

УДК 811.111 + 81.33

<https://doi.org/10.25076/vpl.39.06>

Д.М. Хучбарова

А.Г. Соколова

Российский университет дружбы народов

### НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ СПЕЦИФИКА ПИСЬМЕННОГО ДЕЛОВОГО ДИСКУРСА

*В настоящей исследовательской работе авторы провели лингвокультурологическое исследование письменной формы делового дискурса в таких странах как Россия, США и Великобритания. Письменный деловой дискурс рассматривался с точки зрения таких научных парадигм, как социолингвистический анализ дискурса, прагмалингвистика, контент-анализ, дискурс-анализ, лингвокультурология. В результате теоретического анализа авторы пришли к выводу о том, что современный деловой дискурс представляет собой статусно-детерминированный вид институционального дискурса, речевое поведение, которое совершается в соответствии с нормами, принятыми в современном деловом сообществе. Авторами проводились выборки в случайном порядке и использовались различные английские и русские словари, разговорники, а также разнообразные электронные ресурсы.*

*Русскоязычный деловой дискурс характеризуется высокой частотностью использования глаголов в пассивном залоге. Степень использования пассивных синтаксических конструкций зависит от типа документа. В то время как использование таких синтаксических конструкций необходимо в русскоязычном деловом дискурсе, оно не распространено в английском деловом дискурсе и не служит отличительным признаком официального стиля.*

*Широкое использование модальных глаголов - еще одна особенность английского делового дискурса. К отличительным характеристикам также относится использование нейтральных в гендерном отношении выражений и заявлений в официальных документах. Следует отметить, что гендерно-нейтральный словарь становится все более популярным и широко используется*

в английском деловом дискурсе.

*Ключевые слова: этнопсихоллингвистика, деловой дискурс, лингвистические средства, дискурс-анализ, индукция, дедукция, синтез, лексико-грамматические и стилистические особенности*

**UDC 811.111 + 81.33**  
**<https://doi.org/10.25076/vpl.39.06>**  
**D.M. Khuchbarova**  
**A.G. Sokolova**  
**RUDN University**

### **NATIONAL SPECIFIC NATURE OF WRITTEN FORM OF BUSINESS DISCOURSE**

*In the present research work, the authors conducted a linguocultural study of Russian, American and British written forms of business discourse. The written form of business discourse was examined from the perspective of such scientific paradigms as sociolinguistic discourse analysis, pragmalinguistics, content-analyses, cultural linguistics. According to primary theoretical analysis, the authors concluded that modern business discourse is a deterministic institutionalized discourse, verbal behaviour or act, which is committed in accordance with the standards, adopted in the modern business community. They collected samplings in a random order and used different English and Russian dictionaries, phrase-books, as well as varieties of electronic resources.*

*Russian business discourse is characterised by high degree of usage of verbs in passive voice. The degree of usage of passive syntactic constructions varies according to the type of a document. Whereas the usage of such syntactical constructions is necessary in the Russian business discourse, it is not common in the English business discourse and it doesn't distinguish an official style.*

*An extensive use of modal verbs is another feature of the English business discourse. The distinctive characteristics also include the usage of gender-neutral expressions and statements in official documents. It should be noted that gender-neutral vocabulary is becoming more popular and widely used in the English business discourse.*

*Key words: ethnopsycholinguistics, business discourse, linguistic means, discourse analysis, induction, deduction, synthesis, lexicogrammatical and stylistic peculiarities*

### **Introduction**

Business discourse is the most relevant type of a discourse, which is studied in modern linguistics. Business discourse is studied in language schools of different countries, such as Russia, USA, France, Netherlands and others. Approaches and methods of analysing of business discourse are developed and adopted in cognitive linguistics, cultural linguistics, intercultural communication, a theory of speech acts, ethno-psycholinguistics. The communicative component of business discourse is considered within the framework of official communication, where emotive and cognitive functions are the most important. Furthermore, a business discourse is a deliberate verbal behaviour, complying with conventional standards and communication norms, adopted in business community. Rules of business communication and national specific nature of business discourse are becoming neutral and more universal due to the process of globalisation and the development of mass communication. Though there are still differences in business discourse, connected with linguistic means, forms of linguistic manipulation, a structure of a text and a text composition in the countries of the West and in the Orient.

This research work is a systemization of the experience and a consistent definition of Russian and English written form of business discourse.

Business discourse (communication) is the fundamental component of social communication in the commercial, administrative, legal, economic and diplomatic spheres. New economic and social conditions led to the commercial and organizational activities in which a great number of people is involved. This situation emphasises the necessity of learning speech patterns used in business communication, improving the linguistic competence of people engaged in social and legal relationship and those who carry out their professional duty.

The ability to conduct business negotiations successfully, properly compose text documents, work with documents is considered to be the most important component of the professional culture of every educated person. Speaking and communicating properly, discussing,

commenting – all these kinds of speech activity are a must to be acquired and used in daily professional communication.

