МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему: «Мовленнєвий етикет в оналйн спілкуванні»

Допущено до захисту
«___» _____ *року*

студентки групи МЛа 53-18
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні студії
(англійська мова і друга іноземна
мова): лінгвістика та
перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 філологія
Аносової Аліни Миколаївни

В.о. завідувача кафедри
_____
_____
_____
(підпис)   *(ПІБ)*

 Науковий керівник:
доктор філологічних наук, професор
Стеріополо Олена Іванівна
 Національна шкала   _____
 Кількість балів   _____
Оцінка ЄКТС   _____

КИЇВ – 2019

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Professor G.G. Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno Ugrian Philology

Master's Qualificiation Paper:

ENGLISH SPEECH ETIQUETTE IN ONLINE COMMUNICATION

ANOSOVA ALINA

Group MLa 53-18

Department of Germanic Philology

Reasearch adviser

Assoc. Prof. O. I. Steriopolo

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv –2019

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Speech etiquette is rightly regarded as the cultural face of the nation. It embodies the most common features of human linguistic behaviour in a variety of life situations. By incorporating ancient traditions, customary prescriptions, the speech etiquette of English is a unique, universal model of their linguistic activity, manifested in a system of persistent linguistic expressions. Knowledge of this system is a kind of barometer of the spiritual maturity of a nation. On the contrary, the neglect of the laws of linguistic etiquette is a sign of its deep corrosion processes, which, unfortunately, have progressed in recent decades.

The global Internet network, as a powerful means of mass information and communication, greatly broadens the communicative capabilities of a modern person by offering a variety of forms of online communication, namely, an informational web system, discussion forums, distribution lists, newsgroups, chats, messengers, network games, etc . Today online communication is being studied in the theory of information, mass communication, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, political science, computer science, cognition, conflictology, literary criticism, jurisprudence. The interest in online communication is explained by the fact that it is developing rapidly and it is not sufficiently investigated but, of course, it has a huge interactive potential. Every year the multicultural audience of Internet users increases, and therefore, it becomes important to study the principles, laws and rules of communicative interaction in the virtual space. Recommendations and tips about good behavior on the Internet are unofficial and have been termed «netiquette».

The etiquette is studied by the linguists (V.E.Goldin, A.M. Ilchenko, V.I.Karasik, T.M. Nikolaeva, F.Pap, M.P. Fabian, N.I. Formanovska), the semiotics (G.G. Pocheptsov, T.V. Zivian),the ethnographers (A.K. Bayburin, A.L. Toporkov, S. Girts), the philosophers (O.P. Protsenko) and other specialists. Practical manuals offering information on the types of etiquette in modern life (V.V. Rafeenko, I. Ye. Gusev, I. M. Kuznetsov, M. Mitchell, D. Kor, O.I. Maksymenko, E.Pop) are in high demand. Recently, the attention of the researchers was greatly paid to the issues of

the success of Internet communication (I. Y. Alekseeva, M.B. Bergelson, J. Gargano, S. Goering, D. Crystal, D. Langford, S. Hembrides, V. Shi), the number of electronic projects devoted to netiquette has been growing rapidly. What's important is that netiquette relates not only to speech communication on the Internet, but also covers other technological, organizational, ethical, legal and educational issues.

The aim of the diploma paper is to identify English speech etiquette structures in online communication.

The following **tasks** are to be solved:

– to analyse netiquette as a coordinate system in intersocial and intercultural communication;

– to research te use of speech etiquette in online communication;

– to outline the national and cultural specifics of English speech etiquette in online communication;

– to identify the grammatical, lexical and semantic features of English speech etiquette in online communication;

– to define the formulas of English speech etiquette in online communication.

***The actuality of the topic* of the research** is determined by an increased attention of modern linguistics to the study of online communication, as well as the fact that the prerequisite for the success of intensive intercultural is the observance by communicants of the generally accepted rules of netiquette.

The object of the research is netiquette as a coordinate system in inter-social and intercultural communication.

The subject of the research is national and cultural specifics, grammatical, lexical and semantic features, formulas of English speech etiquette in online communication.

Materials of the research are the examples of the English speech etiquette in online communication, taken from the web-sites, in the Internet. The total number of the speech etiquette formulas chosen with the metod of continuous sampling concludes 100 statements.

In the course of the research, the following ***methods*** were used: *the method of continuous sampling* – for the selection of the actual material; *methods of structural and semantic, pragmatic, semiotic and contextual analysis* – to define the characteristic features of online speech etiquette formulas.

The scientific novelty of the obtained results is the description of netiquette as a coordinate system in intersocial and intercultural communication and its use in the messengers, social networks, chatlines and forums; the national and cultural specifics of English speech etiquette in online communication; the grammatical, lexical and semantic features of English speech etiquette in online communication; the formulas of English speech etiquette in online communication *have been identified*.

The practical value of the research lies in the possibility of using the results of the research in courses in communication theory, lexicology, stylistics, special courses in discourse analysis, communication science, sociolinguistics, and speech culture. The results of the work will help to improve the communicative competence of Internet users and to spread the experience of communication in the virtual space.

The srtructure and scope of the diploma paper. The diploma paper consists of the introduction, three chapters, conclusions, list of reference sourses. The full volume of work is 96 pages, the main content is set forth on 84 pages.

CHAPTER 1
LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF NETIQUETTE

1.1 The notion of discourse in modern linguistics

The core of the broad field of discursive semantics is the very concept of discourse, which still has a significant development potential and is debatable. In the context of the ever-expanding textual base of computer-mediated communication, the significance and role of the discursive methodology are increasing, which is expressed in the confident consolidation of discourse as a language universal, aggregating the linguo-informational specificity of the sphere of speech functioning [9]. There is a close connection between discourse and speech and the language system, and without the involvement of the discursive paradigm, not only modern linguistic theory, but also practice will be incomplete and divorced from communication reality. The constant development of the sphere of speech activity determines the special role of discourse as a complex and functional basis of a wide range of linguistic studies. Moreover, for modern linguistics, the interconnectedness of the phenomena of structural elements of speech practice is important: "Unlike film, language, as a rule, does not consist of separate, unrelated sentences, but, on the contrary, from mutually determined, organized, coherent groups of sentences. We consider interconnected, structured sets of sentences as discourse" [23].

Nevertheless, in many textbooks on linguistics there is not only a systematic exposition of discourse, but even a mentioning of it. The lack of presentation of the discourse in the systematized metalanguage descriptions is explained for another reason: the discourse is not only complex and modern, but also often dissolved in the interdisciplinary paradigm of modern science.

As a term, discourse has long been not an innovation of linguistics, but at the same time there are more interpretations of discourse than for the vast majority of linguistic terms. Many linguists took part in formation of the term, e.g. Halperin, Gasparov, Hoffman, de Saussure, von Humboldt, which means that the diversity of

opinions regarding the definition of discourse is really great. Discourse refers to a unit of language longer than a single sentence. The word discourse is derived from the latin prefix *dis-* meaning "away" and the root word *currere* meaning "to run". Discourse, therefore, translates to "run away" and refers to the way that conversations flow. To study discourse is to analyze the use of oral or written language in a social context. "Discourse is the way in which language is used socially to convey broad historical meanings. It is language identified by the social conditions of its use, by who is using it and under what conditions. Language can never be 'neutral' because it bridges our personal and social worlds" (Henry and Tator 2002).

Today, the presentation of the concept of discourse is carried out taking into account the dynamics of a wide range of sociocultural relations and includes not only the results of speech activity, but also the circumstances of the implementation of the language. Discourse, therefore, is a speech activity unfolded in time and space, due to the wide extralinguistic context and communication specificity. The nomination of Internet discourse seems to be more and more relevant for describing the functioning environment of the discourse of the latest sample, relevant from the point of view of the functionality of modern speech practice.

1.2 Internet discourse as a combination of oral and written discourses

Sociolinguistic research has placed Internet Discourse (ID) at a midpoint on a continuum between oral and written discourses. While this accurately captures strong influences from both oral and written forms of discourse, it fails to take into account the unique features of Internet Discourse. Instead of analyzing ID as a cross between oral discourse and written discourse, ID should be placed at its own corner in a triangular continuum. In this way, a three way dynamic of influences is captured, showing that while each form of discourse has its own characteristics, communication can draw from all three forms.

Oral Discourse is characterized by a number of features. In oral discourse, parties must be present in the same time and space. Of course, there is the case of a

phone conversation or a voicemail, however these do not constitute idealized oral discourse, because certain paralinguistic cues associated with oral discourse such as gesture and facial expression are missing.

Laughter, a paralinguistic cue, is ubiquitous in speech discourse. Provine (1993) examined recordings of anonymous conversations in public places and found that laughter occurred during natural pauses, at the ends of phrases and sentences. Provine called this the 'punctuation effect', because laughter occurred where punctuation would be present in a written representation of the conversation.

Turn taking is another feature of apoken discourse. Interlocutors are present with each other in the moment of communication that is why repairs can be made immediately. An interlocutor can repeat a mispronounced word, or a listener can ask for clarification on an ambiguous or confusing statement or question.

Dyadic or triadic exchange structures are common. Dyadic structures include an adjacency pair exchange of greetings or farewells, or a questions and answer. A triadic structure includes feedback, as in a teacher's communication with a pupil; the teacher first asks a question, the pupil responds, and finally the teacher either agrees or disagrees with the response (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). Feedback is an important part of oral discourse. While feedback can take the form of laughter, nodding, or words like 'uh huh' or 'yeah', they give important information to the interlocutor. Schegloff (1981) posits that such feedback serves two functions:

1) Responses like 'uh huh' can be interpreted as a request for more information. With rising intonation, 'uh huh' can take the place of question words like 'Who?' or 'What?' denoting interest.

2) 'Uh huh' can be used to pass on repairs. An interlocutor may pause and wait for confirmation that the listener is not confused. When a listener says, 'uh huh' it is as if to say, 'I understand,' thus passing on repairs.

Written Discourse, in its idealized form, is an asynchronous form of communication. The writer is removed in both time and space from the reader. While situations such as passing notes may be in written form, such situations take on features of oral discourse, thus falling somewhere in the continuum between written

discourse and oral discourse. The exploitation of its visual nature is a feature of written discourse. Font and color can be used to change the general feeling of the writing. A writer also has the ability to edit their work as much as necessary, unlike a speaker who is obliged to continually produce speech until their idea is complete. However, it is important to note that a writer has no chance for immediate repairs and must accurately judge the prior knowledge of the reader to successfully communicate, while a speaker can easily add more information or clarify something they have said if the listener does not understand.

Brown and Yule (1983) contrast oral and written discourses very well through synthesizing the research of Labov (1972), Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Chafe (1979), Ochs (1979), Cicourel (1981), and Goffman (1981). They state that the syntax of written discourse is significantly more structured than that of oral discourse. Oral discourse contains many incomplete sentences and is often just a series of phrases, unlike written discourse comprised of complete and grammatical sentences. While written discourse may contain a great deal of relative clauses and subordination, oral discourse contains very little. Complementizers (that), temporal markers (when/while), and logical connectors (despite, since, besides, however, etc.) are common in organizing the more elaborately syntactically structured sentences of written discourse. Oral discourse relies on a much smaller set of typical organizers, such as and, but, then, and if. Oral discourse is usually less explicit than written discourse, removing organizational indicators such as because (e.g. 'I'm hungry (because) I haven't eaten yet today'). Written discourse also makes use of rhetorical organizers (first, more important than, in conclusion, etc.) seldom used in oral discourse. Another indication that oral discourse is less syntactically complicated than written discourse is that passive construction is rare in oral discourse. In addition, oral discourse is often organized by placing the most important part of an idea first, regardless of whether it falls in the subject or predicate, unlike written discourse.

While a number of modifiers can be present in noun phrases in written discourse, oral discourse tends to have no more than one modifier per noun phrase.

Brown and Yule (1983) give the example, 'old man McArthur + he was a wee chap + oh very small + and eh a beard + and he was pretty stooped'. In this way, oral discourse is more spread out while written discourse is often more densely packed with information.

