

**S. Baranova**

**T. Pavlenko**

## **CONTACT ESTABLISHING IN AMERICAN CORPORATE CULTURE VIA TRANSLATION**

*The article deals with issues of intercultural interaction in the American corporate culture, it concerns the features of the use of etiquette formulas on the stage of contact establishing within the corporate discourse. The conclusions as to the features of the choice and translation of the fixed lexical units in the process of communicative act were made during the research.*

**Key words:** *discourse, corporate communication, communicative act, contact establishment, etiquette formula, speech etiquette.*

**Introduction.** The specific topic of the research relates linguistic, pragmatic peculiarities of contact in American corporate culture and their implementation into the educational process of translation learning. The relevance of the topic is caused by the increasing role of corporations and businesses in economic, political and social spheres of modern society in the context of globalization and increasing competition, pragmatic significance of phatic function on the phase of contact establishment. The lack of scientific studies devoted to the study of corporate discourse has increased the urgency of the problems of its translation.

**Theoretical background.** Various aspects of official-business discourse were the object of research of such scientists as T.R. Ananko, A.O Kolobova, V.I. Karasik, Y. I. Palekha and other. Some aspects of the functioning and translation of business discourse are covered in the works of such scientists: K.S. Phrantsuzova, A. D. Shveytser, O.V. Yemelianova, L.M. Chernovaty, D.P. Shapran, business dialogical discourse (T.V. Chrdilyeli), management discourse (N.V. Darzhaeva). Among foreign scientists who studied corporate

communication, corporate culture and vocabulary of business communication, one can name E. Nida, C. Taber, F. Bargiella-Chiappini, S. Harris and others.

Corporate communication is realized in the discursive interaction between sender and recipient on the basis of their social roles, mutual relations and situational factors of communication. Business discourse is socially conditioned speech event which functions in the institutional and industrial field and reveals in interpersonal relationships [2, c. 205].

Following T.R. Ananko and A.O Kolobova we also consider corporate discourse as one of the types of institutional discourse [1; 4]. Peculiarities of institutionality establish the role characteristics of agents and clients of institutes, typical actions, conventional genres and speech clichés. Institutional communication is communication in peculiar masks. V.I. Karasik emphasizes that it is the conventionalism of communication that fundamentally differentiates institutional discourse from the personal one [3, c.11].

The study of the text as a part of the discourse and its close relationship with the translation problems serves as the object of the series of translation scientific researches. The text itself is the subject of analysis at the first stage of the related translation with the interpretation of the original, and the text itself is the subject of synthesis at its final stage. Therefore, this problem attracts the attention of the theoreticians of translation [8, c.31].

Corporate discourse is realized in typical communicative situations, the efficiency of which is affected by a number of socio-cultural factors (social and role characteristics of communicants, the gender factor etc.), among which the emphasis is put on style of leadership, coordination of strategies and tactics of communication, accepted for the communicative situation tonality, interest in the subject of discussion, verbal (non-verbal) support of the communicative act by participants of communication. The instrumentarium of phatic function facilitates the fulfillment of these conditions. It includes: greeting, apology, reminders, talk about the weather, expression evaluation, including

complementary, nominations of various degrees of flatness, policy statements, requests, pronouns and other speech units of regulatory nature [2, c. 206].

**Results and discussions.** The connection between the linguistics of the text which was still at an early stage of its development and the theory of translation was first noted by E. Nida [10]. In his view, the theory of translation should take into account some common features of texts which he called "universals of discourse." These include: 1) different ways of marking the beginning and the end of the text, 2) the methods of marking the transitions between the internal units of the concatenated text, 3) temporal connections, 4) spatial relationships, 5) logical relations (for example, the reason and consequence), 6) identification of participants in the discourse, 7) various means of highlighting those or other elements for focusing on them or for emphasis; and 8) involvement of the author (author involvement), that is, his position and point of view [10, c. 181-182]. Characterizing these features as "universals of discourse", E. Nida simultaneously notes that in different languages, they use far from the same means for their expression [10, c.132].