A certain type of linguistic personality is particularly evident in the professional and business spheres. The integration concept of linguistic personality suggested by Y. Karaulov treats its structure as a unity of lexicon, thesaurus and pragmatics, which correspond to the following levels:

- 1) the verbal - semantic level, i.e. natural language fluency;
- 2) the cognitive level which covers “mentifacts” (term introduced by V. Krasnyh) – knowledge, concepts, ideas that shape the world picture of the speaker;
- 3) the pragmatic level, which includes the objectives, motives, interests and intentions of the speaker.

It is important to emphasize that business communication involves the ability to use one’s own tactic and strategic experience. In order to achieve a certain result, due to practical activity and intentions of communication participants, in business discourse the following strategies are used:

- a) strategy of receiving information;
- b) strategy of providing information;
- c) strategy of retaining information.

It is argued that the contribution of applied linguistics research into Business English has brought forward useful information on the nature and the prominent features of business communication. Nonetheless the survey conducted by Nickerson on materials for teaching English for specific business purposes (ESBP) suggests that reference to pertinent research in this area appeared to be minimal and found only in a small number of the books surveyed. It is this relationship that warrants a study so as to investigate the causes and the possible ways to overcome this problem.

Similarly to researchers of discourse analysis, when business English students are given a single text or multiple texts to work with, they are in fact asked to analyse the discourse of those texts within a given specific purpose. This indicates that the very same research methods used in research could effectively be used as methods in the teaching and learning of English for specific business purposes (ESBP). All studies emphasise the use of authentic materials, the important of context and situation, and the effects of cultural and organisational on

the production of discourse. Also, key to these studies, the use of corpus analysis as well as the focus on genres is prominent; which are key areas for the teaching of (ESBP). Through such studies a wealth of information emerges in regard to what is to be taught and methods that could be used for the teaching of written business discourse. In stating so, this is very useful for curriculum developers, teachers and learners. For curriculum developers, these studies offer a comprehensive perspective which can be used to guide them in the development of materials that is in harmony with the demands and the needs of our contemporary business world in terms of communication. For teachers, they provide teaching methods which can be used in the classroom to help learners understand the complexity and the nature of written business English. For the latter, they emphasise the role of students as researchers, and this is exemplified in the use some of the discourse analysis methods found in research and assuming an active role rather than a passive one it is through such analysis that students come to understand how language is used appropriately to suit its business purposes and the factors which determine each final realisation. It is through such practices that students are able to identify thematic relations in texts, analyse structure, examine how meaning is constructed in discourse, determine the genre and the register the texts are part of and examine the suppositions formulated in relation to the rapport between the message writer and its recipient. These are practices reflected in the methods of data collection and analysis used in the studies. It is also important to emphasise the importance of students engaged in such activities which without them, students will be unable to produce appropriate business discourse that is fit to serve the purpose of smoothing and maintaining business relationships with the prime intention of making profit.

It should be noted that among the prospects of further business discourse studies the thorough study of its strategies and tactics is of great importance, as well as features of the linguistic personality of the English-language discourse.

**The relevance** of the research work is in the need for a holistic description and a comprehensive study of linguistic characteristics of written form of business discourse in terms of social and cultural differences of communication in Russian and English linguoculture.

Business discourse is entering into a communicative space of a modern society with the development of business contacts. However, extralinguistic factors of written form of business discourse (social, cultural, conditional) have not been studied thoroughly. Changes in the society over the last few years indicates to the specific interest in the subject in terms of sociocultural and linguistic aspects.

**The scientific novelty** of the work is in the research of linguistic and sociocultural

characteristics of a written form of business discourse, focused on comparison of Russian and English business correspondence.

The research work is **aimed at** identification, description and systemization of characteristics of business discourse in the Russian and English languages.

Per the terms of reference, the following **objectives of the study** were identified:

- to identify theoretical aspects of the research problem based on the systemization of specialised literature;
- to characterize a notion of institutionalised business discourse in terms of modern linguistics;
- to characterize main approaches to the learning of business discourse;
- to identify national and cultural peculiarities of business discourse;
- to describe linguistic, social and cultural peculiarities of business discourse in Russian and English culture of languages.

**The research object** is a written form of business discourse as a type of Russian and English business communication.

**The subject of the study** are social, cultural, lexico-grammatical and stylistic peculiarities of written form of business discourse in Russian and English business communication. The research work is based on the hypothesis: a written form of business discourse is a type of institutional business discourse. A written form of business discourse is based on the ritual aspect and unithood of clichés and phrases according to pragmatic functions of the Russian and English languages.

The following **methods** were used in the research work: a descriptive method, a contextual analysis, a comparative analysis, a discourse analysis, induction, deduction, synthesis, formal logic. Methodological basis for the study is fundamental provisions

represented in research works of leading domestic and foreign scholars (Benvenist E., Seriot P., Stabs R., Luis R., Hall E., Karasik V.I., Kibrik A.A., Plungyan V.A., Vezhbtskaya A., Vvedenskaya L.A., Kybryakova E.S., Arutyunova N.D., Sternin I.A., Alefirenko N.F.) and devoted to business discourse and intercultural communication. A practical base for the research is documents of a legal internet portal of Eurasian Economic Union, databases of United Nations, official website of the White House, business letters of intercultural business negotiations.