Of course, a significant amount of communication occurs outside the realm of the idealized informal conversation of oral discourse and the formal academic writing or letter writing of written discourse. As mentioned above, voice messages lack the feedback of a listener. Notes passed back and forth may take a more informal nature than written discourse. An oral presentation usually contains more formal sentence structure than oral discourse. These are examples illustrate that discourse is on a continuum. Even in an informal conversation, a speaker that sends a significant amount of time reading may incorporate elements of written discourse in their speech, while someone who rarely reads may use informal elements of oral discourse in their writing. Certainly, a child while learning to write may use incomplete sentences, or may spell words phonetically, incorporating features of oral discourse in their writing.

Internet Discourse is certainly influenced by both oral and written discourses. Influence of written discourse can most obviously be seen in the visual context of internet discourse. Internet Discourse is a written form of communication. Also, the interlocutors are physically, and depending on the type of internet discourse, temporally separated, as in written discourse. Asynchronous forms of internet discourse include e-mail, list-serves, and wall posts. Synchronous forms include chat rooms (internet relay chats) and, the focus of this study, instant messaging. Hentchel (1998) examined a number of internet relay chats and found that capital letters were used to denote yelling or usage of a raised voice, a technique used in written discourse to provide the same kind of emphasis. Ferrara, Brunner and Whittemore (1991) also investigated internet discourse, but through instant messaging. They had subjects chat with a research assistant over an instant messenger with the object of making travel plans. They found several examples of cataphora, or forward reference, in their instant messaging texts. For example, they found phrases such as, 'the

following criteria' and, 'the following two airlines', in their conversation logs. Cataphora is a device used in written discourse primarily, and relies on the non-linear ability to reference something before communicating specifically what it is.

Several studies have found influence of oral discourse on internet discourse. Ferrara, Brunner, and Whittemore (1991) found that conversations typically had a dyadic exchange structure, as in oral discourse. In addition, they found significant usage of informal discourse particles typically used in informal speech such as okay, sure, sorry and now. Al-Sa'di and Hamdan (2005), 5 examining internet relay chats, mention that interlocutors can make immediate repairs, either correcting typos or responding to a clarification question from another interlocutor. Farias (2008), examining conversations in chat rooms found that openings and closings were common, and in fact expected, commenting that not greeting the members of a chat room when entering was considered rude. Provine, Spencer and Mandell (2007) examined postings on website message boards. They looked specifically at the usage of laughter denoted by the acronym 'LOL', meaning 'Laughing Out Loud', and smiley emoticons. They found that laughter was placed either alone, what they term 'naked', or at the beginnings or ends of questions and phrases, mimicking the punctuation effect of laughter that Provine (1993) found in oral discourse.

A number of features on internet discourse seek to recreate the properties of oral discourse. While the forms and techniques used are unique to internet discourse, they show a significant amount of influence from oral discourse. Emoticons are used to simulate facial expressions (Hentschel, 1998). A wide variety of emoticons are used including smiley faces, frowny faces, surprised faces, and blushing faces, more or less recreating any facial expression. Expressions can also be recreated by naming the expression offset by asterisks, for example '*grins*'. This technique can also be used to denote onomatopoeias like '*gluckgluckgluck*' recreating the sound of drinking quickly (Hentschel, 1998).

Werry (1996) examine internet relay chats in French and in English, and found that interlocutors verbally hugged, kissed, offered each other coffee, yawned, and popped champagne through use of offsetting these gestures in asterisks as Hentschel

(1998) found. Werry (1996) also found that physical objects can be symbolized, for example a rose @}-'-,-'---, recreating the physical context of oral discourse. Prosodic cues from oral discourse can also be recreated in internet discourse. Periods, hyphens, and other punctuation are used to denote tempo (Werry, 1996). Phonetic qualities of oral discourse can be replicated through creative orthography, e.g. 'wuz' for was, 'wotz' for what's.

Filler words are also present in internet discourse, though their function is not fully understood. While they could be used to recreate the phonetic properties of oral discourse, they do not serve the same purpose of holding the floor as they would in a oral conversation.

Though some of these same features function differently from in oral discourse. Nonstandard spellings of words can be used for brevity and ease of typing. Competition for attention, screen size, average typing speed, the desire for minimal response times, channel population, and the fast pace of conversation all motivate brevity in internet relay chats. The phonetic spellings of sounds often correlate to a shorter form. Sometimes, words are even further reduced to forms such as 'u' for 'you' and 'c' for 'see'. Common words are often abbreviated by convention such as 'pls' for 'please'. Pronouns are often omitted, such as in the phrase '[I] went to the store today' (Werry, 1996). Also, a wide range of acronyms are commonly used. including 'lol' mentioned above, 'rofl' for 'rolling on the floor laughing', 'brb' for 'be right back', and 'g2g' for 'got to go'.

Emoticons also can serve functions other than simply recreating facial expressions. They can be used to exert illocutionary force on the statements they accompany. Dresner and Herring (2010) give the example of a person posting about a recent flare-up on fibromyalgia on a Yahoo! support forum. He ended his message with a smiley face emoticon, clearly not indicating that he was happy with his condition, but rather as a way to soften the sadness or negativity of his statements. According to Dresner and Herring, emoticons are used to demarcate a joke or to soften commands. They equate emoticons used in this way as comparable to gesture or facial expression that change the meaning of a phrase in oral discourse, or to

punctuation such as question marks and exclamation marks change the meaning of a phrase in written discourse. Emoticons can also convey socio-emotional information. Fullwood and Martino (2007) examined the effects of emoticons on perception of personality. Subjects asked prompted questions through an instant messenger and received pre-determined answers, either containing emoticons or not. After completing the 'conversation', the subjects were asked to rate their conversation partner on their extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience. Subjects who received responses including emoticons rated their partners as being more extraverted and agreeable than those who did not receive responses with emoticons.

Turn taking principles are also significantly altered in internet discourse, as compared to oral discourse. An interlocutor can hold the floor by entering small chunks into a conversation in an internet relay chat or instant messaging conversation. Hentschel (1998) found that often these chunks were incomplete sentences or phrases, helping to indicate that the interlocutor had not finished their turn. Also, turns do not need to be taken in a sequential manner.

These turn taking principles take advantage of the written form of the conversation, allowing for non-linear flow and incomplete text entry. Also maximizing the written form, Werry (1996) found that multiple conversations took place simultaneously in internet relay chat, leading to rapid topic changes. In addition, while instant messaging and internet relay chats are typically synchronous, they can be used asynchronously, or an interlocutor can excuse himself from a conversation and come back at whim. Baron (2004) examined instant messaging conversation and was surprised by a low number of turns per minute, suggesting that interlocutors were not directing their attention solely to the conversation, or that they were leaving the conversation for short periods of time. She also found anecdotal evidence that subjects were multitasking while participating in the conversations. In this way, an interlocutor can enter a turn and come back to the conversation later, picking up where the conversation left off.

1.3 The concept and essence of speech etiquette

According to Cambridge dictionary etiquette is the set of rules or customs that control accepted behavior in particular social groups and social situations. Etiquette of speech communication plays an important role for successful actions of people in society, their personal and professional growth, building strong family and friendly realtions. English speech important not only for the English but for all learners of English as a foreign language. English speech etiquette is original and has its own rules and regulations, which sometimes differ substantially from rules and norms of speech etiquette of another language. This leads to the fact that the very cultured person may seem impolite among the English if communicating them in fluent English, but not fluent speech etiquette. The peoblem of communicative and cultural competence achieved on the basis of acquiring the strategies of intercultural communication and knowledge in the spheres of native and foreign cultures are of great importance nowadays. So before one starts communicating with English speakers, one needs to understand the importance of speech etiquette. Speech etiquette is a sphere of communication between people, when the multifaceted factors that cause communication are often often encountered: the linguistic, social, national, and psychological. As it was stated before, etiquette is a set of rules of conduct of a person, which expresses the outside of communication (greetings, manners, treatment, gratitude, clothes). To fully understand the role of etiquette in shaping the national linguistic image, one should familiarize with the culture, way of life, rituals, traditions of native speakers, the language, explore practical methods of communication and specificity of the language. The study of the forms and means of expression of etiquette contributes to the complete and in-depth disclosure of the national-linguistic image of the world.

By the degree of ritualisation of behaviour different types of etiquette may be distinguished: *everyday*, *casual*, *festive*. The multi-level structure of etiquette includes several levels: *verbal level* (etiquette of greetings, farewells, thanks,

apologies, etc.); *paralinguistic level* (rate of speech, volume, intonation); *kinetic level* (gestures, facial expressions, poses); *proxemic level* (standard communication distances, honorable place for guests, etc.).

Therefore, *etiquette* operates in two main forms of behaviour: *verbal* and *non-verbal*, which are closely related and interdependent. Since **etiquette**, as a code of rules, regulates external behaviour in accordance with the requirements of the environment, **speech etiquette** can be defined as rules governing speech behaviour, as evidenced by domestic and foreign lexicographic sources:a desire of to establish contact between the interlocutors and to maintain communication in the chosen tone according to their social roles and role positions, mutual relations in official and informal tional conditions»; "*linguistic etiquette* refers to the practice in any speech community of organising linguistic action so that it is seen as appropriate to the current communicative event".

Based on the above-mentioned definitions, we understand *speech etiquette* (hereinafter referred to as SE) as a relatively autonomous system of linguistic signs and rules for their use, a well-established set of requirements for form, content, order, character and situational expediency of expression. SE characterises virtually every successful act of communication and it is associated with the tenets of speech communication by G. P. Grace. It is based on the principle of cooperation and it is therefore considered in terms of achieving specific goals in context. In a narrow sense, the SE represents a system of linguistic means in which etiquette relationships are realised that are realised at different linguistic levels. The essence of the concept of SE is determined by its main characteristics: anthropocentricity and dialogism. SE is anthropocentric in nature because it reflects an aspect of reality that is related to the individual in his or her relationship with others and etiquette. SE's dialogicality is manifested in the context of dialogic relations as a universal phenomenon, which pervades speech and all manifestations of human life.

The concept of SE includes a set of governing rules of speech behaviour, a wide range of units of speech, which "verbally expresses the etiquette of behaviour, because it gives us those linguistic riches that have accumulated in each society for

expressing non-conflicting, friendly treatment of people". On the other hand, *etiquette* makes it possible to choose the means of speech in a particular situation, in a particular case related to specific individuals. Therefore, while in general SE is embodied in mature stereotyped formulas and communicative units of language, each specific choice in a speech act is a matter of individual creativity. The structure of SE is defined by the following basic communicative-semantic groups – elements of communicative situations: appeals, greetings, forgiveness, apologies, thanks, wishes, requests, acquaintance, congratulations, invitations, offers, advice, agreement, refusal, condolences, compliments, oaths, etc. .

SE is related to the social notion of etiquette when fulfilling a regulatory role in the choice of the register of communication and ritualised speech behavior. Speech behavior is carried out within the limits of the unwritten laws produced by society as a result of the number of repetitions in prototype situations. At the same time, social communication involves the standardisation of the communicative expression of social relations, in particular etiquette, in order to maintain non-antagonistic contacts between individuals. Such semiotic stereotypes are formed in the process of education and produced in communicative situations. SE is social in essence because it reveals the social and role side of communication. The choice of a certain unit of SE is influenced by the social role of the individual, i.e. a normatively endorsed by society a behaviour that is expected of anyone who takes a particular social position. When changing the role structure of the communication situation, the individual switches from one stereotype to another, using language styles and SE units. It follows that the social roles of the speech personality are key in understanding the essence of speech etiquette.

Because the individual's linguistic competence is formed precisely in the context of a culture that is the main determinant of his or her speech behaviour, SE is a functionally semantic and pragmatic universality, manifested in different national cultures. It is a "universal language phenomenon that is inherent in all peoples and cultures, but each language has its own thesaurus, reflecting the national specificity of speech politeness". Within the specific national peculiarities of each culture,

etiquette-ritualised behaviour can be distinguished, personal behaviour, cultural-national communication. We believe that in the presence of several subcultures in each culture, when analysing figures of SE, one must take into account the socio-stylistic differentiation corresponding to the structure of the society.