Taking into account that corporate discourse is a relatively new field of study, it makes the process of translation as well as recognizing corporate types of texts more difficult for the translator, which leads to difficulties in recognizing corporate elements in the text and choosing the appropriate strategies for their translation. Possible ways of solving these issues are: 1) definition of the concepts related to the translation of corporate discourse, the integration and systematization of the translation and linguistic classifications of its vocabulary, as well as those types of texts and discourses in which they are recorded; 2) identification of the most appropriate methods for the translation of texts that refer to the corporate discourse; 3) the formulation of strategies and methods for the translation of corporate elements.

On the basis of the revealed features, the translation criteria are built which predict the choice of adequate translation strategies used for interpreting a

corporate lexicon. The notion of "corporate" can include the definition of those subjects and phenomena that are related to the corporate sphere. Under the corporate lexicon we mean lexical and phraseological units for which the semantics of "corporate" is compulsory. In the translation of the corporate lexicon reproduction of this semantics is also obligatory [6, c.338].

Lexical basis that distinguishes corporate discourse from other kinds of discourse includes Business English, English for Special Purposes, Business Communication – a set of different language devices which are used in business communication, technical terms which vary according to the branch specifics of the company; professional vocabulary which indicates the professional direction of corporate communication; corporate jargon illustrating features of internal office communication [2, c. 206].

The specifics of the translation of the corporate lexicon essentially depend on its main criteria. They may have the following system form:

- correlation of lexemes and phraseological units with the notion of "corporation";
- ethnospecifism (language and communicative);
- polysemantism;
- full comprehension only for the selected people ("semitransparency" for the general public);
- semantics of priority and dominance;
- distinctness, high symbolism, up to the level of group sacredness [6, c.339].

Analyzing corporate terms, realities and symbols, as well as special corporate terms and jargons, K. Frantsuzova notes that the requirements for the translation of terms are supplemented by the requirements for the translation of slang, professionalism, as well as metaphors, allusions, realities, symbols, which serve as the basis for corporate jargons [7, c. 7].

So, it is rather important to analyze the functions performed by professionalism and corporate jargon in corporate discourse. The use of a specific language or register in the context of the company's activities has a certain impact on employees and helps them to form the necessary perception of the company. Corporate terminology and standard lexemes used by corporate members foster group cohesion and facilitate the introduction process in new employees [9, c.10]. The jargonization of professional speech, especially informal, is a universal speech process which consists in the concentrated use of certain specific lexico-semantic units by its participants characteristic only for their environment.

The words and statements of corporate jargon characterize the nature of business, reflect the specifics of office work and illustrate the peculiarities of organizational communication. For example, *Idea Hamsters – workers whose ideas always work; Adminisphere – management representatives who do not always make the right decisions; the big boys – big companies.*

Establishing communication contact in the American corporate culture is performed due to use of contact establishing units which considering their lexical-semantic features include: greetings, compliments, status messages, addressing, presentation, apology which are realized in speech by using the formulas of speech etiquette, stereotyped constructions and means of direct addressing [2, c. 206]. Under the formulas of speech etiquette, we understand a microsystem of nationally specific fixed formulas of communication, adopted and prescribed by society to establish contact with the interlocutors, maintaining communication in a certain tonality. Such fixed formulas of communication, or stereotypes of communication, are typical, repetitive constructions used in high-frequency daily situations, including corporate communication. That is, the set of typical frequent situations leads to the emergence of a set of speech media serving these situations.

As Y. Palekha notes, greetings are the most widespread practice which in both everyday life and in business communication requires tact and a certain education [5, с. 91]. The words that we speak, greeting someone, regardless of whether we will meet him again or not, may have far-reaching consequences [5, с. 92].