**Theoretical and practical significance** of the research work lies in the fact that conclusions, synthesis, data can serve as a basis for further research on the issue.

Practical significance of the work is the possibility of applying data in intercultural negotiations.

#### **History of an official style in English communication**

History of the English business language began in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when the first English printed manuals were published. Until the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Englishmen had to use manuals, printed in Latin, French, and Italian or manuals for writing manuscripts. Manuals of that period allow to find out what theoretical knowledge was necessary for ordinary citizens. Theoretical basis of manuals provides information about the level of the development of epistolography in that period. Elements of tradition “ars dictaminis” and medieval art of writing letters can be found while researching the manuals. According to Donald Dickson (1985), classical models of letters of Renaissance period, in particular «The Enemy of Idleness», written in 1568 by William Fulwud, played an important role in the development of the English business language. This is a compendium of umbrella letters, copying the style, structure, lexical and grammatical peculiarities of epistolary heritage of Cicero. “The enemy of Idleness” along with “A Panoply of Epistles” of Abraham Lincoln and “The English Secretary” of Angel Day are included in the first letter-writing manuals.

“The enemy of idleness” is an adapted version of Jan de la Moine “Le stile et maniere de composer, dicter, et escire toute sorte d’epistre, ou lettres missives, tant par response, que autrement”, translated into English and published in Lion in 1566. In his research work, Fulwud identifies readership of that manual in the letter: “Right worshipful the Master, Wardens, and Company of the Merchant Tailors of London”

(“Почтенным Мастерам, Надзирателям, Почтенной компании коммерческих портных”). The author asserted that he was a merchant, but it’s doubtful whether he was a member of “Merchant Tailor’s Company”. The author clarified an unusual title of the manual, pointed to the role of letters in addressing immediate problems and idleness. The first part is based on the tract of Erasm D. “De conscribendis epistolis” (1552), devoted to theoretical questions.

Thanks to scientist Erasm D. an informal style of business letter was established in the society. According to Erasm D., business letters are divided into three groups: juridical, deliberative, demonstrative. This classification can be also found in the first part of the manual “How to Write under the Demonstrative Gender, in the Praise of Some Bodies”, written by Fulwud. The second part of the manual is devoted to scientists, humanists and intellectuals, interested in new learning.

The most important information is in parts 3-4, where we can find letters of outstanding people, describing diverse living situations and problems. Those letters are addressed to the members of the family and business partners. Abraham Fleming didn’t follow the pattern “The enemy of idleness” in his research work “A Panoply of Epistles”, written in 1576. In the introduction “To the Learned and Unlearned Reader”, we can see a title of the book “An epitome of precepts whereby the ignorant may learn to indite, according to skill and order, reduced into a Dialogue between the Master and the scholar”. These rules are presented in the form of a dialogue between a teacher and a pupil. “A Panoply of Epistles” was intended for a wide audience, but expectations were subverted and the manual wasn’t popular. There was a translation of Latin letter-writing theory with examples of letters of famous people in this manual. Theoretical principles were taken from “Methodus Conscribendi Epistolas” by Christopher Hegendorff.

Day’s “The English Secreatry” follows the structure of “The Enemy of Idleness”, presenting theoretical knowledge and practical advice. It proves that readers were attracted by the combination of theory and practical advice in this manual. One of the works of Daniel Defoe “The Complete English Tradesman” (1727) has played an important role in the development of English business language. There is practical advice on written business English in chapters “Of the Trading Style” and “Of a Tradesman's Writing Letters” of the work. Daniel Defoe’s work allows us to trace the development of written business English in terms



of historical, social, economic and political context.

Mary T. Carbon associates the origin of business language with the names of famous orators of 18<sup>th</sup> century, such as George Kampbell, Hue Blair, Richard Weitly.

These orators established fundamental principles of modern business communication, based on traditions of public speaking of Ancient Rome: adaptation of the text for the audience, standard style in epistolography and in letter-writing. These principles were later developed by orators and scientists of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In 1916 the first textbook on business communication appeared: "Business English. Its Principles and Practice" by George Berton Gochkis. The author pays much attention to the importance of rhetorical principle

CUE (Coherence, Unity, Emphasis) and the law of language orientation of a recipient in accordance with the existing principles of business communication.

From the above it follows that, the development of business language is directly related to the first English printed manuals on business letter-writing, such as: "The Enemy of Idleness" by William Fullwud, "A Panoply of Epistles" by Abraham Flemming, "The English Secretary" by Angel Day, published in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The further development of business English is associated with the names of British orators George Kampbell, Hue Blair, Richard Weitly. An invaluable contribution to the development of an official style was made by George Berton Gochkis, the author of the first manuals on business English.

#### **Development of an official style in Russian communication**

Russian official style is deeply rooted in the history of the Old Russian state.

