The next optional move was the employment of phatic communication by means of a pleasantry, but it was nonexistent except for only one occurrence by a male student. This finding concurs with Zarepour and Saidloo (2016), who claimed that students kept phatic communication to a minimum (2.7% of the total number of opening moves in their data). These authors attribute this minimal use to the fact that phatic communication is "a personal preference, not a strategy" (p. 583). As for identification of self, female students outnumber males (76% vs 32%). This is a necessary move in our data, as they were first-contact emails and the professor did not know the sender's identity. These percentages are much lower than expected, especially for male emails, as students were the ones who initiated the online

interaction and thus personal identification is perceived as necessary when addressing their professor.

Turning our attention to closings, all females used a pre-closing formula, decreasing to 76% for male students. Complimentary closes were more used by males than females (80% vs 60%), and there exists an outstanding difference in the last optional move, that is, the signature, since all female students signed to finish their mails but only 68% of male students included it. Broadly speaking, emails written by female students contain a more formal structure than those sent by males, especially in the use of closings. Emails written by male students may reflect Bernal's (2007: 181) claim that omitting closings in Peninsular Spanish "is a conscious choice which expresses impoliteness" (own translation).

RQ 2 asked about the elements in openings and closings in emails written by female and male students in their L1. Tables 2 and 3 present the results for these framing moves taking the variable of gender into account.

Table 2. Frequency and percentages of elements in openings

		Male students	Female students
Salutation		Frequency (percentage)	Frequency (percentage)
	GE	10 (40%)	9 (36%)
	GE+T	9 (36%)	0
	GE+FN	3 (12%)	14 (56%)
	GE+T+LN	3 (12%)	0
	GE+T+FN+LN	0	1 (4%)
	∅	0	1 (4%)
Pleasantry		1 (4%)	0
	∅	24 (96%)	25 (100%)
Identification of self			
	FN	1 (4%)	4 (16%)
	FN+LN	7 (28%)	15 (60%)
	∅	17 (68%)	6 (24%)

Note: GE stands for Greeting Expression; T for Title; FN for First Name, and LN for Last Name

In the emails written by males, a greeting without any address term occurred in 40% of the cases, and a slight lower percentage (36%) in the female corpus. This finding is lower than the one reported by Chejnová (2014), with over 50% in her data. As in Félix-Brasdefer's (2012) study, we can note some gender differences in the use of greetings by male and female students: firstly, over half of the female emails (56%) have included a Greeting Expression + the professor's First Name; secondly, whereas 36% of emails written by males included a Greeting Expression and a Title, female students did not use this type of greeting at all. The variety of choices to greet the professor had already been attested in previous research, irrespective of gender (e.g., Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Níkleva and Núñez, 2013).

In his L1 (English) data, Félix-Brasdefer (2012) found that females mainly used Greeting word only (Hello) to address their professor, followed by a more respectful strategy (Title + Last Name). Similarly, males also used a Greeting word as the preferred strategy, but their deferential opening move was in the form of Greeting + Title + Last Name). However, this author reported no significant differences in the opening move of males and females in their L1. In a workplace situation, Waldvogel (2007) found that women used more greetings than their male counterparts.

The most striking similarity between genders can be noted in the use of the pleasantries, as students, regardless of gender, did not use it except for one male student. As mentioned before, this strategy serves to establish social relationships, and although the function of students' emails has been claimed to be both transactional and interactional (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2018), our students were probably more concerned with the transactional goal of their mails, as the lack of phatic communication shows. With regard to identification of self, females seem to be more concerned about providing it (76%) than males (32%). This is an important finding, as females more than doubled the frequency of self-identification in their first-contact emails compared to males. Identification included the student's First Name (16% for females and 4% for males) and First Name + Last Name (60% for females, 28% for males). Again, apart from the fact that female students used more identifications of self, they did so by providing their full name, which seems to be the appropriate choice when students address their professor for the first time. In addition, all female students who did not identify themselves in the opening (6 cases, or 24%) did include their name in the signature, as part of the closing. In turn, out of the 17 males (68%) who did not include their identification, 12 (70.5%) signed their emails and 5 (29.5%) did not. In light of the findings for identification of self, we may claim that females seem to adhere more to the expected degree of deference to the recipient by providing self-identification in the opening move, and in those cases in which they did not,

identification was present in the signature. Male students identified themselves in the openings to a much lesser extent, and it is worth noting that 68% of male students did not provide identification in their openings, a fact which may result inappropriate in first-contact emails.