Business etiquette in the USA provides a brief greeting, accompanied by a handshake, using the standard greeting phrases: *Nice to meet you* (*Радий познайомитись*), *How are you doing? How are you?* (*Як Вамі справи?*), *Good morning!* (*Доброго ранку!*), *How do you do!* (*Здрастуйте!*), *I congratulate you* (*Вітаю Вас!*), *With the arrival of you!* (*З приїздом Вас!*), the use of a neutral greeting employed regardless of the degree of acquaintance and the age register is also frequent, for example:

*Wyatt: Good morning, Alastair! How nice it is to see you! Do tell us about the Americans.*

*Alistair: Good morning, colleague! Don't ask.*

*Вайатт: Доброго ранку, Алістеір! Як приємно зустріти тебе! Розкажи нам щось про американців.*

*Алістеір: Доброго ранку, колего! Навіть не питай.*

As for the semantic-lexical and grammatical features of the etiquette greeting formulas, in the arsenal of English speech etiquette there is a certain number of greeting expressions that have the root of *good* (*добр-*): *Good morning!* (*Доброго ранку!*), *Good afternoon!* (*Добрий день!*), *Good evening!* (*Добрий вечір!*) and so on.

Addressing is one of the main aspects of contact establishing, nomination of recipient in attempt to draw attention to themselves in a verbal way. In the English language etiquette, it is one of the oldest rhetorical figures. In our opinion, this is the element of speech etiquette, which primarily indicates the social relations that are established within a communicative act. Therefore, the main factor influencing the choice of one or another form of addressing is the

social status of communicants. The English language etiquette is characterized by the following forms of addressing: *Mister (Містер), Miss (Міс), Sirs (Панове), Dear sirs (Шановне панство), Dear colleagues (Шановні колеги), Dear friends (Дорогі друзі), Comrades (Товариши)* and others. The generally recognized form of addressing in this case is *Mr / Mrs / Ms + last name*, for example:

- *Mr. Walker, I'm waiting for your report laying on my desk tomorrow morning.*

- *Містере Волкер, я чекаю на Ваш звіт на моєму столі до завтрашнього ранку.*

Frequently used etiquette formulas include presentation formulas. According to Y. Palekha, presentation can be described as establishing a contact between people with a message of communicative minimum of knowledge, given by them or about them, required for communication.

English speech etiquette provides many options for presentation phrases and some established acquaintance standards. So, if people get to know directly, that is, without a third person, they use the following verbal formulas: *I'm glad to meet you (Радий познайомитись!), I want (would like) to get acquaintance with you (Я хочу (хотів би) з Вами познайомитись!).* After such formulas there are phrases of self-calling: *I am... (Я...), My name is... (Моє ім'я...), My surname is... (Моє прізвище...)*

- *Good afternoon, my name is Jackie Blaz.*

- *Good afternoon, Mr. Blaz, nice to meet you!*

- *Доброго дня, мене звати Джекі Блез.*

- *Доброго дня, Містер Блез, радий познайомитись!*

The lexical-stylistic feature of the English formulas of acquaintance is that they necessarily have in their structure a possessive pronoun *my* etc.

One of the most important ways of the tact and politeness manifestation in the English language etiquette is an apology. These etiquette formulas are often

used to maintain contact in a communicative act. American etiquette formulas of apologizing include: *Excuse me* (Вибачте), *I'm sorry* (Мені дуже шкода), *I beg your pardon* (Я прошу вибачення), *Please, excuse me* (Вибачте, будь ласка), *I'm sorry for troubling you* (Пробачте за турботу). English etiquette apology formulas, as a rule, have an etiquette component - the language formula *Please... (Будь ласка): Excuse me, please* (Вибачте, будь ласка). Even in cases where the forms *Excuse me* and *I'm sorry* are interchangeable, each of them has its own shade of meaning: *I'm sorry* – spontaneous expression of compassion and regret at the address of the interlocutor regarding some kind of trouble; *Excuse me (I beg your pardon)* – apology formulas for the inconvenience caused to the interlocutor, *Forgive me* - addressing with apology for more serious actions in relation to the interlocutor [6, с.172].