The first written official documents became available after the development of writing in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The examples of these documents are the texts of contracts, concluded between Russians and Greeks in 907, 911 and 971. At an early stage of the development, an official style was used in such spheres of public life as international relations and foreign trade and dealt with issues, related to private property. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a Code of Laws of Kievan Rus – the Russkaya Pravda – was created. This monument of writing presents us with the opportunity to judge the level of the development of the system of political and legal terminology of that time. The charter of

Grand Prince Mstislav Volodimirovich and his son Vsevolod was the second important document of historic significance in 1130, as there was a special formula with the names of witnesses of the transaction and a man, who seals and signs a document. One of the key points in the development of Russian business letter were paper work and proceedings of the 15-17<sup>th</sup> century. It is related to the creation of Russian Centralized State and State public affairs. An official language is regarded as a standard language. Business letters had a number of essential characteristics in that period: the order of the material, textual formulations and information items, such as requisites and linguistic units (Vvedenskaya, 2004). In 1720 General regulations introduced a new “collegiate” system of office procedures, named after new institutions – “colleges”. In the collegiate system of office procedures, an official language progressively split off from conversational style and included a lot of new terms and borrowings. They are: “администратор”, “асессор”, “бухгалтер”, “министр”, “маклер”, “губернатор”, “губерния”, “баллотировать”, “апелляция”, “журнал”, “инструкция”, “рапорт”, “протокол”, “акт” etc.

Numerous linguistic borrowings resulted from the aspiration of Peter I to align a Russian official writing style with European patterns and models of writing letters.

Models of documents, called “general application forms”, were developed. New norms of paperwork, standards of titles, rules of appropriate addressing, including ranks and titles were also considered. A number of props are also introduced, denoting different stages of document processing: index registers, signatures, a mark indicating a ratification etc. After the development of a literary language,

functional varieties of the language were established in XIX century. In 1811 a process of unification of business letters was ratified and an institution of ministers was established. Such features of an official style as a non-personal type of speech,

a lexical and morphological monotony, a logical organisation of the text, standardisation began to develop. Official letters, written on internal forms with props, were widely distributed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Paperwork management and literature was developing at that period. Letter books with letter samples appeared and researches in the area of Russian business correspondence were conducted (Krasivova, 2001). In the 20<sup>th</sup> century the State apparatus was changed, as a result of which

the introduction of new rules of paperwork was necessary. A problem of unification and standardization of documents became urgent, which was partially solved in 1918 after establishment of unique blank forms. By the end of the 20-s an intensive work on the establishment of new standards of official correspondence began. A Cabinet of standardisation was established, focused on issues of the development of standards for such official letters as protocols, telegrams, notifications, management letters. The project “General rules of paperwork and document management” played a significant role in addressing the challenges in 1931. Researches and theoretical conclusions of domestic and foreign scientists, practical experience and lessons learned were compiled and generalised (Vvedenskaya, 2004). Establishment of Unified State System of documentation was an important stage in standardization practice in the 80-s. All-Union classification and aligned system of documents were developed at that time (Vvedenskaya, 2004). The format and content of business communication changed considerably in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. This is linked to the development of business, commerce and integration of Russian economy into the global economy, that require the introduction of new types of business correspondence and business communication skills in international practice. Having analysed the process of the development of the written form of business communication, we can conclude that an official style of the Russian language has changed significantly in the history of the development. However, it was based on a wealth of experience of previous generations.

#### **Specific character of business communication culture in the English-speaking countries**

Despite the fact that business communication has general requirements and characteristics, there are differences in communication behaviour, communication rules, manner of speaking, preferences in different societies and groups. One of the new tendencies in the language learning, called “contrastive pragmatics” is considering the matter now. Vezhbitskaya A. identifies three concepts within the framework of this tendency: 1) people speak in different ways according to the society they belong to. 2) Differences in the ways of speaking reflect cultural values and hierarchy of values of this group. 3) These differences are significant and systematic (Vezhbitskaya, 2003).

Participants in communication should have cultural competence for effective business communication, negotiations and meetings. This term designates the ability to see value in cultural attitudes and cultural values of partners and the impact of these differences on business communication (Vezhbtskaya, 2003). Having analysed peculiarities of business communication in English-speaking countries, we can state that British mindset is characterised by formalism and conservatism. They have a specific culture, which is different from culture of other countries due to its insularity. The British culture is considered a “middle ground” between excessive formalism, intrinsic to Germany, and American familiarity. Conservatism is reflected in the British style of business communication. It is expressed in respecting traditions of negotiating and demeanour. English businessmen follow specific rituals and rules of business communication. There are some issues to be clarified before negotiating. An appointment should be made only after obtaining proper information about price levels, a tendency, characteristics of market and existing trends, information about characteristics of a firm and its employees (Igebaeva, 2009). British entrepreneurs analyze the market carefully and the situation in the market. Short-term and long-term forecasting is an integral part of this process. It is notable that British businessmen prefer to enter into contracts, making a profit in the near future and avoiding wasteful expenditures.