SE is considered in terms of the category of speech courtesy. The concepts of SE and courtesy are not identical, though interrelated. Courtesy is understood as a system of communicative strategies and tactics for maximum understanding and harmony, and as a functional-semantic category with pragmatic signs of expressing the addresser's attitude to the addressee, broader than etiquette, which is a set of communicative norms and rules. SE is included in the area of the functional-semantic field of courtesy as traditions and rituals of social interaction, as communicative-semantic groups of utterances – speech acts expressing etiquette intentions, as well as other speech expressions of politeness. The concept of negative and positive politeness proposed by P. Brown and S. Levinson should be distinguished here as the motivational basis for any communicative behaviour. Negative politeness aims at minimising impoliteness in speaking and avoiding communicative conflict. It involves reducing aggression in communication, preserving freedom in actions, and maintaining a proper distance between communicators. There is a wide arsenal of verbal and non-verbal strategies to fulfill these tasks in culture and language, in particular, mediation on requests, euphemisms and other ways of avoiding discussing unpleasant topics.

According to of J. Leech, the degree of necessary courtesy directly depends on the following pragmatic variables: the addresser's power over the speaker, social distance between the participants of communication, the amount of effort the addresser has spent on this speech act. Functional-semantic field of courtesy encompasses a wide range of tokens with intentional and emotional meanings of respect, reverence, gallantry, correctness, which are "the characteristics of direct speech and verbal behaviour (verbal and non-verbal) of the characters of artistic texts, as well as narratives as modes of descriptive language. Significant role here is played by individual grammatical categories in the pragmatic aspect (person, manner), as

well as strategic and tactical speech steps, enshrined in the language consciousness, communicative and pragmatic competence of the native speakers. In conjunction with the maxims of the pragmatic principle of J. Leech's courtesy (be tactful, generous, humble, show sympathy, agreement and approval), SE prevents and eliminates conflicts, providing a non-conflict area of communication. Violation or failure to comply with the maxims of politeness and the principle of cooperation can lead to communicative failures.

Like sincere courtesy, or the courtesy of a mask designed to cover up the true intentions of the addressee, SE can act as an outward display of respect and desire to establish and maintain contact, and in fact express modality (I want – you should).

According to the notion of communicative truth introduced by G. Pocheptsov, one can assume that some etiquette statements are only communicatively true, and in fact in certain etiquette situations there is a difference between communicative and denotative truth. As a de facto category with reference to the social status of the communicants, *courtesy* relies on the basic indicators that determine the context of speech, namely: participants, time, place and social characteristics. Even when labelled, they play a role in communication because they are indirectly linked to the central point of reference in the speech interaction. The rules of SE vary according to the situation and the sphere of communication and are determined by extralinguistic factors, in particular the personal and role relations of the communicants.

SE encompasses verbal forms of expression of polite relationships that are conditioned by the situation, cultural level, gender, age, degree of affinity and familiarity of the communication participants. The communication process is also influenced by the social status of the addresser and the addressee, their position, nationality, profession, religion, character, i.e. the rules of etiquette are closely related to the status, role and even biological characteristics of the communicants. All these factors belong to the parameters of etiquette variability, which determine the process of speech interaction. In this approach, in our view, the use of SE is appropriate in the communicative-discourse paradigm, because label formulas are most complete and reveal their potential in open dialogues and in communicative situations, including

both speech behaviour and paralinguistic manner, communication situation, its perception by communicants, their moral and physical condition and intentions.

The interpretation of the term "etiquette» has undergone a significant evolution from the period of antiquity, which refers to the emergence of this phenomenon, which came from the word "ethos», i. e. the place of social habitation of people, but later it was used to refer to those human qualities that are formed in the process of living in society, to nowadays, where *etiquette* is defined as "an external, visible component of ethics that has been formed over centuries and millennia in human society, an integral part of the spiritual world of man".

Nowadays, this term has two meanings: 1) a section of philosophy, the object of which is morality (problems of meaning of life, purpose of man, etc.); 2) norms, rules, supported by public opinion, which determine how a person should act in the conditions of choice between good and evil, selfishness and altruism, in situations of self-expression, in motivation of actions, in understanding the principles and norms of behaviour, in particular speech behaviour.

The psychological encyclopedia gives the following definition of *etiquette*: "etiquette is a summary of the rules of conduct, treatment, accepted in certain social groups (at the court of monarchs, in diplomatic circles, etc.). In a figurative sense, *etiquette* is a form of behaviour, rules of politeness that are characteristic of a particular society».

Psychological Dictionary explains the term "etiquette» as an integral part of the external culture of man and society. It includes those requirements that become more or less strictly regulated ceremonials and in which certain form of behaviour is of particular importance.

The Ethics Dictionary extends the meaning of etiquette by claiming that *etiquette* is a set of rules of conduct that relate to the outward manifestation of people (treatment of others, forms of treatment and greetings, behaviour in public, manners and clothing). *Etiquette* is an integral part of the external culture of society (culture of behaviour), which expresses the content of certain principles of morality, respect for man. It expresses itself in a complex system of detailed rules of courtesy, clearly

classifies the rules of treatment of representatives of different classes, officials depending on their rank (how to approach certain people, how to whom to name), rules of behaviour in different circles (court etiquette, diplomatic etiquette, "higher world» etiquette, etc.). Fair treatment of a woman, respectful treatment of elders, forms of address and greetings, rules of conversation, behaviour at the table, with guests, fulfillment of requirements for human clothing in different circumstances – all these laws of decency carry a general understanding of human dignity, simple requirements comfort and ease in people's relationships. The attention to the external form is manifested here only as long as it reflects the idea of beauty in the behaviour and in the external account of man. In general, *etiquette* meets the general requirements of politeness; it is based on the principles of humanism. Regarding the ritual forms of etiquette, they are preserved mainly only in the field of diplomatic relations (adherence to the so-called diplomatic protocol) [Словарь по этике, p. 44]. But they also provide for equal treatment of representatives of different countries, which is impossible without the knowledge and application of the rules of speech etiquette.

According to N. Dzyubyshyn-Melnyk and S. Yermolenko, ***speech etiquette*** is understood as the set of requirements for the form, content, order, character and situational appropriateness of expressions adopted in a particular culture [Культура української мови 1990, p. 11].

N. Formanovska defines ***speech etiquette*** as "rules governing speech behaviour, a system of nationally specific stereotyped, stable communication formulas adopted and specified by society to establish interlocutor contact, maintain and stop contact in a selective tone» [Формановская 2005, p. 16].

Speech etiquette is primarily about words and expressions used by people for forgiveness, apology, etc., typical for forms of communication, intonational features that characterise polite language, etc. The study of speech etiquette has a special position at the intersection of linguistics, theory and history of culture, ethnography, country studies, psychology and other humanities. According to the cultural handbook, *speech etiquette* is a typical formula of greetings, farewells, wishes,

invitations, etc. They change depending on the situation of communication, on the social status, educational and age level of speakers.

G. Grice identified the postulates of speech communication to which they relate: the postulates of quality (the message should not be untrue or without the necessary grounds), the quantity (the message should be neither too short nor too detailed), the relation (message should be relevant to the addressee) and manner (the message should be clear to the addressee. [Грайс 1985].

The logic of the initial research requires to find out such concepts related to speech etiquette as "courtesy", "the culture of behaviour», "speech culture". Let us consider these notions.

Courtesy, according to I. Aasamaa, it is a moral quality that characterises the behaviour of a person for whom respect for people has become a daily norm and a common way of speaking to interlocutors. Courtesy is an elementary requirement of a culture of behaviour. It includes attentiveness, an outward display of kindness to everyone, a willingness to do service to all who need it, delicacy, tact.

Labeling is directly related to the notion of a culture of behaviour. According to the psychological dictionary, *the culture of behaviour* is interpreted the ability to find the right tone in different conditions of communication with their environment. The culture of human behaviour reflects to a certain extent its personal qualities.

One of the components of the culture of behaviour is *the speech culture*, or *the culture of speech*. The pedagogical encyclopedic dictionary for teachers gives the following definition of speech culture: "*Speech culture* is the degree of conformity of speech to the norms of orthoepy, vocabulary, grammar established for a particular language; the ability to imitate the best examples in their individual speech". According to the encyclopedia of the Ukrainian language, speech culture, or language culture, is the observance of established norms of pronunciation of words and the construction of phrases provided by the scientific development of phonetic, orthoepic, grammatical and lexical aspects of language, creation of works from the relevant linguistic disciplines, including textbooks. *The culture of speech* is the level

of speech development, the degree of mastery of language norms or dialect together with the ability to "reasonably depart" from these norms.

The speech culture starts with the self-awareness of the language personality and it is directly linked to sociology and psychology. Due to the need to foster a culture of inter-ethnic relations, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of language culture are becoming increasingly important. They intersect with the national-cultural specificity of speech behaviour and they are intended to assess the appropriateness, expediency or inappropriateness, inappropriateness of using different means of linguistic expression. According to L. Vvedenskaya and L. Pavlova, the basis of language culture is the literal language. It is the highest form of national language. It is the language of culture, literature, education and the media [Введенская 1995, p. 208].

In any act of communication, according to L. Vvedenskaya and L. Pavlov, it is possible to distinguish etiquette of speech and etiquette of written speech and etiquette of hearing. With regard to verbal speech, it envisages observance of the following rules of etiquette, such as: display of respectful, friendly attitude to the interlocutor; attention to the listener; choosing a topic of communication based on its relevance, clarity and interest to the listener; taking into account the threshold of semantic perception and concentration of attention of the listener [Введенская 1995, p. 306].

Speech etiquette as a social linguistic phenomenon is determined from the functional side, i.e. at the heart of its selection are specialised functions. N. Formanovska distinguishes the whole spectrum of communicative functions of speech etiquette. Here are the most important of them: 1) *contact (phatic) function* – the establishment, preservation or attachment, maintained relationships and relationships individually or socially mass. The concept of "contact function" applies equally to all thematic groups of units of speech etiquette, because even saying goodbye, we establish the possibility of further contact; 2) *politeness function* (connotative) is related to the manifestations of polite behaviour of the team members with each other; 3) *regulatory function (regulatory)* also applies to all manifestations

of speech etiquette, because the choice of a particular form when establishing contact regulates the nature of the relationship between the addressee and the addressee; 4) *influence function (imperative)* involves the interlocutor's reaction – verbal, gestural, activity; 5) *the function of appeal (appeal)* is closely related to the imperative, because to attract attention means to exert influence on the interlocutor; 6) *emotional-expressive (emotional) function* is an optional function because it is not peculiar to all units of speech etiquette.

Many specialised units and general manifestations of speech etiquette differ in their steadfast affiliation with certain social groups of native speakers. These groups can be distinguished by the following criteria: 1) **age**: speech etiquette formulas related to youth slang (*Hello! Bye! See You*); specific forms of politeness in the language of older people (*Thank You Very Much, Would You Kindly; You are awfully obliged, Much obliged to you, I can never thank you enough*); 2) **education and upbringing**: more educated and intelligent people tend to use more accurate units of speech etiquette, use forms of speech more widely, etc. (*Pleased to have been of service to you*); 3) **gender**: middle-aged women tend to be more polite, less likely to use rude, abusive vocabulary, more sophisticated in choosing a topic (*Oh, please, do forgive me*); 4) **belonging to professional groups** [Томахин 1984, p. 97].

Analysing the concept of "speech etiquette» in terms of stylistics, it can be argued that stylistic differences in the use of units of speech etiquette are largely determined by the belonging of the language to different functional styles. Virtually every functional style has its own labelling rules. As for business language, it is characterised by a high degree of formality: the absence of jargon expressions, neologisms, exclamations, words-parasites; foreign words can only be used when their correct meaning and pronunciation are known; the participants in the communication, the persons and objects in question are called by their full official name, without any abbreviations.