Table 3 depicts the elements in the closing moves. The most frequent pre-closing was an expression of gratitude by means of *Gracias* (Thanks). In addition, 13 female students used the intensified form of thanking *Muchas gracias* (Many thanks), whereas only 9 male students employed this structure. In our study, 24% of male students did not employ any thanking formula, a lower percentage than the one in Rodríguez-Velasco (2019), as only half of his L1 students used a thanking expression to mitigate their requests. In contrast, our female emails included a pre-closing statement showing gratitude in 92% of the cases. A high occurrence of closings showing gratitude was also found by Félix-Brasdefer (2012), in both male and female data. Expressions of gratitude plus apology were kept to a minimum, probably because the low degree of imposition of the request did not demand this mitigation strategy.

Table 3. Frequency and percentages of elements in closings

		Male students	Female students
Pre-closing		Frequency (percentage)	Frequency (percentage)
	Gratitude	15 (60%)	20 (80%)
	Gratitude+Apology	1 (4%)	2 (8%)
	Gratitude+Appeal	3 (12%)	1 (4%)
	Appeal	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
	∅	6 (24%)	0 (0%)
Complimentary Close		20 (80%)	15 (60%)
	∅	5 (20%)	10 (40%)
Signature			
	FN+LN	8 (32%)	11 (44%)
	FN	9 (36%)	9 (36%)
	∅	8 (32%)	5 (20%)

Males employed more complimentary closes, that is, conventional expressions such as *Un saludo*, than females (80% vs 60%). The use of this element contributes to the formality of

the email by adding respect towards the recipient, a fact that 40% of our data from female students ignored.

With regard to the signature, Rodríguez-Velasco (2019) claims that in his L1 Spanish data all but one student used it to close their emails, after thanking the professor. In the present investigation, our results show a different tendency, as 20% of females and over 30% of males did not include a signature as the last part in their emails. The absence of the sender's name to end the email was reported as the highest rating for pragmatic failure in Stephens, Houser and Cowan's (2009) study. Indeed, a lack of signature may result in overly casual first-contact emails in faculty interactions. This finding may be explained by the fact that our participants were "digital natives" (Prensky, 2001), that is, a generation who uses social media platforms heavily and may have transferred the digital language of these cyber world into their email writing.

The answer for RQ3 suggests that female students tended to address their professor with the informal pronoun *tú*, and male students performed similarly in the use of *tú* and *usted* (see Table 4 below). As a consequence, a close and familiar tone is established between students and faculty, avoiding deference and blurring any asymmetrical relationship.

Table 4. Use of pronouns of address in the emails

	Male students	Female students
	Frequency (percentage)	Frequency (percentage)
<i>tú</i>	12 (48%)	15 (60%)
<i>usted</i>	13 (52%)	10 (40%)

Our data show that both male and female students favoured the use of the informal pronoun of address *tú* in their first-contact requestive emails (the difference between *tú* and *usted* for males is only one occurrence). More specifically, females opted for *tú* in 60% of their emails. Therefore, our study seems to challenge the stereotype that females are more polite than males, at least in the choice of terms of address to the professor. Taken together, these results do not mirror Hofstede's (2001) ranking for Spain as a high-power culture, as a deferential tone was expected in this type of institutional exchanges. As pointed out by Chejnová (2014) and Vela-Delfa (2018), the power distance index seems to be decreasing with time, and, as a result, a more symmetric relationship emerges between students and faculty. This change was recently pointed out by Salazar-Campillo (2023), who found that in 50% of the first-contact emails under

analysis the students used *tú*. This percentage increased to over 70% in the follow-up email, thus showing informality and closeness. The change towards more egalitarian relationship professor-student had already been reported by Chejnová (2014), on the grounds that university students in the Czech Republic did not employ polite forms of address in their emails to professors. In turn, Alcón-Soler's (2015) study of Spanish teenagers' lack of mitigation in their requestive emails shows that these students "do not perceive their relationship with their learning mentor as one of social distance" (Alcón-Soler, 2015: 40). In light of these claims, which are supported by our findings, the Spanish academic context at tertiary level seems to be moving to a more familiar tone in student-professor email consultations. A further variable may be playing a role in the decreased level of formality in this setting, as Economidou-Kogetsidis (2018: 508) suggests: the fact that over the past years, university students have been regarded as consumers who may not address politeness on the grounds of their "specific customer rights", underestimating the degree of imposition of requests when emailing their professors.

5. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This study adds to the scant body of research on gender and requestive emails by examining the structural elements in emails, the pragmalinguistic variation in the framing moves, and second-pronoun address terms in student-initiated low-imposition emails. Two decades ago, Mills (2003) argued that gender was not a factor in speech. This claim has been challenged more recently, for example, in the context of English-as-a-foreign language, Martí-Arnándiz (2012) reported gender differences in the use of request modifiers by Spanish learners. Moreover, and at least in email communication, the results of the present study do not fully corroborate Mills' statement for a number of reasons: first, differences have been noted in the opening move, as females favoured the use of self-identification. In the closing move, males outperformed females in the employment of complimentary closes but all female students signed their emails. Moreover, males tended to employ both formal and informal pronouns in a more balanced way whereas females addressed their professor more informally. Therefore, and in light of our findings, we may suggest that there is not a pattern typically male or typically female when university students address their professor; however, some elements in the framing moves and the use of a specific pronoun of address are favoured over the rest depending on the sender's gender.

The present study is subject to a number of limitations. Firstly, we cannot make any strong claims due to the small sample. Secondly, some other individual differences (i.e., older

students) as well as the recipient's age and seniority (Haider & Zandi, 2022) and a higher degree of imposition of the request should be taken into consideration to provide a wider picture on gender and pragmalinguistic choices. In addition, the professor's gender (female) may have played a significant role in the results of the present study. Previous research has suggested that the gender of the addressee also influences the way the speaker opens and closes the interaction (Antonopoulou, 2001; Félix-Brasdefer, 2012).

This study only focused on students' first-contact initiated emails. Therefore, the possible chain of exchanges, that is, the students' follow-up mails after the professor's mail were not analysed. Bou-Franch (2011) argued that structural moves could be influenced by the conversational progression. To the best of our knowledge, one of the few studies which have considered a thread of requestive emails to detect possible changes in politeness was Salazar-Campillo (2023) on address terms. This author reported that in the students' follow-up email, 22.5 % changed from *usted* to *tú*, thus indicating a decrease of formality as student-professor interaction developed. Further research is needed on the use of Spanish address forms and framing moves in students' successive emails taking gender as a variable.

Finally, smartphones and instant messaging apps may have an impact on choice of request and format of email (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2018) and on informal linguistic structures (Shaitan and Zakhidova, 2021). Also, as stated by Patrama (2019), lack of politeness may be the result of incorrect grammar or punctuation, misspellings and the use of emojis, to name but a few. This issue should be approached from a gender perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is part of the research project PID 2020-117959GB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. Additional funding has been granted by Generalitat Valenciana (AICO/2021/310), and Projectes d'Innovació Educativa de la Unitat de Suport Educatiu de la Universitat Jaume I (47310/23).

REFERENCES

- ALCÓN-SOLER, Eva (2013): “Mitigating email requests in teenagers’ first and second language academic cyber-consultation”, *Multilingua*, 32, pp. 779-799. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2013-0037>
- ALCÓN-SOLER, Eva (2015): “Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay”, *System*, 48, pp. 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.005>
- ANTONOPOULOU, Eleni (2001): “Brief service encounters: Gender and politeness”, *Linguistic politeness across boundaries*, eds. Arin Bayraktaroğlu, and Maria Sifianou, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 241-259.
- BERNAL, María (2007): *Categorización sociopragmática de la cortesía y de la descortesía: Un estudio de la conversación coloquial española*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Stockholm University. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:196989/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- BLOCH, Joel (2002): “Student/teacher interaction via email: the social context of internet discourse”, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, pp. 117-134.
- BOU-FRANCH, Patricia (2011): “Openings and closings in Spanish email conversations”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, pp. 1772-1785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.11.002>
- CHEJNOVÁ, Pavla (2014): “Expressing politeness in the institutional e-mail communications of university students in the Czech Republic”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 60, pp. 175-192.
- CRYSTAL, David (2006): *Language and the Internet*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- DEL SAZ, María (2010): “A gender analysis of email communication”, *Interlingüística*, 21, pp. 231-239.
- DEVECI, Tanju, and Ikhlas HMIDA (2017): “The request speech act in emails by Arab university students in the UAE”, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13.1, pp. 194-214.
- ECONOMIDOU-KOGETSIDIS, Maria (2011): “‘Please answer me as soon as possible’: Pragmatic failure in non-native speakers’ email request to faculty”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, pp. 3193-3215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.06.006>
- ECONOMIDOU-KOGETSIDIS, Maria (2015): “Teaching email politeness in the EFL/ESL classroom”, *ELT Journal Advance Access*, 69.4, pp. 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv031>
- ECONOMIDOU-KOGETSIDIS, Maria (2018): “‘Mr Paul, please inform me accordingly’. Address forms, directness and degree of imposition in L2 emails”, *Pragmatics*, 28.4, pp. 489-515. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.17025.eco>