The usual way to begin negotiations, business communication in Britain would be with mundane concerns (the weather, sport, news), not with the topic of the discussion. If you are doing business with English businessmen, you should prove that universal human values are more important than commercial interests (Emisheva, 2000). British style of business communication is challenging for representatives of other cultures, as it combines indirect communication and direct communication. The latter is used when discussing figures, quantity, data, price policy of a company. The style of the communication is indirect, as the British business communication is characterized by understatements.

Consider the following sentence, characteristic to British style of business communication: “If you have time you may want to look into that.” (Если у Вас есть время, то Вы могли бы заниматься этим вопросом). Representatives of countries, dominated by direct style of

communication, would not consider this statement as an order, though it is a demand for action in British style of communication. It is common to substitute negative statements for positive ones. For instance: the statement “I disagree” (я не согласен) is substituted for “I think you have made several excellent points there but have you ever considered...” (Я считаю, что Вы прекрасно выразили свою позицию, но не думали ли Вы о...).

Lack of interest in the proposed topic is expressed in the following way: “That’s an interesting point” (Это интересная точка зрения).

Humor is another specific feature of British style of business communication. English humor permeates all levels of business communication and is considered the main instrument of communication. The more complex and strained situation, the more likely you will hear a joke. It does not mean that British people don’t take the situation seriously. Point is that Britons don’t like boring meetings and strained relations, that’s why they resort to different forms of humour and tactics to ginger up the talk and keep the situation calm. It’s preferable to be self-critical than to promote yourself by creating positive image. People, boasting about their achievements and positive traits are not considered credible. Such behaviour is considered bad and spoil the impression about this man. Restraint inherent to Britons is reflected in business communication. They keep their temper and restrain themselves, avoiding categorical propositions, questions about private life.

It’s typical for Britons to listen patiently to an interlocutor, not objecting and opposing. But it does not mean approval and consent. Self-control is considered a human dignity, explaining such a behaviour. Members of the British delegation are considered to be good psychologists in the negotiations. During the negotiations, great attention is paid to studying habits and tendencies of a partner. It’s probably due to studying psychology in British universities, which is obligatory in training of specialists in the field of international relations and political science. Now, let’s consider an American style of business communication. Features of an American model of business communication reflect an American culture. An anthropologist E. Hall identifies lower-context and high-context cultures, depending on the context of the communication. Hall defines intercultural communication as a form of communication that shares information

across different cultures and social groups. One framework for approaching intercultural communication is with high-context and low-context cultures, which refer to the value cultures place on indirect and direct communication.

According to the classification of E. Hall, an American culture is considered lower-context (Hall, 1976). A low-context culture relies on explicit communication. In low-context communication, more of the information in a message is spelled out and defined. Informality is a mark of low-context cultures. This is because low-context cultures are generally short-term encounters of people who are open to outsiders. Language is another key determinant of low-context culture. Low-context cultures use very distinct and detailed modes of communication.

The information is given in the words, not in the context. A direct style of communication is preferable. In low-context cultures, great importance is attached to oral and written speech. Discussion of details is extremely important; nothing is left in the air. This is precisely why representatives of this culture put emphasis on contracts, documents and agreements. Low-context cultures have the following features: 1) non-verbal communication is of low priority. 2) Everything is expressed through verbal communication, an assessment is made. 3) Expressing of dissatisfaction is possible in certain cases. 4) A conflict is constructive, resolving the question. Thus, a direct style of communication is characteristic for American style of business communication. All the statements are brief and unambiguous, avoiding misunderstanding. Americans do not waste time on formalities and get to the heart of the issue. Concurrently, they make show of friendship, openness and positive energy and thinking. They prefer informal, unofficial style of communication and are good with humour in the negotiating process. Sarcasm is considered the main factor of negotiations, facilitating work and reducing time.

It's notable that representatives of an American culture, as well as representatives of low-context culture, make friends easily, but interpersonal relations are superficial and temporary. Americans identify different types of friendship: "work friends", "sport friends", "family friends", "vacation friends", etc. An American style of negotiating is aggressive and rapid. However, it is a feature of an American style of business communication. In a whole, activity of

American delegations is professional. They make thorough preparations for negotiations, requiring efficiency and effectiveness from their partners too (Lantsov, 2008).

The words of Franklin “Time is money” guide Americans in their work, as they value the time. Punctuality is primary for them. They live on a schedule. Silence is a bad sign in the negotiations for the representatives of American delegations. It means discontent, irresolution, misunderstanding, a risk for open communication.

They arrive at a decision rapidly and change their mind very seldom. A distinctive feature of an American style is predominance of unofficial words. This is born out of the historical experience: it is connected with the desire of colonists to differ from aristocrats. In the book of American historian K. Cmiel “Democratic Eloquence”, one can follow the process of American speech development from 1775 to 1900. The author notifies, that it was A. Lincoln, who maintained pre-revolutionary traditions of communicating in the civil area (Cmiel, 1991).