Linguistic constructions, expressing the prompting or asking the speaker to forgive him some kind of a guilt, can be combined with the words to *вибачити, пробачити, дарувати, простити* in the form of an imperative mood. The semantics of verbs *вибачити та пробачити* is increased in conjunction with the verb *просити*, resulting in the formulas of politeness *прошу вибачити, прошу пробачити* etc.

- *I must apologize for interrupting you!*

- *That`s all right! You may come in.*

- *Прошу вибачити за те, що перебиваю (відволікаю) Вас!*

- *Усе гаразд! Ви можете увійти.*

Another common example of the English language etiquette is the request formulas. By its content, the formulation of the request may vary from the actual request in a sophisticated form which may be referred almost to the order and even to the requirements. Such tolerance of the requirement is a feature of corporate speech, the form of request-order is conditioned by diplomatic politeness as an obligation of diplomatic subculture. Using such forms of requests as *I ask to give... (прошу надати...), I ask you to inform... (прошу*



*повідомити...), I ask you to consider... (прошу вважати...), I ask you to pay attention... (прошу взяти до уваги), I ask to fulfill... (прошу виконати) give obligatory instructions, namely, requests.*

**Conclusions.** Analysis of the corporate discourse in its various aspects is a very relevant topic within domestic and foreign linguistics. The corporate language, being a comprehensive and unique environment for the performance of corporate communication and sociopragmatic theory of corporate discourse built on this basis, serves as a universal tool in terms of adopting various methodological and theoretical frameworks for teaching a foreign language.

Potential future directions of research is the investigation of various difficulties in reproducing the corporate lexicon, such as translation problems inherent in the lexical and phraseological units of corporate discourse; translation difficulties associated with conveying the corporate terms; lack of bilingual corporate dictionaries; the presence of partially adequate vocabulary equivalents and so on.

### References

1. Ананко Т. Р. Англомовний корпоративний дискурс: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 Германські мови / Т. Р. Ананко. – Х., 2007. – 20 с.; Ananko T. R. Anhlovnyy korporatyvnyy dyskurs: avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.04 Hermanski movy / T. R. Ananko. – Kh., 2007. – 20 s.

2. Ємельянова О.В. Linguistic and pragmatic specifics of contact establishing in american corporate culture / Ємельянова О.В., Павленко Т.А. // Наукові записки. – Випуск 154. – Серія: Філологічні науки – Кропивницький / Лисенко В.Ф., 2017. – С.205-208.; Yemeljanova O.V. Linguistic and pragmatic specifics of contact establishing in american corporate culture / Yemeljanova O.V., Pavlenko T.A. // Naukovi zapysky. – Vypusk 154. – Serii: Filolohichni nauky – Kropyvnytskyi / Lysenko V.F., 2017. – S.205-208

3. Карасик В. И. О типах дискурса / В. И. Карасик // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. – С. 5-20.; Karasik V. Y. O tyakh dyskursa / V. Y. Karasik // Yazikovaya lichnost: institutsionalniy i personalniy diskur: sb. nauch. tr. – Volhohrad: Peremena, 2000. – S. 5-20.

4. Колобова А. А. Социопрагматика корпоративного дискурса (на примере текстов корпоративных кодексов американских компаний): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 – германские языки / А. А. Колобова. – М., 2009. – 24 с.; Kolobova A. A. Sotsiopragmatika korporativnogo diskursa (na primere tekstov korporativnykh kodeksov amerikanskih kompaniy): avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.04 – hermanskiye yazyki / A. A. Kolobova. – M., 2009. – 24 s.

5. Палеха Ю. И. Спілкування з представниками Америки та Австралії / Ю. И. Палеха // Етика ділових відносин. – К., 2008. – С. 323–338.; Palekha Y. I. Spilkuvannia z predstavnykamy Ameryky ta Avstralii / Y. I. Palekha // Etyka dilovykh vidnosyn. – K., 2008. – S. 323–338.