N. Formanovska and V. Goldin distinguish between the paralinguistic aspects of speech etiquette, i.e. non-verbal means, which are included in speech communication and which, together with verbal means, convey meaningful

information [Формановская 2005, p. 44]. There are three types of paralinguistic means: phonation, kinetic and graphic. The phonation includes the timbre of voice, tempo of speech, loudness, types of placeholder pauses (*er, um*, etc.), melodic phenomena, as well as features of pronunciation of speech sounds (social and ideological dialects); the kinetic components include gestures, the type of posture selected, facial expressions; to graphic – type of execution of letters and punctuation marks (handwriting), ways of graphic additions to letters, their substitutes.

In any communicative act, all its components (verbal and non-verbal) are also represented. According to S. Bodnar, these components are involved in communication purposefully, in a certain amount, in a certain combination and in a certain sequence, i.e. such a synthesis of communicative means is formed, which, taking into account the situation of communication, dominant motivation and past experience of communicating, results in achievement. In natural language there is a constant redistribution of functional load between linguistic and non-linguistic signs of the transmission of linguistic information, and the informative nature of the latter is situational.

For example, verbal remedies tend to predominate in neutral situations, and non-verbal remedies are complementary, compensating, or intensifying. However, in situations of extreme emotional arousal of the speaker, the role of verbal means can be reduced or reduced to zero, giving way to non-verbal means.

Speech etiquette distinguishes such paralinguistic signs as: signs that do not carry a specific etiquette load (duplicating or replacing segments of speech, indicating expressing consent or rejection, emotions, etc.); signs permitted by the label rules (bows, handshakes); signs that have an invective, offensive meaning [Грицанов 2001, p. 42]. At the same time, the regulation of gestures and facial expressions covers not only the last two categories of signs, but also non-label characters – even purely informative ones; for example, labelling prohibit finger-pointing. In addition, the requirements of speech etiquette can extend to the paralinguistic level of communication as a whole [Грицанов 2001, p. 44]. For example, English speech etiquette is intended to refrain from overly expressive facial

expressions and gestures, as well as from gestures and facial movements that mimic elementary physiological responses. However, it is essential that the same gestures and facial movements can have different meanings in other cultures.

Let us consider the components of speech etiquette. A. Kazartseva distinguishes the following components of speech etiquette: 1) *greeting* is the element of speech etiquette from which the kind of speech communication begins; 2) *address* is an element of speech etiquette associated with the beginning of communication, which is expressed in the address to the interlocutor by name, name or official character; 3) *dating* is an act of mutual self-determination in communication between people who were not previously introduced to each other; 4) *invitation* is the element of speech etiquette associated with the offer of a meeting to establish further contacts; 5) *compliment* is an element of speech etiquette, which carries a certain exaggeration of a person's positive qualities; 6) *farewell* is the element that completes any kind of speech communication [Казарцева 2003, p. 320].

Analysing the presented components of speech etiquette, we extend their composition and add to them: wishes, apologies, requests, advice, agreement / disagreement, surprise, gratitude, sympathy, praise, attention, suggestion, discussion and planning, getting information, transition to a new topic, summation, agreement, wishes for success, wishes for a happy journey, wishes for health, greetings, wonder, anxiety, excitement, indifference, joy.

Therefore, the purpose of this paragraph was to determine the essence and content of the notion of "speech etiquette". Based on the studied linguistic, literature, it has been established that ***speech etiquette*** can be considered in a narrow and broad sense. <u>Speech etiquette in a narrow sense</u> is a formula that ensures that people are accepted in a certain environment, in a certain group of people and in a certain communicative situation, engage in speech contact, maintain communication in the chosen tone. And <u>in a broad sense</u>, these are all rules of speech behaviour, all linguistic permissions and prohibitions related to the social characteristics of speakers, in our case future managers, and their environment, on the one hand, and stylistic resources of the language, on the other.

The system of speech etiquette that has developed in a particular national culture is the totality of all etiquette formulas. They identify the main elements of communicative situations: appeal, familiarity, greetings, attention, wishes, invitations, compliments, apologies, requests, advice, agreement/disagreement, forgiveness, surprise, gratitude, sympathy, approval, understanding, confirmation, rejection, warning, precautions, etc. In the course of business communication, speech etiquette implements contact, connotative, regulatory, imperative, appellate, and emotional functions. Together they provide a communicative function of the language.

Speech etiquette sets the boundaries of language rules within which meaningful communication must take place, and is an integral element of any national culture without which the process of communication cannot proceed.

1.4 Netiquette as a coordinate system in intersocial and intercultural communication

Messaging services such as WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger and Kik have revolutionised the way we communicate. They have also created a whole new social sphere in which new rules of etiquette are still being tested out.

Messaging apps are hugely popular with both children and adults, due to the fact they are free to use and allow users to talk to each other regardless of whether they have an iPhone, Android or Windows device. As well as text, users can also send images, video and audio messages. Using these apps, one can talk to someone, or with more than one person in a group chat. The group chat function is very popular amongst users, as it's an effective way to share messages with lots of people at once.

For young people, group chats can be difficult to navigate, due to the social pressures of contributing to a conversation in a space where lots of other people can see and comment on it. Therefore it's really important that people understand the need for positive behaviour within these group chats.

According to Cambridge dictionary "netiquette - the set of rules about behaviour that is acceptable on the internet". Network etiquette is a set of rules formed on the basis of the principles of human politeness, designed to regulate communicative interaction in virtual space, to promote communication success and to create an attractive virtual image of the speaker.

Like speech etiquette, netiquette is a universal phenomenon, but it is dynamic in nature, depending on the anthroponymic and toponymic characteristics of virtual space. The dynamic of netiquette is observed in different chatline societies and is reflected in the choice and implementation of communication strategies and tactics.

Electronic transmission of messages is a common means of communication between students, staff, friends and colleagues. As it was stated before, the term "netiquette" refers to online etiquette over networks, such as emails, online communities, forums, and the online learning environments. Somewhere around the 1970s early users of the Internet laid the basis for a set of conventions and rules for doing things on the Internet. These rules are nowadays commonly called *netiquette.* In this sense, netiquette includes laws, regulations, as well asgood manners and practices. There is a significant amount of literature on and discussion about netiquette, but amazingly little has been written about the cultural dimensions of netiquette. There are many studies that concern netiquette as culture, but the question of different attitudes towards netiquette between cultures has been left largerly untouched. In the field of computer sience there are studies in computer politeness, computer gestures, educational technology etiquette and so forth, but in computer scientists' discourse, netiquette has been largely disregarded. Although netiquette is not a widely studied topic, Preece (2004) notes that there is a diversity of net users,in terms of their culture, age, enthusiasm, income, and so forth. She also notes that different technologiesrequire different forms of etiquette; for example, the etiquette of text messaging is different from the etiquetteof email. Furthermore, the netiquettes between web communities differ (Shea, 2004).

It is also argued that even the basic functions of new technologies may be culturally determined. For instance, Lee (2000) found that in South Korean

companies, email is quite often seen as an inappropriate wayof communicating with one's superiors. In South Korea, email is not considered as respectful as other formsof communication. We acknowledge that new technologies may challenge previously accepted norms – netiquettes are not rigid (Preece, 2004) and they should not be understood as such. Yet, the flexibility of netiquettes should not be used as an argument for introducing culturally inappropriate conventions.

There are polls about issues concerning netiquette (Preece, 2004), but those polls typically donot collect background variables, such as country of origin, age, gender, education, or even Internet usage patterns, and they are grounded in "official netiquette." Although conducting a poll that answers a questionsuch as "Which netiquette issues aggravate you the most?" in a number of countries might reveal differences in attitudes towards netiquette, the poll would be biased by default. Namely, giving a preordained list of netiquette issues sets a fixed framework for the study. We believe that the question of a culturally fair, globalnetiquette is an increasingly important one, and that studies of it need to begin with more cultural sensitivitythan the studies hitherto.

Hofstede (1997) and Trompenaars (1997) propose a number of *cultural dimensions*, which are sets of valuestatements that typify differences between cultures. If one considers these dimensions as being correlatedwith how people feel about the Internet or how people behave on the Internet, a number of possibledifferences in netiquettes between cultures can be predicted. For instance, differences in *power distance* (Hofstede, 1997) may reflect different opinions on how the Internet should be regulated, on authority on theInternet, or on restricting the usage of the Internet. Differences in the level of *individualism* in cultures(Hofstede, 1997) may reflect different opinions on copyright issues, strong encryption, and anonymity on theInternet. Differences in the level of *masculinity* (Hofstede, 1997) may reflect different opinions oncompetitiveness and task-orientation versus collaboration and aesthetic issues (Marcus & Gould, 2000).

However, studies in cross-cultural psychology (which include cross-cultural comparisons as well asecological studies such as those by Trompenaars and

Hofstede) are hindered by various methodological problems. In general, researchers of cross-cultural psychology view culture as an independent variable andas a characteristic of an individual, similar to age, gender, or occupation (Ross, 2004). This view presumesthat culture can be easily separated from other factors such as education, environment, or income level. Inaddition, equating a culture with a country is common in cross-cultural studies (Matsumoto & Juang, 2004).Many consider cross-cultural research, erroneously, to be causal-comparative research in which participantsfrom different countries are compared.In the case of Hofstede's study, for example, it is assumed that there is only one (national) culture inevery country. Furthermore, in Hofstede's study it is assumed that the informants (employees of IBM) formcomparable samples across different countries and that the results can be generalized to whole nations(instead of only IBM employees in a certain country). When the results of Hofstede's study are applied, for instance, in the cross-cultural design of websites, yet another daring assumption is made – that the culturaldimensions of Hofstede (or of Trompenaars, or of others making similar conclusions) are indeed predictorsof the preferences of the users of the Internet in different countries. Studies such as Hofstede's andTrompenaars' are very abstract and cannot easily be applied to different contexts as such.Cole (1998) has argued that rigorous compliance with the methods of cross-cultural psychology is notsufficient for the study of culture. As there are no culture-free research tools, and the tasks in theexperiments are always dependent on the context and the subjects, Cole suggests that researchers should look for other ways to study culture. Cole recommends basing the research on the everyday activities of participants. The researcher creates an *activity frame* in which both the subjects and the researchers can participate in, and then during the course of the study the initial activity frame evolves. In this way, the studywill include a temporal (historical) dimension. Instead of relying on ecological studies such as Hofstede's or Trompenaars', our study will utilize an established qualitative, anthropological methodology, introduced byCole (1998).

Though the Internet covers an enormous variety of cultures and task domains, the idea of global netiquette isneeded in order to establish a common ground so that stakeholders can have pervasive rules that transcendcultural varieties across countries and regions.

Accordind to Shea the following netiquette rules must be taken into account:

Rule 1. Remember the human Be polite. Never mail or post anything you wouldn't say to your reader's face. Keep in mind the fact that although you are looking at a keyboard and a computer screen, there are real people with real feelings reading your words. Be aware that the written word has different effects on the recipient than a oral word. A hastily written response can come across as terse, insulting, and/or mean-spirited. This is the reason some people use emotions such as :) :-) or ;). Also, it's fine to use humor, but use it carefully. The absence of facial and vocal cues can cause humor to be misinterpreted as criticism or flaming (angry, antagonistic criticism). Feel free to use emotions such as :) to let others know that you're being humorous. Capitalize words only to highlight a point or titles— capitalizing otherwise is generally viewed as shouting.

Rule 2. Adhere to the same standards of behavior online that you follow in real life. Be ethical and don't break the law. Cite all quotes, references, and sources.

Rule 3. Know where you are in cyberspace. Check the discussion frequently and respond appropriately and on subject/task. Before you begin to post, spend some time reading previous posts to understand the tone and content of the discussion so far. In this way, you can avoid asking questions that have already been answered and contribute more intelligently when you do participate.

Rule 4. Respect other people's time and bandwidth. When posting a long message, it's generally considered courteous to warn readers at the beginning of the message that it is a lengthy post. Focus on one subject per message and use pertinent subject titles.