Here is a table as an example, where American and British variants of various expressions in business communication are given. American direct style and British indirect style of communication are compared.

<b>American business communication</b>	<b>British business communication</b>
Jack'll blow his top. “У Джека крыша съедет”.	Our chairman might tend to disagree. “Наш руководитель возможно не согласится с этим”.
You gotta be kidding. “Вы, должно быть, шутите”.	Hmm, that's an interesting idea. “Хмм, интересная идея”.
Bean counters drive me mad. “Счетоводы меня выводят из равновесия”.	Accountants can be frustrating. “Бухгалтеры могут иногда разочаровывать”.
It's the only game in town. “Это единственный выход”.	I'm afraid, there is no other choice. “К сожалению, другого выхода нет”.
If they ever come back from the grave. “Если они когда-нибудь восстанут из мертвых”.	If they are ever a force in business again. “Если они опять станут влиятельными в бизнесе”.

We had sticker-shocked the consumers right off their feet. “Наши потребители были в шоке от грабительских цен”.	We had overpriced the product. “Мы сильно завысили цену на товар”.
You’re going to get hurt. “У вас будут потери”.	I’m not sure this is advantageous for you. “Я не уверен, что это решение принесет вам выгоду”.

*Table 1*

Having analyzed the foregoing, we have come to conclusion that American and British styles have some peculiarities. The British style implies keeping up traditions and rituals of business communication, reflecting British conservatism. The usual way to begin negotiations in British business communication would be with unrelated topics, showing the importance of universal human values. It should be noted that British style combines indirect and direct styles of communication. However, an indirect style is leading, as “understatements” are characteristic for British business communication. Humor is also characteristic for British business communication. American business communication, as a part of lower-context culture, is characterized by open communication style. All the statements are brief and unambiguous. Non-verbal forms of communication are of minor importance; all the statements are expressed through verbal communication.

Americans, in turn, do not waste time on formalities and get right to the point. Notably, American communication style is characterized by high rate of discussion and predominance of non-formal words. Americans prefer non-official style of communication and use humor in the discussions and negotiations.

**Specific character of business communication culture in Russia.**

In XXI century, cross-cultural studies are the most urgent and highly important in intercultural business communication. Russian entrepreneurs are increasingly required to cooperate with foreign partners and collaborate with foreign companies. Certainly, Russian style of business communication, like every other national style, has some characteristics. Unobvious for the representatives of Russian culture, these features are extremely important for representatives of



other cultures. American scientists identify such features as mood swings and change of attitude to a business partner, when analysing Russian style of business communication. A friendly attitude can be replaced by official one and vice versa.

While meeting and saying goodbye, a handshake is the main ritual in Russian business culture. It is noteworthy that the common feature for Russian and American styles is carefully prepared statements and professionalism. Furthermore, a written commendation is considered to be a good manner in Russian business communication (Lantsov, 2008). Richard Luis analyses differences and similarities of Russian and American business communication in his book "When cultures collide: leading across cultures". The author explored the vital question of how the mind is conditioned, culturally, at an early age. The common features for Russian and American business communication are love for technology, hospitality, multi-ethnicity, expansionist approach towards problems, etc. Negotiations with the representatives of Russian delegations are compared with a chess game since advance planning is preferable in Russian business communication. Business partners are considered to think about consequences of their actions before taking any decision. A spirit of compromise is regarded as a sign of weakness in Russian business communication. In a deadlock situation, representatives of Russian delegations show patience and tolerance to find solutions to challenges. In general, Russian partners don't take risks and operate cautiously. Russian partners prefer not to take any risk and operate cautiously on the whole. They choose the lesser of two evils, discussing risky and less risky options. Representatives of Russian delegations have very limited capacity to operate and can't take initiatives on their own. It should be noted that, there is a general upward tendency of using direct and open styles of speech nowadays.

Comprehensive and conceptual approaches are adopted in Russian negotiating style in consideration and adoption of agreements as opposed to American and German incremental approaches. Adoption of a conceptual approach raises some difficulties while working out and clarifying details in the follow-up process in a lot of ways.

It is for these reasons that the main feature of Russian style of business communication is considered to be a focus on common objectives and inadequate attention towards the ways of achieving. Contractual arrangements are not so obligatory in consciousness of

Russian society as opposed to Western mindset.

Russian and Asian views are the same in this regard. Besides, sudden changes and new offers are often a cause of concern for Russian representatives. It will always present difficulties to reach consensus with directors.

It is usual for Russian business communication to address the audience using pronouns “we” in the communication. So, it is an indication that business communicators are considered collective actors. A pronoun “I” is not only replaced with a pronoun “we” in business communication, but it can also be omitted, which is considered the norm of business correspondence. For example, we use “it was done” instead of “I asked to do” or “I request to do it”. This fact is also represented in the usage of collective nouns, such as “directorate”, “administration”, “government” in business correspondence, when an official signs a document.

It means that an official (an author of a document or a business letter) is a representative of the entire organisation.