6. Французова К.С. Корпоративний лексикон в художньому дискурсі: перекладацький аспект (на матеріалі роману М. П'юзо «Хрещений батько») / К.С. Французова // Наукові записки. – Випуск 81(4). – Серія: Філологічні науки: У 4 ч. – Кіровоград: РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2009. – С. 338-343.; Frantsuzova K.S. Korporatyvnyi leksykon v khudozhnomu dyskursi: perekladatskyi aspekt (na materialy romanu M. Piuzo «Khreshchenyi batko») / K.S. Frantsuzova // Naukovi zapysky. – Vypusk 81(4). – Seria: Filolohichni nauky: U 4 ch. – Kirovohrad: RVV KDPU im. V. Vynnychenka, 2009. – S. 338-343.

7. Французова К.С. Корпоративний лексикон як об'єкт перекладу (на матеріалі корпоративних бізнес-тренінгів, слоганів і презентацій) : Автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук / Херсонський держ. ун-т. – Херсон, 2011. – 20 с.; Frantsuzova K.S. Korporatyvnyi leksykon yak obiekt perekladu

(na materiali korporatyvnykh biznes-treninhiv, slohaniv i prezentatsii) : Avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk / Khersonskyi derzh. un-t. – Kherson, 2011. – 20 s.

8. Швейцер А. Д. Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты. – М.: Наука, 1988. – С. 29-31.; Shveytser A. D. Teoriya perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty. – М.: Nauka, 1988. – S. 29-31.

9. Bargiella-Chiappini F. The language of business: Introduction and Overview / F. Bargiella-Chiappini, S. Harris // The language of business: an international perspective. - Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 1997. – P. 1-18.

10. Nida E. A., Taber C. R. The Theory and Practice of Translation. – Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969. – P. 132, 181-182.

Submitted October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

С. В. Баранова

Т. А. Павленко

## **ЛІНГВОПРАГМАТИЧНА ТА ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКА СПЕЦИФІКА ВСТАНОВЛЕННЯ КОНТАКТУ В АМЕРИКАНСЬКІЙ КОРПОРАТИВНІЙ КУЛЬТУРІ В АСПЕКТІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ**

*У статті розглянуто питання міжкультурної взаємодії в американській корпоративній культурі, висвітлені особливості використання етикетних формул на етапі встановлення контакту в межах корпоративного дискурсу. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена зростанням ролі міжкультурної комунікації у корпоративному контексті, прагматичною значущістю етикетних формул на етапі встановлення контакту.*

*У діловому спілкуванні фаза встановлення контакту спрямована на досягнення міжособистісної згоди і віддзеркалює нормовану, етикетну поведінку учасників комунікації, у типових комунікативних ситуаціях, на ефективність функціонування яких впливає низка соціокультурних*

*факторів (соціально-рольові характеристики комунікантів, гендерний фактор та ін.). Важливим елементом англомовного ділового дискурсу є професійна комунікація, яка характеризується цілою низкою специфічних засобів, що увиразнюють стереотипність і трафаретність ділового спілкування. Встановлення комунікативного контакту в американській корпоративній культурі відбувається завдяки контактовстановлюючим одиницям, до яких відносять: привітання, компліменти, звертання, представлення, вибачення, які реалізуються в мовленні завдяки використанню формул мовленнєвого етикету, клішованих конструкцій і засобів прямої адресації. Під час роботи над статтею було проаналізовано специфіку вибору сталих лексичних контактовстановлюючих одиниць в процесі комунікативного акту, семантико-лексичні та граматичні особливості їх використання в мовах оригіналу та перекладу.*

**Ключові слова:** *дискурс, корпоративна комунікація, комунікативний акт, встановлення контакту, етикетна формула, мовленнєвий етикет.*

Baranova, S. Contact Establishing in American Corporate Culture via Translation [Текст] / S. Baranova, T. Pavlenko // Вісник Маріупольського державного університету. Серія: Філологія. – 2018. - Випуск 19. – С. 184-190.