- FÉLIX-BRASDEFER, César (2012): "Email request to faculty", *Interlanguage Request Modifications*, eds. Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis, and Helen Woodfield, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 87-118
- HAIDER, Iftikhar, and Hamed ZANDI (2022): "In my professor's eyes: Faculty and perceived impoliteness in student emails", *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 18.1, pp. 197-222.
- HASHEMIAN, Mahmood, and Maryam FARHANG-JU (2019): "Applied Linguistics faculty members' perceptions of (im)politeness and (in)appropriateness of L2 learners' e-mail requests", *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 38.1, pp. 119-155.
<https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2019.34578.2729>
- HERRING, Susan C. (2000): "Gender Differences in CMC: Findings and Implications", *Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility*, retrieved 03-04-2023,
<http://cpsr.org/issues/womenintech/herring/>.
- HERRING, Susan C. (2003): "Computer-mediated discourse", *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton, Malden, Blackwell Publishing, pp. 612-634.
- HOFSTEDE, Geert (2001): *Culture's consequences. Differences in work-related values*, Beverly Hills, Sage.
- HOLMES, Janet (1995): *Women, Men and Politeness*, London, Longman.
- LAKOFF, Robin (1975): *Language and woman's place*, New York, Harper.
- MARTÍ-ARNÁNDIZ, Otilia (2012): "Are women more polite than men? The effect of gender on the use of request modifiers by Spanish EFL university students", *Speech acts and politeness across languages and cultures*, eds. Leire Ruiz de Zarobe, and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe, Bern, Peter Lang, pp. 307-336.
- MILLER, Jane, and Alan DURNDELL (2004): "Gender, Language and Computer-mediated Communication", *Human Perspectives in the Internet Society: Culture, Psychology and Gender*, eds. Konrad Morgan, Carlos A. Brebbia, José Sánchez, and Alexander Voiskounsky, Southampton, WIT Press, pp. 235-244.
- MILLS, Sara (2003): *Gender and Politeness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- NÍKLEVA, Dimitrinka, and María Pilar NÚÑEZ (2013): "El correo electrónico como género discursivo: percepciones y habilidades para su composición en estudiantes universitarios", *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, 26, pp. 385-407.
- PATRAMA, Heidi (2019): *Linguistic politeness in online communication*, Semarang, LPPM Unnes.