Rule 5. Make yourself look good online. Check grammar and spelling before you post. Know what you're talking about and make sense. Identify yourself. Never

send an e-mail without including your name and contact information at the bottom of the e-mail. Similarly, don't post forum messages without identifying yourself.

Every country, every region has its own culture. The Internet also has its own culture. It is important anytime you enter into a new country you learn, understand, and practice the culture that you are entering.

Rule 6. Share expert knowledge Offer answers and help to people who ask questions in discussion groups.

Rule 7. Help keep flame wars under control. Don't flame others, and if you are flamed, don't respond. It's like arguing with a drunk at a football game: You will never win. If you feel you've been flamed in a forum, make your complaint public to the entire forum. As much as possible, let's try to resolve conflicts as they occur and as a team. If you've posted flame-bait, or perpetuated a flame war, apologize.

To sum up, ***speech netiquette*** is one of the necessary components of human communication. It is a set of standardised speech forms, which are stereotypes of speech, ready-made formulas with a certain syntactic organisation and lexical content.

In the speech netiquette of native speakers of different languages, the coordinate system of interpersonal communication is organised in the same way. The rules of etiquette have a unifying (coordinating) character, which reveals the diversity of the rules of etiquette and the means of their expression in different peoples, conditioned by special conditions of their historical development, cultural traditions, religions.

The nation's speech netiquette system is made up of relationships and links between all possible etiquette communication formulas. Its structure is defined by the following basic elements of communicative situations: appeals, greetings, forgiveness, apologies, thanks, wishes, requests, acquaintances, congratulations, invitations, offers, advice, consent, refusals, condolences, compliments, oaths, praise, etc., which differ depending on from the system of coordinates of interpersonal communication: when making contact between speakers – formulas of addresses and

greetings; while maintaining contact – formulas of apology, request, thanks, etc.; at termination of contact – formulas of farewell, wishes.

Conclusions to Chapter 1

Speech netiquette is one of the necessary components of human communication. It is a set of standardised speech forms, which are stereotypes of speech, ready-made formulas with a certain syntactic organisation and lexical content. In the speech netiquette of native speakers of different languages, the coordinate system of interpersonal communication is organised in the same way. The rules of etiquette have a unifying (coordinating) character, which reveals the diversity of the rules of etiquette and the means of their expression in different peoples, conditioned by special conditions of their historical development, cultural traditions, religions.

Speech etiquette can be considered in a narrow and broad sense. Speech etiquette in a narrow sense is a formula that ensures that people are accepted in a certain environment, in a certain group of people and in a certain communicative situation, engage in speech contact, maintain communication in the chosen tone. And in a broad sense, these are all rules of speech behaviour, all linguistic permissions and prohibitions related to the social characteristics of speakers, in our case future managers, and their environment, on the one hand, and stylistic resources of the language, on the other.

Speech etiquette is characterized by ritualism (which implies the standard and stereotypicality of etiquette figures) and situationality, variability, dynamics, flexibility and discourse variability.

CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FUNDAMENTALS
OF BUSINESS COMMUNICATION IN INTERNET DISCOURSE
IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

2.1 The problem of business communication

According to O. Selivanova, communication is a purposeful, socially determined process of information exchange between people in different spheres of their cognitive work and creative activity, which is realised mainly through verbal means [Селіванова 2006, p. 571].

Depending on the means of communication, there are two types of communication: <u>speech</u> – with words and sounds, <u>non-speech</u> – with facial expressions and gestures. Depending on the nature and content of the information, R. Lewis identifies the following forms of communication: business, everyday, ritual, intercultural (inter-ethnic), etc. [Льюис 1999, p. 16].

According to ceratin scholars (M. Lukashevych, I. Osechynska, G. Chaika, T. Chmut, etc.), *communication* is a multidimensional, multifunctional, diverse process that has the following characteristics: intergroup, intersocial communication, as well as communication between the individual and the group; by quantitative characteristics of subjects there are self-communication, interpersonal communication and mass communication; by the nature of communication can be indirect and direct, dialogical and monologic; by target communication – anonymous, role-playing, informal [Етика ділового спілкування 2003, p. 50].

N. Butenko, analysing the functions of communication, identifies:

1) contact function – establishing a contact as a state of mutual readiness to receive and transmit messages and maintain interconnection in the form of continuous interoperability; 2) information function – exchange of messages, thoughts, ideas, decisions; 3) incentive function – stimulation of partner activity to direct him / her to perform certain actions; 4) coordination function – mutual

orientation and coordination of actions when organising joint activities; 5) understanding function – adequate perception and understanding of the content of the message and mutual understanding – intentions, guidelines, experiences, states; 6) emotional function – the formation of the necessary emotional experiences with the partner, as well as with the help of their experiences and states; 7) the function of establishing relationships-awareness and fixation of their place in the system of role, status, business, interpersonal and other relations of the community in which the individual operates; 8) influential function – changing the status, behaviour, individually significant states of partners [Бутенко 2004, p. 14–15].

Yu. Palekha proposes a different classification of communication functions. He believes that communication manifests such basic functions as:

– informative and communicative that is connected with all processes that cover the essence of such components of communication, like the transmission and reception of information and the response to it;

– regulatory and communicative, because there is a process of correcting behaviour when a person can influence the motives, the purpose of communication, the programme of actions, decision-making;

– affective and communicative, because there is mutual regulation and mutual correction of behaviour, i.e. a kind of control over the whole sphere of activity of the partner is exercised. Here the possibilities of suggestion, imitation, all possible means of persuasion can be realised [Палеха 2004, p. 25–26].

Communication is a message or factual information transmitted; purposeful process of transmission with the help of a language (language code) of certain content [3, p. 229]; semantic and individual-meaningful aspect of social interaction; exchange of information in various processes of social interaction [Белолипецкий 2004, p. 9]. Comparison of both concepts leads to the conclusion that "communication" can be general in content and specific, which denotes only one of its types (social interaction). In the process of communication, there is a specific interaction of its subjects by means of verbal and non-verbal means, which appears as an act of their interaction. *Interaction* is a process of organised verbal and nonverbal interactions

that occur during communication [Апатова 1994, p. 10]. The term "communication" can be used as a synonym for the term "interaction" in order to emphasize the processes of social interaction considered in the symbolic embodiment [Азимов 1999, p. 28].

O. Leontiev defines *communication* as a kind of human activity in general, speech activity along with work, play, cognitive. It is the activity when the objective is displayed in the subjective image transitions. Ideal speech activity with the use of language code means is one of the manifestations of sign activity of people and its main species, which logically and genetically precedes the rest of its species [Леонтьев 1974, p. 31].

At all times, ***business communication*** was one of the most important components of any business, the main means of interaction within its business and an important level of influence of one of its subjects on others. The success of business is determined be the properly conducted business negotiations, a well-crafted agreement or a skilful justification of a proposal at the end.

Business communication can be understood in a narrow and broad sense. In a broad sense, *business communication* is a process of speech interaction between people, in which speech activity, information and experience are exchanged in order to achieve a certain result [Колтунова 2000, p. 47]. In a narrow sense, business communication is a type of communication in business organisations, characterised by a specific functional style and culture (code) of behaviour and the speech etiquette of business communication. Business communication usually takes place under official conditions, because it is based on the principles of cooperation and rivalry, and the intentions of the interlocutors are as follows:

1) to give, receive or exchange the necessary information; 2) agree on an issue of interest to the interlocutors; 3) to assure the partner of the correct decision; 4) to establish contact, business relations, while maintaining a certain status and role [Мескон 1993, p. 287]. The following scholars N. Gez, B. Golovin, V. Derkachenko, O. Lavrinenko, and Y. Palekha define *business communication* as a specific form of contacts and interaction of people who represent not only themselves but also their

organisations [Гез 1985; Головин 1998; Деркаченко 2004]. Such communication, according to Yu. Palekh, involves the exchange of information, proposals, requirements, views, motivation to solve specific problems both inside and outside the organisation, as well as concluding agreements, contracts or establishing other relationships between enterprises, firms, organisations [Палеха 2004, p. 15].

Business communication is a special layer of literary language, which is distinguished by vocabulary, semantics, certain composite forms, practically suitable for conducting business papers, business correspondence [Андреев 1995, p. 288].

Yu. Palekh highlights the following the peculiarities of business communication: 1) the presence of certain official status of objects; 2) focus on establishing mutually beneficial contacts and maintaining relationships between representatives of mutual interest organisations; 3) compliance with certain generally recognised and generally accepted rules; 4) predictability of previously planned business contacts, determination of their purpose, content and possible consequences; 5) constructive nature of the relationship, their orientation to the solution of specific tasks, the achievement of a specific goal, mostly without going beyond a certain circle; 6) coherence of decisions, agreement and further organisation of partner interaction; 7) the importance of every partner as an individual; 8) direct activity that people are engaged in, not problems that disturb their inner world [Палеха 2004, p. 20–21].

According to G. Andreyeva, the following stages can be distinguished in business communication: greetings, conversations of the interlocutors to each other; question, problem, request, one-party proposal; active listening and sharing of information; formulation of ideas, versions, hypotheses, problem solving; finding the best way to solve the problem, the issue; decision-making; completion of communication (wishes for mutual success, expression of plans for the future) [Андреева 1996, p. 47].

Business communication, like communication in general, performs certain functions. The analysis of the scientific literature showed that the scholars differently distinguish the functions of business communication.

F. Khmil offers his position concerning the functions of business communication. He believes that business communication performs communicative (exchange of information), interactive (exchange of actions), perceptual (mutual perception and establishment of mutual understanding between communication partners) functions. Their implementation is a prerequisite for the effectiveness of business communication. It is necessary for the manager to know and skillfully use all his types, types and forms [Хміль 2004, р. 26].

The important role in business communication is played by various forms of joint discussion of problems. Thanks to them, people are active in their decision-making, influence decision-making and implementation. The high culture of collective discussion directly contributes to the spiritual enrichment of members of society and, consequently, to the acceleration of democratic processes in the country, to the improvement of people's material well-being. Collective discussions include meetings, rallies, talks, discussions and brainstorming [Уедерспан 1993, р. 144].

Thus, an analysis of the problem of business communication has revealed that *business communication* is a necessary component of any successful business in today's economic space. It is defined as the verbal communication of people who represent not only themselves but also their organisations and includes the exchange of information, suggestions, requirements, views, motivation to solve specific problems both inside and outside the organisation, as well as covers such types of business oral communication as: image creation, business telephony, business talks, audience communication, public relations. Therefore, it should be noted that in order to have successful business communication, one is to have a business speech etiquette that deserves detailed study, which we represent in the next chapter.

2.2 Business writing in Internet discourse

The written form of human interaction is traced in the focus of the development of intercultural communication, where the notions of "communication" and "interaction» are observed. Therefore, clarifying the terminological area of our

study,attention is paid to the specifics of written communication in the intercultural context of its implementation.

Let us dwell on the following questions: a) to reveal the main characteristic features of intercultural communication, b) to define the role of writing in intercultural contacts between people, c) to identify the functions of writing as a form of intercultural communication in comparison with oral speech. This will allow us to determine the theoretical fundamentals for ascertaining *the role of business writing in intercultural communication*.

The review of numerous works shows that nowadays more and more scholars are turning to the theory and practice of intercultural communication (hereinafter referred to as IC). It became clear that in order to solve problems of intercultural communication it is necessary to unite the efforts of representatives of different sciences. This phenomenon is considered through the linguistics (E. M. Vereshchagin, V. G. Kostomarov, V. N. Teliya, S. G. Ter-Minasov, etc.), psycholinguistics (A. A. Zalevskaya, A. A. Leontyev et al.), sociolinguistics (M. V. Garayeva, A. S. Izotova, V. I. Karasik, V. P. Konetskaya, N. B. Mechkovskaya, etc.), linguistics (N. V. Baryshnikov, G. Yelizarova, V. V. Safonova, V. P. Furmanova, I. I. Khaleyeva, etc.). Thus, it can be seen that the importance of the IC has spread to the whole field of humanitarian, interdisciplinary knowledge.