Thus, we can distinguish frequent mood swings and attitudes to business partners as the main features of Russian business communication. Friendly attitude is replaced by more official and vice versa. The significant feature is the predominance of conceptual and comprehensive approach of negotiating, that is the reason for which Russian style is considered to focus on common objectives and pays insufficient attention to the ways of achieving goals.

Comparing Russian and American business communication, we can identify other common features, such as demand for well-prepared logic statements, presentations and performances and the usage of pronoun “we” in their speech.

In general, negotiations with Russian representatives can be compared with a chess game, as it is common for Russian business partners to contemplate further actions beforehand.

So, we can conclude that the emergence and development of English and Russian business communication are attributable to different factors and characteristics.

The development of the English business language is connected with the first English printed business letter-writing handbooks and guides, whereas Russian official style was rooted in the history of old Russian State and connected with the emergence of the first written

official documents, i.e. treaties, signed between the Russians and Greeks. So, we can see that the development of the English business language is linked to names of English rhetoricians, while the emergence of the Russian business language is tied to historical events, such as the development of Russian centralised State.

The main feature of the British style of business communication is respect for the traditions and rituals of business communication that reflects British conservatism.

Humour is a significant feature of the British business language. The British style combines indirect and direct styles of communication, but the main communication style is indirect.

The American style reflects lower-context culture and is characterised by open and direct communication style. Non-verbal communication is of minor importance; as verbal communication plays the primary role. The American style of negotiating is characterised by rapid pace. Finally, one of the features of the American style of business communication is the predominance of simple informal words in the vocabulary.

### **Conclusion**

Taking into account all the above mentioned theoretical considerations and practical analyses allows us to conclude that Russian business discourse is characterised by high degree of usage of verbs in passive voice. The degree of usage of passive syntactic constructions varies according to the type of a document. Whereas the usage of such syntactical constructions is necessary in the Russian business discourse, it is not common in the English business discourse and it doesn't distinguish an official style. An extensive use of modal verbs is another feature of the English business discourse. The distinctive characteristics also include the usage of gender-neutral expressions and statements in official documents. It should be noted that gender-neutral vocabulary is becoming more popular and widely used in the English business discourse, notably gender-neutral pronouns.

In the course of our research, we have arrived at the conclusion that the most frequently used lexical units in the English written form of business discourse are such verbs as "to promote", "to exchange", "to encourage", "to undertake" and participles, such as "wishing", "recognizing", "reaffirming", "highlighting".

In the Russian business discourse, the most frequently used verbs are “поддерживать”, “содействовать”, “осуществлять”, “оказывать” and participles “подтверждая”, “подчеркивая”, “признавая”. We can also note the most frequently used catch phrases, such as “to enter into an agreement” (вступать в соглашение), “at a short notice” (за короткий срок/ по первому требованию), “to proceed with the execution / to proceed an execution” (приступать к выполнению), “by mutual agreement” (по взаимному соглашению), “by common consent” (с общего согласия).

Thus, the authors described and systemized the peculiarities and features of written form of business discourse in the Russian and the English languages.

#### Литература

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Фразеология и паремиология. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009.
2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Дискурс // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1990. – С. 136 -137.
3. Баранов А.Н., Михайлова О.В., Сатаров Г.А., Шипова Е.А. Политический дискурс: методы анализа тематической структуры и метафорики. – М., 2004.
4. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика: пер. с франц. – М.: Либроком, 2010.
5. Введенская Л.А. Павлова Л.Г., Кашаева Е.Ю. Русский язык. Культура речи. Деловое общение: учебник. – М.: КНОРУС, 2012.
6. Введенская Л.А, Павлова Л.Г, Кашаева Е. Ю. Русский язык и культура речи: Учебное пособие для вузов. 10 -е изд. Ростов н/Д: изд-во « Феникс», 2004.
7. Вежбицкая А. Культурная обусловленность категорий «прямота» vs. «непрямота» // Прямая и непрямая коммуникация: Сб. науч. ст. – Саратов: Издво ГосУНЦ «Колледж», 2003. – С.136 - 159.
8. Демьянков В. З. Англо-русские термины по прикладной лингвистике и автоматической переработке текста. Вып. 2. Методы анализа текста // Всесоюзн. центр переводов. Тетради новых терминов, 39. – М., 1982.