- PHAM, Thi Minh Trang, and Aiden YEH (2020): "Politeness of Vietnamese students in writing request email in English: A course-based and socio-pragmatic study", *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 2.2, pp. 109-128.
<https://doi.org/10.36892./ijlls.v2i2.202>
- PRENSKY, Marc (2001): "Digital natives, digital immigrants", *On the Horizon*, 9.5, pp. 1-6.
- RODRÍGUEZ-VELASCO, David (2019): "Análisis de los elementos pragmáticos en la interacción escrita académica: el caso de los correos electrónicos de universitarios norteamericanos", *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de las Lenguas*, 13.26, pp. 198-224.
- SAFONT, Pilar (2023): "Multilingual cyberpragmatics in instructional settings. Exploring gender and age effects in Catalan, Spanish and English email requests", *International Journal of Multilingualism*, accessed 07-05-2023,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2023.2187811>
- SALAZAR-CAMPILLO, Patricia (2019): "Student-initiated email communication: An analysis of openings and closings by Spanish EFL learners" *Sintagma*, 30, pp. 81-93.
<https://doi.org/10.21001/sintagma.2018.30.05>
- (2023): "Address forms and politeness markers in Spanish students' emails to faculty", *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada*, 21.1, pp. 58-73.
- SALAZAR-CAMPILLO, Patricia, and Victòria CODINA-ESPURZ (2018): Politeness in first and follow-up emails to faculty: Openings and closings, *Learning Second Language Pragmatics Beyond Traditional Contexts*, eds. Ariadna Sánchez-Hernández, and Ana Herráiz-Martínez, Bern, Peter Lang, pp. 87-108.
- SHAITAN, Alexandra, and Guzál ZAKHIDOVA (2021): "Writing a formal email in English: Exploring university students' pragmatic competence", *Central Asian Journal of Education*, 6.1, article 14.
- STEPHENS, Keri, Marian HOUSER, and Renee L. COWAN (2009): "R U able to meet me: The impact of students' overly casual email messages to instructors", *Communication Education*, 58.3, pp. 303-326.
- TAJEDDIN, Zia, and Ali MALMIR (2014): "Knowledge of L2 speech acts: Impact of gender and language learning experience", *English Language Teaching*, 1, pp. 1-21.
- TANNEN, Deborah (1990): *You just don't understand*, New York, Ballantine Books.
- VELA-DELFA, Cristina (2018): "La apelación en el género discursivo del correo electrónico: fórmulas nominales de tratamiento en las aperturas y los cierres de los mensajes de email", *Onomázein*, IV, pp. 98-118. doi: 10.7764/onomazein.add.06

- VINAGRE, Margarita, and Marta GONZÁLEZ-LLORET (2018): “La comunicación mediada por computador y su integración en el aprendizaje de segundas lenguas”, *Comunicación mediada por tecnologías*, eds. Marta González-Lloret, and Margarita Vinagre, Sheffield, Equinox, pp. 1-19.
- WALDVOGEL, Joan (2007): “Greetings and closings in workplace email. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*”, 12.2, pp. 456-477. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00333.x>
- ZAREI, Gholam, and Masoomeh MOHAMMADI (2012): “E-politeness in Iranian English electronic requests to the faculty”, *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 3.1, pp. 3-24.
- ZAREPOUR, Fatemeh, and Masoomeh Imani SAIDLOO (2016): “An analysis of Iranian EFL Learners’ English written requestive e-mails”, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7.3, pp. 579-585. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0703.20>

APPENDIX 1. TYPOLOGY FOR THE ANALYSIS OF OPENING AND CLOSING MOVES (SALAZAR-CAMPILLO AND CODINA-ESPURZ, 2018)

OPENINGS							
A.	Salutation: Greeting expression + Address term					Example	
	Code	Greeting/ term of deference	Title	First name	Last name		
+ Degree of formality -	1.	GE+T+FN+LN	X	X	X	X	<i>Dear Dr.</i> (professor's first name and last name)
	2.	GE+T+LN	X	X		X	<i>Dear Dr.</i> (professor's last name)
	3.	GE+T+FN	X	X	X		<i>Dear Dr.</i> (professor's first name)
	4.	T+FN+LN		X	X	X	<i>Dr.</i> (professor's first name and last name)
	5.	T+LN		X		X	<i>Dr.</i> (professor's last name)
	6.	T+FN		X	X		<i>Dr.</i> (professor's first name)
	7.	GE+T	X	X			<i>Dear Professor</i>
	8.	T		X			<i>Professor</i>
	9.	GE+FN+LN	X		X	X	<i>Dear</i> (professor's first name and last name)
	10.	GE+LN	X			X	<i>Dear</i> (professor's last name)
	11.	GE+FN	X		X		<i>Dear/Hello</i> (professor's first name)
	12.	GE	X				<i>Hello, Good afternoon,</i>
	13.	FN+LN			X	X	(professor's first name and last name)
	14.	LN				X	(professor's last name)

	15.	FN			X		(professor's first name)
	16.	Ø	-	-	-	-	(no Salutation)
	B.	Pleasantry					<i>I hope this email finds you well.</i>
	C.	Identification of self					sender's identification

CLOSINGS		
A.	Pre-closing statement	Example
	Gratitude	<i>Thank you for your help/your answer.</i>
	Appeal	<i>Looking forward to hearing from you</i>
	Hope/wish	<i>I hope I can register in your class.</i>
	Apology	<i>Sorry for the inconvenience.</i>
B.	Complimentary close	<i>Regards/Thanks/Have a nice day.</i>
C.	Signature	Student's first name and/or last name(s)