Due to the fact that a certain amount of information has been accumulated on the issue of determining the nature and specificity of IC, recent publications, according to a number of contemporary scholars (O. A. Leontovich, S. L. Mishlanova, T. M. Permyakova), do not focus on the definitions of this phenomenon. As a result, "the IC value either" slips "or is accepted by default" [Мишланова, 2005, p. 340]. Taking into account the latter, as well as understanding the need to determine a solid and reliable basis for solving the research problem, we set ourselves the task that accompanies the main tasks – on a scientific basis to determine the wording of IC, basic for the work; from these positions it will become possible to establish the role and specifics of business writing.

The analysis of the literature (N. V. Baryshnikov, G. M. Vereshchagin, V. G. Kostomarov, T. G. Hrushevitska, V. D. Popkov, A. P. Sadokhin, G. V. Yelizarova, O A. Leontovich, S. L. Mishlanova, V. V. Safonova, S. G. Ter-Minasova, I. I. Khaleyeva) showed that there are currently different definitions of the notion of *intercultural communication*. In the vast majority of scientific literature (T. G. Hrushevitska, V. D. Popkov, A. P. Sadokhin, S. G. Ter-Minasova,) its interpretation is made through a combination of key components – communication and culture, because "communication cannot be separated from the cultural context" [Гутнова, 2000, p. 11].

As a consequence of this basic perspective, intercultural communication is interpreted as "an adequate understanding of two participants in a communicative act belonging to different national cultures" [Верещагин, Костомаров 1990, p. 13]. Other scholars are expanding the range of forms and types of manifestations of intercultural communication, not limiting this process exclusively to mutual understanding. From their point of view, IC suggests "a combination of diverse forms of relations and communication between individuals and groups belonging to different cultures" [Грушевицкая 2002, p. 142]. I. I. Khaleyeva writes about the same: "Intercultural communication is a set of specific processes of interaction between communication partners belonging to different cultures and languages» [Халеева 2000, p. 11].

Thus, the main indicator of IC is the totality of relations between communicants belonging to different cultures.

We note, first of all, that for effective intercultural communication it is desirable that the nature of these relations be as favorable as possible for the goals of both communication partners. In this case, mutual understanding is achieved, and it is this that is the result of intercultural interaction. According to G. V. Yelizarova, "the productivity of intercultural communication is determined by the achievement of mutually beneficial results. A condition for achieving such results is mutual understanding, and its condition is the creation of a common meaning for the participants in the communication" [Елизарова 2001, p. 21].

A review of numerous works (G. M. Andreyeva, T. N. Astafurova, S. V. Borisnev, M. A. Vasilik, I. S. Volskaya, A. L. Zhuravlyov, O. L. Kamenska, V. B. Kashkin, A. A. Leontyev, B. F. Lomov, N. N. Razgovorova, etc.) indicates that in the process of any communication in the native culture, oral and written communication is performed a number of identical functions – contact, information, incentive, emotive, etc. At the same time, "each of the selected functions contributes to the process of successful communication" [Астафурова 1997, p. 14].

In order to achieve the successful implementation of the understanding function in the context of intercultural interaction, it is especially important to take into account the specifics of the written form of communication. In this case, it is possible both to "extract from the text its own, "textual meaning"(A. A. Leontyev), and "discretion in the message of some content that is not in the text itself. The meaning in this case is not extracted from the text, but from the communicator's objective world, from the real motives of his activity" [Социальная психология, 2003, p. 78]. This is due to the fact that the information that forms the fundamentals of intercultural communication does not exist in isolation, but "against the background of a culturally determined picture of the world" [Леонтович 2005, p. 40].

Therefore, the main function of the written form of intercultural communication is not just the exchange of information, but "the exchange of meaning, content of information" [Бориснев 2003, p. 17], in which there is mutual interaction between the communicants, leading either to mutual understanding or to confrontation. The latter become the goal and result of intercultural communication in this context.

Other functions are subordinate to the function of exchanging the content of information. Let us consider them in more detail, since it is precisely at the level of their study that the differences between oral and written intercultural communication are especially pronounced. At the same time, we focus on the business sphere of interaction (oral and written) of two multilingual communicants. In addition, we strive to establish dependencies between the identified functions of written business

communication and IC indicators in order to trace the role of these functions in the implementation of the latter.

With the help of a written and oral form of business communication, an exchange of information takes place, necessarily accompanied by intellectual, psychological, emotional, professional impact, while expressing personal and collective positions, people's views.

The above-mentioned allows us to determine the following function of business communication – the impact on the addressee, manifested in the "achievement of the goal by convincing the interlocutor and prompting him to action» [Каменская 1988, p. 15]. Moreover, as indicated by G. V. Elizarova, this function "can only be realised if all participants in the IC recognise some signs or symbols as incentive" [Елизарова 2005, p. 100].

In this regard, it should be noted that in the process of oral interaction, the success of achieving the result desired by the producer of the statement is most likely, almost guaranteed. This is explained by the nature of the oral language itself – the possibility of using gestures, facial expressions, etc. in direct contact with the interlocutor. As for written speech, as A. A. Kazantseva points out, due to its specific features, the acting nature of the written statement is complicated because it requires maximum the use of emotionally expressive syntactic and other means in order to optimally influence the addressee [Казанцева 2004, p. 35]. It is significant that this is why the text of a business letter as a unity of verbal and non-verbal means should be considered as a "polycode text", which "represents the most effective form of presentation of information in terms of impact on the addressee" [Винарская 1995, p. 21].

From the foregoing, it follows that, with the unity of the function of influencing the addressee, **written business communication** differs significantly from the oral form of communication. This must be taken into account when implementing effective intercultural interaction in order to achieve mutual understanding. In addition to the above-mentioned, we note that the functions of business communication are not limited only to information areas, it is "not only the transfer

of administrative, instructive, strategic information, but also the management of people's activities" [Основы теории коммуникации 2003, p. 281].

Thus, another function of verbal and written communication, which is reflected in the business sphere, is the management function, which consists of "regulating the behaviour and direct organisation of joint activities of people in the process of their interaction" [Журавлев 1999, p. 187]. Moreover, the implementation of this function is possible only taking into account the specifics of IC, during which it is necessary "an adequate perception of the system of values that govern each other's behavior" [Парыгин 1999, p. 180]. In this regard, the control function is directly related to such an IC parameter as the communicants' awareness of their "otherness".

2.3 The characteristics of business letter in Internet discourse

The basic unit of the process of intercultural written business communication is *the text of a business letter*, and naturally, it could not fail to attract our attention. When analysing this phenomenon, they were forced to admit the presence of certain difficulties in its study. These difficulties are due to the fact that the text is currently being considered in two aspects: *text* as the product of speech activity and *text* as discourse. At the same time, the concepts of "text" and "discourse" are used by scholars in different ways – either as differing, or as interchangeable. In this regard, to clarify the terminology used in the study, it is necessary to form an idea of the specifics of these phenomena. We will use this representation in the course of our study.

So, in the process of presenting this section, we intend to solve the following problems: firstly, to study the essence of the text-discourse dichotomy in the linguistic perspective of its consideration, secondly, to determine the specifics of the written text/discourse, revealing its characterological features, and thirdly, to determine the quality parameters of the business written text /discourse – the subject of our consideration. The data obtained in the course of solving these problems will

help us comprehensively determine the basic concept for our work – "business letter".

The analysis of the literature shows that the term "discourse" is considered in many works as *linguistic* (B. Ye. Aznauryan, N. A. Balandina, M. K. Bisimaliyeva, T. A. van Dijk, Yu. N. Karaulov, O. S. Kubryakova, etc.), *sociolinguistic* (V. I. Karasik, O. S. Syshchikov, etc.), and *linguodidactic* (N. V. Yelukhina, L. V. Kaplich, A. V. Konobeyev, R. P. Milrod, S. N. Musulbes, N. B. Khokhlova, Ye. S. Chuykova, etc.) *positions*.

We begin our analysis with the assertion of many scholars that a single, generally accepted definition of discourse has not yet been developed, the term "discourse" itself is interpreted differently by different scholars. According to a number of scholars (T. A. van Dijk, N. V. Yelukhina, Yu. N. Karaulov, Yu. A. Sinitsa, etc.), ***the discourse*** is understood as a speech work that along with the linguistic characteristics inherent in the text, it also has extralinguistic parameters. These, in particular, include participants in communication, their communicative goals and intentions, pragmatic attitudes, social roles, background knowledge about the conditions of communication. ***The text*** is "a sequence of symbolic units united by semantic connection, the main properties of which are connectedness and integrity" [ЛЭС 1990, p. 507].

Meanwhile, the notion of discourse has its own distinctive features. A number of scholars (B. Ye. Aznauryan, N. D. Arutyunova, Ye. V. Kovshikova, O. S. Kubryakova, etc.) compare discourse with the text on the basis of dynamics/statics, completeness/incompleteness. The text is treated as a static complete work, considered outside the communication situation, but discourse – as a dynamic, not always completed and situationally determined speech event: discourse is "speech immersed in life" [Арутюнова 1990, p. 137]. In other words, the text is static and complete, the discourse is dynamic and not always complete. In this regard, it is worth emphasising that discourse is not opposed to the text, but is "the embodiment of a communicative approach to studying the text" [Каплич 1996, p. 10]. In this

understanding, "discourse is a text plus communicatively significant circumstances in which this text is updated" [Азнаурьян 2005, p. 12].

In general, it can be noted that the notion of "discourse" is associated with the analysis of the language segment as a process, taking into account the participants in this event, their knowledge, as well as the prevailing communication situation. The notion of "text" refers to the analysis of the language segment as a product, and here, according to M. K. Bisimaliyeva, "attention is mainly paid to the formal means of communication of its parts" [Бисималиева 1999, p. 82]. Thus, the text is "a special result of the process of speech" [Кубрякова 2004, p. 516]. The above-mentioned is confirmed by L. V. Kaplich, who suggests using the term "text", speaking about the product of speech activity, its characteristics, qualities, and using the term "discourse", implying the process of creating a statement [Каплич 1996, p. 10].

Consideration of textual competence is carried out by a number of scholars. In particular, N. P. Perfiliyev, who proposes to interpret this competency as "a set of ideas, knowledge, skills that reflect the image of the text that has developed in the minds of the linguocultural collective, and ensure the generation of the speech work as a hierarchically ordered whole in accordance with the intent of the speaker" [Перфильева 2006, p. 12].

M. Ya. Dymarsky specifies the notion of textual competence in details, interpreting that it os not only from the standpoint of the scholar ("The Speaker", according to N. P. Perfiliyeva), but also from the standpoint of the addressee (reader). The scholar emphasizes the multi-level nature of this phenomenon and suggests that the levels of this competence are a complex formation, the structure of which is, on the one hand, the disintegration of the general idea (analysis), and on the other, the author's ability to provide "an adequate reconstruction (synthesis) of the whole reader" (M. Ya. Dymarsky).

So, judging by the information available, *textual competence* is designed to generate and adequately perceive high-quality text messages that meet the requirements of a particular linguosocium.

The discursive competence has an unconditional resemblance to textual competence, while having quite tangible features. Taking into account our analysis, a much larger number of works is devoted to discursive competence. Its importance for full-fledged intercultural communication is noted by many scholars (T. A. van Dijk, N. V. Yelukhina, O. I. Kucherenko, Yu. A. Sinitsa, etc.).

It is worth noting that the formation of discursive competence in the field of written foreign language communication has its own specifics, due to the psychological, psycholinguistic and linguistic characteristics of this form of speech. As indicated by N. P. Golovin, on the one hand, in the formation of discursive competence in writing, the role of the text is great, on the other hand, the analysis and consideration of the parameters of the extralinguistic context is of particular difficulty, because a written work is usually created outside the immediate communicative situation [Головина 2004, p. 7].