9. Дейк Т.А. Ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. / Пер. с англ. – М.: Прогресс, 1989.
10. Емышева Е.М., Мосягина О.В. Некоторые особенности ведения переговоров с представителями разных стран // Управление персоналом. – 2000. – № 2. – С. 5 -9.
11. Игебаева Ф.А. Этические основы деятельности современного делового человека // Современный мир: экономика, история, образование, культура. Сборник научных трудов. – Уфа, 2009. – С.110 - 113.
12. Каменская О. Л. Текст и коммуникация. – М.: Высшая школа, 1990.
13. Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс // Языковая личность: проблемы лингвокультурологии и функциональной семантики: Сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград: Перемена,1999.
14. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс: монография. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2002.
15. Кибрик А. А., Плунгян В. А. Функционализм // Современная американская лингвистика: фундаментальные направления. Изд. 2 -е, испр. и доп. – М.: УРСС, 2002. – С. 276 -339.
16. Косоногова О.В. Динамика развития ономастического пространства англоязычной юридической терминологии. – Новосибирск: Издательство ЦРНС, 2016.
17. Косоногова О.В. Характеристики юридического дискурса: границы, содержание, параметры // Историческая и социально-образовательная мысль. – М., 2015. – с. 61-68.
18. Красивова А.Н. Деловой русский язык. – М.: Из-во МФА, 2001.
19. Кубрякова Е. С., Александрова О. В. Виды пространства, текста и дискурса // Категоризация мира: пространство и время: материалы научной конференции. – М.: Диалог-МГУ, 1997. – С. 19-20.
20. Ланцов С. Политическая конфликтология. – СПб.: Питер, 2008. – С.110-120.

#### References

- Alefrenko, N.F. (2009). *Fraseologia i paremiologia [Phraseology and Paremiology]*. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka.
- Arutjunova, N.D. (1990). Diskurs [Discourse]. In *Linguisticheskij*

- enciklopedičeskij slovar*. Moscow: Sovetskaya enciklopedia.
- Baranov, A.N., Mihajlova, O.V., Satarov, G.A., & Shipova, E.A. (2004). *Politicheskij diskurs: metodi analiza tematičeskoj strukturi i metaforiki* [Political discourse. Methods of analyses of the structure and metaphors]. Moscow.
- Benvenist, E. (2010). *Obshaya lingvistika* [General linguistics]. Moscow.
- Vvedenskaya, L.A. (2012). *Russkij yazik. Delovoe obshenie*. [Russian language. Business communication]. Moscow: KNORUS.
- Vvedenskaya, L.A. Pavlova, L.G., & Kashaeva, E.Y. (2004). *Russkij yazik i kultura rechi: uchebnoe posobie dlya vuzov* [The Russian language and standards of speech]. Rostov-on-Don: "Fenix".
- Vezhbitskaya, A. (2003). Kulturnaya obuslovlennost kategorij "pryamota i nepryamota" [Cultural implications of categories "directness and non-directness"]. In *Pryamaya i nepryamaya kommunikacija*, (pp. 136-159). Saratov: GOSUNC "College".
- Demjankov, V.Z. (1982). *Anglo-russkie termini po prikladnoj lingvistike i avtomatičeskoj pererabotke teksta. Metodi analiza teksta* [Anglo-Russian terms on applied linguistics and text processing]. Moscow.
- Dejk, T.A. van (1989). *Yazik. Poznanie. Kommunikacija* [Language. Cognition. Communication]. Moscow: Progress.
- Emisheva, E.M. (2000) Nekotorie osobennosti vedenia peregovorov s predstaviteljami raznih stran [Peculiarities of negotiating with representatives of different countries]. In *Satff management* (pp. 5-9). Moscow.
- Igebaeva, F.A. (2009). *Eticheskie osnovi deyatelnosti sovremennogo delovogo cheloveka* [Ethical foundations of businessmen. Scientific periodical]. Ufa.
- Kamenskaya, O.L. (1990). *Tekst i kommunikacija* [Text and communication]. Moscow: Vishaya shkola.
- Karasik, V.I. (1998). Religioznoj diskurs [Of discourse categories]. In *Yazikovaya lichnost: problem linguokulturologii i funkcionalnoj semantiki* (pp.87-93). Volgograd. Saratov, Peremena Publishing House.
- Karasik, V.I. (2002). *Yazikovej krug: lichnost, koncepti, diskurs*. [Linguistic background: individual, concepts, discourse]. Volgograd: Peremena.

- Kibrik, A.A., & Plungyan, V.A. (2002). Funkcionalizm [Functionalism]. In *Sovremennaya amerikanskaya lingvistika: fundamentalnie napravlenia* (pp. 276-339). Moscow: URSS.
- Kosonogova, O.V. (2016). *Dinamika razvitiya onomasticheskogo prostranstva angloyazichnoj yuridicheskoy terminologii* [Development of onomastic space in English legal terminology]. Novosibirsk: CRNS.
- Kosonogova, O.V. (2015). Charakteristiki yuridicheskogo diskursa: granitsi, sodержanie, parametric [Characteristics of legal discourse: borders, content, parameters]. In *Istoricheskaya i socialno-obrazovatel'naya misl* (pp. 61-68). Moscow.
- Krasivova, A.N. (2001). *Delovoj russkij yazik* [Russian business language]. Moscow: MFA.
- Kubryakova, E.S., & Aleksandrova, O.V. (1997). Vidi prostranstva, teksta i diskursa [Types of space, a text and a discourse]. In *Categorization of the world: space, time* (pp. 19-20). Moscow: MGU.
- Lantsov, S. (2008). *Politicheskaya konfliktologiya* [Political conflict management]. Saint Petersburg.