All of the above-mentioned serves as a basis for us to formulate conclusions that are relevant to the subject of our consideration – ***a business letter***. From the point of view of the represented fundamentals, *a business letter*, on the one hand, should be qualified as a business text (as a product of written activity in the business sphere of communication), and on the other hand, as a form of business written discourse (as a process of implementing written business communication). The process of generating business writing should also be considered from two perspectives: on the one hand, as a textual one, and on the other, as a discursive activity.

In connection with what has been said in this section, we intend to draw attention to both the productive and the procedural aspects of written business communication, therefore it is important for us to highlight the characteristics of a business letter a) as a text and b) as a discourse. Setting these guidelines for ourselves, we are based on the idea of the indissolubility of these two sides of written business communication: it is the integrative view that will reveal the most complete picture, the full range of aspects (linguistic and extralinguistic) that reveal the specifics of business writing (this is the purpose of this part of the work).

The study of linguistic literature devoted to text/discourse (I. R. Halperin, N. S. Valgina, A. A. Kazantseva, L. V. Kaplich, O. S. Kubryakova, S. N. Musulbes, N. B. Khokhlova, A. V. Jung, etc.), allows us to state that each text / discourse is evaluated by a whole range of criteria. The main components of these criteria are:

1) information and structural qualities, which include connectivity, consistency, accuracy, clarity and accessibility;

2) tonal (stylistic) qualities (correctness, purity, speech culture) [Валгина 2003, p. 183].

All of these parameters fully apply to the analysis of written text/discourse. Comparing them with the specifics of written business communication, we can conclude that the same criteria should characterise a business written text/discourse, because only their combination contributes to the implementation of the main function of IC in writing – the understanding function.

The main feature of the written discourse is considered connectivity, expressed "in the consistent semantic coordination of the statements included in the discourse" [Мусульбес 2005, p. 11]. The logical and semantic unity of business written discourse is achieved through means of connectivity that not only "turn a set of individual thoughts into text, but also activate the degree of their impact on the recipient" [Ibid., p. 12].

Along with connectivity, the qualitative characteristics of all written discourses, including business discourse, include integrity, which, although it may be accompanied by connectivity, does not depend on it. The integrity of the text is defined as the global connection of the components of the text at the substantive level. It is supported by keywords and their alternatives [Валгина 2003, p. 164]. With regard to the discourse of business writing, integrity is associated with its compositional form, which is expressed in the construction of the statement in accordance with a certain scheme.

Our analysis allowed us to conclude that the indicated characteristics of business writing – coherence and integrity – are directly related to the implementation of certain functions of intercultural business written communication.

We are talking about the management functions and the impact on the addressee. This dependence is caused by the fact that only a coherent, well-structured business letter can have a certain impact on the recipient – a partner in intercultural business written communication. This helps the writer to show himself as a competent specialist, which means that the self-presentation function will be implemented. In addition, it is a coherent and integral business letter that fully contributes to the removal of barriers that inevitably arise in the process of intercultural business written communication.

Written discourse, as O. L. Kamenskaya writes, "really functions only in interaction with the addressee", and in the process of such interaction, part of the content that is inserted by the author and perceived by the addressee can be omitted, and part can be added from oneself, interpreted [Каменская 1988, p. 129]. Consequently, one more qualitative characteristic of written discourse is addressing, which is especially relevant in relation to business written discourse, because "taking into account a specific recipient determines the success and mutual understanding between partners in professional activities" [Казанцева 2004, p. 27]. This position becomes especially significant when it comes to business written communication in an environment of intercultural communication. In this case, the achievement of the IC's goal is facilitated by the possession of "a set of both linguistic and extralinguistic means, due to the specificity of the national-cultural mentality of a communicant-foreign phone" [Ibid., p. 37].

In addition to the above-mentioned, it is necessary to emphasise the role of such a parameter of business writing as situationality. Its significance is determined by the fact that any discourse appears and functions in a specific socio-cultural context, in a particular linguistic and cultural community. Therefore, the understanding of the textual activity of a foreign phone and building a high-quality business written discourse is possible only on the basis of knowledge of a system of regional geographic background knowledge that is characteristic for one or another foreign language culture (Yu. A. Sinitsa). As a result, "situational characteristics of

communication and, above all, the characteristics of participants in communication" come to the fore with this approach [Азнаурьян 2005, p. 12]

Awareness of the essence of the indicated qualitative characteristics of a business letter makes us think that the function of influencing the addressee, the control function, and the contact-setting function are directly correlated with the considered parameters.

The leading characteristics of a business letter include informativeness, which is "one of the factors of the effectiveness of semantic perception and an adequate interpretation of the message" [Ковшикова 1997, p. 11].

In this regard, it is worth noting that often in the texts of a business letter, information content does not correspond to the consumer load of the document and it is not synonymous with useful information, unlike private letters. This is due to the fact that one of the requirements for business communication is the brevity of presentation, and this, according to N. Yu. Chigridova, in some ways contradicts the "information completeness strategy". Meanwhile, the presence of this characteristic suggests that the communicant should "proceed from saving time, material, linguistic and paralinguistic means and at the same time dose information based on its necessity and sufficiency, and also take into account the presuppositions and ideas of his addressee about the writing genre" [Чигридова 2000, p. 17]. Such an aspiration is connected with the general law of language saving, and in the case of intercultural business written communication, with a reduction in the physical length of the speech message, its greater semantic capacity and compactness [Нгуен Тхи Бик Лан 2006, p. 13]. Consequently, the information in business correspondence should not be redundant, but at the same time it should be sufficiently complete, since this is one of the main conditions ensuring "communicative efficiency" (N. D. Golev) of a business letter.

Uniformity of speech means and their frequent repeatability, as well as cliched business letters contribute to conciseness. As indicated by S. Yu. Fedyurko, "standardisation provides many conveniences both from the technical side, and in terms of perception". In particular, every standard contributes to the normalisation of

relations between people, which is especially important when it comes to communicants belonging to different linguistic and cultural communities. Therefore, document cliches are an indicator of the level of language culture of documents [Федюрко 2002, p. 15].

The above-mentioned indicates that the indicated parameter – conciseness – achieved through the use of cliches and stereotypes, contributes to the implementation of such functions of business written communication as the functions of recording and storing information and supporting oral communication, as well as the self-presentation function.

Any business letter must be reasoned, i.e. convincing. This is due to such functions as the function of influencing the addressee, the control function. "The art of persuading» business correspondence is especially important, because it is due to the need to acquire a customer or consumer product, supporter or like-minded person in business relationships. The main condition for achieving a reasoned business letter is evidence, namely correctly selected and accurate facts.

In connection with the requirement of clarity and argumentativeness of a business written presentation, there is a need for updating, when it is generated, such a qualitative parameter as consistency, which implies such qualities of the text as "consistency in the presentation of the material, the consistency of thought, clarity and sufficiency of reasoning, the ratio of the general and private [Валгина 2003, p. 171].

In this regard, it is worth noting that the logic of thought is most directly expressed precisely in business texts, because logical violations in business written communication flowing in the context of IC can lead to serious distortions of the truth that impede the achievement of the goals of IC. This is due to the fact that logic contributes to the implementation of such functions as the control function, the function of establishing contact, the function of removing barriers to communication.

One of the generally recognised qualities of business communication is neutrality, realised through stylistically neutral, general literary vocabulary (A. N. Vasiliyeva, B. N. Golovin, I. B. Golub, M. N. Kozhina, T. P. Pleschenko, G. Ya.

Solganik, etc.). This characteristic, in turn, is associated with such a feature as objectivity, when "subjective moments are minimized" [Федюрко 2002, p. 9].

Along with the recognition of the role of these parameters, it is legitimate to indicate that the text of the business letter refers to documents of a low level of standardisation (in comparison with other business papers). This, according to Ye. V. Kovshikova, allows the author of a business letter "to create a text to a certain extent authorial, i.e. bring in a given standardised form the traits of an individual style, using, for example, emotionally colored vocabulary, exclamatory and interrogative sentences" [Ковшикова 1997, p. 9]. This is due to the fact that a business letter is characterised by more flexible possibilities for the realisation of a communicative intention than other genres of business writing (order, agenda, notice, reference) [Федюрко 2002, p. 11]. This is also confirmed by N. Yu. Chigridova, who points out that in recent years there has been a tendency to abandon ceremonies and heaviness of style, the norm is the naturalness of business speech. The scholar even reveals the "expressivity strategy" in business letters, which allows the communicant to express himself and express emotions [Чигридова 2000, p. 14].

The above-mentioned allows us to conclude that such parameters as expressiveness, emotionality and expressiveness are also inherent in a business letter. As a result, speech becomes "emotionally personal and, consequently, deeply acting" [Тутатчикова 2003, p. 21]. This means that these characteristics contribute to the implementation of such functions of business written communication as the functions of influencing the addressee, management functions, and contact-setting functions. In addition, the presence of these parameters of business writing indicates a high culture of writing, as expressiveness is recognised (A. N. Vasiliyeva, B. N. Golovin, I. B. Golub, M. N. Kozhina, T. P. Pleschenko, etc.) is one of those main features of speech, testifying to its perfection. Perfect speech is one of the conditions that helps participants in intercultural communication to get an idea of each other. It is about the implementation of the self-presentation function.

The presence of expressiveness, emotionality relieves the participants of the IC from the so-called communicative errors, which are a kind of barrier, and therefore

hindering the effectiveness of intercultural written communication. Such errors are considered as "inability to convey denotative information within the framework of connotative", which, among other things, expresses the "emotional state of the subject" [Копыловская 2000, p. 9]. Therefore, these characteristics provide direct assistance in the implementation of such a function of written communication as the function of removing barriers to communication.

It should be emphasised that the expressiveness of business writing is of a different nature compared to oral speech. It can be called "intellectual-logical" expressiveness. It is carried out by a more careful selection of appropriate language tools, more abstract vocabulary, more complex sentences, by more logical coherence of thoughts and a clearer division of the text into paragraphs [Тутатчикова 2003, p. 21]. And as a result, it contributes to a more efficient fixation and storage of written information.

Summarizing the above-mentioned, it can be noted that the integral qualitative characteristics of the "good, high-quality" (L. V. Kaplich) business written discourse are: connectedness, integrity, consistency, addressability, situationality, interpretability, accuracy, informativeness, conciseness, objectivity, reasonedness, expressiveness/emotionality/expressiveness.

It should be noted that the peculiarity of the mentioned parameters of the discourse is that they, according to I. V. Karasik, significantly change their essential characteristics depending on the format of the text. In addition, according to N. Yu. Chigridova, none of the listed characteristics has an absolute character, i.e. it is not dominant and capable of guaranteeing the stability and success of business communication, but only their combination indicates the quality of business written discourse.

Their special "impact" on the quality of written business discourse is due to the fact that these characteristics ensure the implementation of the basic functions of business intercultural communication, and therefore contribute to the realisation of the goals of participants in intercultural communication.

Conclusions to Chapter 2

Business communication can be understood in a narrow and broad sense. In a broad sense, business communication is a process of speech interaction between people, in which speech activity, information and experience are exchanged in order to achieve a certain result.

Business communication is a special layer of literary language, which is distinguished by vocabulary, semantics, certain composite forms, practically suitable for conducting business papers, business correspondence

Business communication are not limited only to information areas, it is "not only the transfer of administrative, instructive, strategic information, but also the management of people's activities".

The above-mentioned allows us to conclude that such parameters as expressiveness, emotionality and expressiveness are also inherent in a business letter. As a result, speech becomes "emotionally personal and, consequently, deeply acting". This means that these characteristics contribute to the implementation of such functions of business written communication as the functions of influencing the addressee, management functions, and contact-setting functions.

CHAPTER 3
LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH SPEECH ETIQUETTE
IN ONLINE COMMUNICATION: PRACTICAL APPROACHES

3.1 National and cultural specifics of English business etiquette in online communication

T. Ritchenko and N. Tatarkova argue that the constructiveness of business communication is often hindered by all sorts of communication barriers. These include: social barriers – political, religious, etc., which generate misunderstandings, suspicion, and they lead to blocking interpersonal communication; ethno-cultural barriers are national and cultural features that influence the perception of other peoples, their traditions and habits are perceived as the norm, their absence in others – as a disadvantage; psychological barriers are individual characteristics of a person (seclusion, shyness, persistence, etc.); psychological relations of those who communicate (mutual sympathy, dislike, incompatibility, etc.); lack of necessary communication skills [Рытченко 2008, p. 28].

While conducting business online, one must maintain a professional and courteous demeanor at all times. Online business etiquette, not unlike offline business etiquette, calls for attention to grammar, tone and discretion. The difference lies in the fact that, once one puts something on the Internet, he/she cannot take it back. Whether one is emailing a business prospect or updating a Facebook business page, it is needed to make sure whether one is sending the right message about the company and himselfself/herself.

Email messages should be professional and concise. Multiple-page email messages are less likely to be read. One should fill in the "Subject" field as accurately as possible, particularly when exchanging multiple email messages with the same person. This will make it easier to find and file messages after receipt. One should use correct punctuation and spelling to increase credibility and work with black text and standard fonts to convey formality and reduce the chances of being blocked by

spam filters. Salutations should be courteous, referencing proper titles, such as "Mrs." or "Dr." unless a first-name basis is established. Most email programs have a signature feature that automatically generates a professional sign-off. A company email address should be used for work-related matters only. One must refrain from sending jokes, chain letters and forwards, regardless of how cute, insightful or funny they may seem. Before sending large files one must get permission and cross-check software compatibility.

Good communication is essential for the overall health of business. Internal and external written and oral communication represents the level of professionalism in the company. Inappropriate business communication can damage client relationships, lower morale among employees and negatively affect the company's reputation. Clear guidelines in writing for employees on what is appropriate and expected must be created in all forms of communication to avoid the consequences of bad communication.

From memos to reports, one should never deviate from a professional tone in written business communication. Eschew the use of humor and avoid a patronizing tone. Tailor the communication to the intended audience. Highly technical industry jargon is often inappropriate for general documents. Writing must be clear and concise and the use of abbreviations must be limited. The documents must be formatted correctly and kept streamlined. Fancy embellishments are unnecessary in business documents.

Email is often perceived as a less formal method of communication than printed letters and memos, but one should discourage that attitude among employees, particularly for communication with clients. Inappropriate emails include the use of emoticons, slang and abbreviations of the type used in texting. Encourage employees to create emails in the same way they would a traditional business letter, with a standard greeting and full signature that includes the company logo or name. Before sending emails to recipients, grammar and spelling must be checked properly.

With the prevalence of email and texting among employees, telephone etiquette is sometimes lost or never learned. Inappropriate telephone communication

ranges from rudeness to poor customer service. Employees should be instructed to speak politely, be honest, avoid putting calls on speakerphone and be patient, even with rude customers. Cell phones enable employees to conduct business in places other than the office, but give thought to surroundings when taking or making business calls. Loud background noises can be distracting and annoying during an important call.

Most forms of texting are inappropriate to use in a business setting. The informality reflects on the professionalism of the company, and it's far too easy to create misunderstandings with texting. An email or telephone call is a better method for scheduling appointments, making requests or communicating an important idea. Texting in business situations is often done surreptitiously at inappropriate times, such as during meetings, and should be discouraged.

Non-verbal etiquette of online business communication involves the use of different psychological techniques. In the speech communication of business people, compliments are very important – pleasant words expressing approval, positive evaluation of business activity, emphasising taste in clothing, appearance, balance of actions of a partner, i.e. the evaluation of the mind of a business partner. A compliment is a necessary part of speech etiquette. In business communication, there is always a real opportunity for compliments. They inspire your business partner. Online business etiquette implies steadfast adherence to negotiating the rules of conduct of the partner country. The rules of communication of people are connected with the way and style of life, national customs and traditions [Уедерспан 1993, p. 10].

The rules of online English business etiquette require the use of a specific code, i.e. a limited number of lexical units, mostly stamps, ready-made language stencils, which correspond to typical situations of business communication. Adhering to such a code, which is the vocabulary of business documents and business contacts, helps to save the time and effort of the addressee, and the neutral style of presentation – the absence of ambiguous or emotionally colored words – best suits the purpose of

business communication. For the most part, the word in business speech actualises only its denotative meaning, which ensures the unambiguity, clarity of the message.

One can emphasise the following rules of online business communication in English:

– understanding your expression is related to the construction of the sentence. Long sentences are complex and grammatically unclear. To understand them, a partner needs a lot of focus and attention. Long sentences make it difficult to understand the question, meaning is often lost in subordinate sentences;

– short sentences (8-15 words) consist of completed thoughts. These are accurate and effective statements. Short sentences evoke a mutual feeling; they are always visual;

– it is recommended to use verbs rather than nouns more often in online business communication. Verbs add expressiveness, but nouns are predominantly semantic. The use of verbs helps to form a specific picture from a fuzzy representation. It is also necessary to do without adjectives – they are very personal;

– the verb becomes «more alive» if the expression uses its active rather than passive form, for example: *I invited him* and not *he was invited*. The liability affects impersonally, creates a certain distance between partners, carries a minimal emotional load;

– formulations such as: *«According to this it is possible to understand that ...»*, as well as statements containing large numbers, act remotely and impersonally. The use of conditional sentences: *«I would say ...», «I would consider ...», «I should have ...», «I should have ...»* do not express a decisive act, but they create a distance between the interlocutors.

There is also a problem when the partner does not fully understand or otherwise interpret the meaning of the words or expressions that they have. The meaning of the oral word partner either expands or narrows. The more abstract the concept, the more meaningful it can be interpreted. It is often necessary to clarify concepts at the very beginning of the conversation, to tell the partner that you understand specifically. Therefore, it is necessary to formulate their statements

briefly, but not concisely; simply avoid expressions in another foreign language; sentences should not be more than 5–10 words, should be clear and understandable [Бройніг 2006, p. 20].

The specificity of communicative behaviour, the national style of verbal communication, argues Y. Kuzmenkov, determined by the type of culture, which is defined and normative, business etiquette and social norms [Кузьменкова 2005, p. 2].

The formality of English language culture becomes a factor of particular concern in interlingual communication. After all, this specific feature of speech behaviour of members of the English society often leads to the fact that the tone dissonant for the native speaker is perceived as an indicator of hostility, irritation or dissatisfaction with the speaker.

Among the stamps used in English-language business communication, T. Gritsenko distinguishes the so-called *commercial jargon*, which is advised to avoid primarily when writing or negotiating, for example: *Enclosed please find* instead of *I enclose*, the same instead of *it* or *them*, our conversation instead of *with reference to your letter / to our conversation, your communication to hand* instead of *We have received your letter* [Гриценко 2007, p. 13].

It is also worth noting the absence in the English business culture of a pronounced (and strictly adhered to by the English-speaking peoples) tradition of writing thank-you letters and greeting postcards to business partners.

The lack of frankness in communication, self-control and endurance of the British, the constant «next smile» of the American and his deliberate attachment to the interlocutor can be a kind of defensive reaction, the desire to «retain personality», always «to keep youthful», not to give appearance, if something is «wrong» [Веселов 1990, p. 27].

It is worth noting that although the word «etiquette» in its modern sense was used in English as early as the middle of the XVII century, it is striking that in everyday British communication is not so often resorted to refined manners, leaving a showy courtesy sometimes only in business. Also noteworthy is the fact that

politeness in modern English-speaking cultures is focused on the desire to preserve one's identity, distance oneself from one's interlocutor and find a compromise that provides the necessary comfortable atmosphere of conflict-free business communication. Quite typical are the phrases: *Hello, everyone, let's get the meeting going* or *Listen, got to think more about your offer*.

The nature of the interaction of the participants in the traditions of English-speaking cultures also has strictly regulated rules that determine the activity of participation in the conversation, the frequency of participation in it, the frequency and duration of participation. The replicas of all the interlocutors should be appropriate and relatively short; talk at the same time, interrupt is not accepted, the «relay» shows the pauses that must be completed, constantly provide communicative support to each other through various formal «attention signals», which extend even to invitations and compliments.

However, to speak seriously about the professional interests of one of the business partners or interlocutors (to talk shop) in a large company is not acceptable – the lack of a common communication base is a violation of the principle of equality of partners. Also, in the English-speaking business environment, a disapproving attitude towards the open expression of emotions at the linguistic (lexical) level is traced: in negative connotations of the adjectives emotional, demonstrative, excitable, effusive, as well as the verbs of emotions s*ulk, fret, fume, rave hunger / sad / angry instead of rejoice / pine / fume / rage*. A distinctive feature of the English address to an unfamiliar addressee is an address without a nominative basis (*Hi, Hello* or *Excuse me*).

At the grammar level, English business communication's etiquette implies the use of Future Simple to construct commonly used order formulas and instructions: *Should have to ask you to sign it; You still need to sign it again; Will you join our meeting in 10 minutes?* instead of the command method *Sign it! Sign it again! Join us in 10 minutes!* Modal Verbs are most often used when asking, inviting, asking: *Could / would you lend me your printer? Would you care to follow our assistant upstairs? Might it be alright to do this way?*.

Question constructs with verbs *could, would, might* – traditional ways of expressing a polite request, suggestion or thought, critical remarks that might otherwise sound more imperative or categorical: *Could / Would you do that for me? –* instead of *Will you do that for me? Suppose we could / might find another solution? –* instead of *We should find another solution! You could / might tell me before reading my report. –* instead of *You should read my report!*

Conditional verbs are permissible for different types of inquiries and guidance because they can add tactile, unobtrusive questions to the questions and make them less definite: *Where exactly could you leave your resume?*

Recommendations and wishes, personal questions and denials of requests also sound more tactful in a conditional way: *I'd rather you. I wish you would. Really like.* The prompts are usually presented in the form of a question: *I suppose you will find the time for it now? I suppose you are very busy now? You have seen my report yet, have you?*

Also no direct objection technique is used: *I am not pleased with his statement. I could think I could particularly agree with it. He has told me something special about it* and the technique of hidden and double denial: *He's got a little idea how business works. I hardly ever speak in public. It is not impossible. His business plan is not without drawbacks.*

Typical violations of the culture of English business communication S. Katlip includes such as:

– misplaced use of split judgment because of misunderstandings of business broadcasting traditions, for example: *«growth» (instead of «growing»), «ensuring use» (instead of «use»), «showing respect» (instead of «honoring»)*, etc.;

– the use of phrases that do not meet the norms of Ukrainian idiomatic broadcasting, which is observed both in split sentences: *«raise questions» (instead of «raise / ask questions»), «allow theft» (instead of «allow theft»)*, and in established phrases business style: *«increase the number» (instead of «increase the number»), «play value» (instead of «matter»), «play a role» (instead of «play a role»)*;

– unjustified use of borrowed words that have English counterparts: *to dominate – to prevail, to limit – to restrict, to monitor – to control, to prolong – to continue, the prerogative – to advantage* [Катлип 2000, p. 87].

Business-to-business communication in the English language must meet business-style standards. It is characterised by a low degree of emotion, the use of appropriate professional terminology, the stereotypical nature of imaginative expressions, which are mostly linguistic metaphors or somewhat renewed winged and imaginative cliches. Typical for such situations is a large number of terminological borrowings: *tender, dealer, prolongation, default, brand, bonus, dumping, audit, marketing, consulting, leasing, holding, liquidity of capital*, etc..

The English language has a tendency to saturate this subject with quite striking elements of the figurative nature, which is largely facilitated by the metaphorical English-language business-commercial terminology – the use of figurative expressions, for example, arising from the division of dealers in the bull market «bulls» bears, i.e. those who expect prices to rise or fall.

As O. Dubenko points out that such terminology has a double function: it not only attracts with its expressiveness, but also adds to the informality of the tone of communication. The decrease in stylistic tone becomes especially noticeable when the speaker uses metaphorical terms that are related to business slang, for example, greenmail, which has two meanings: green mail is a stock buy-in at a below-market price (a technique used when approaching a company for the purpose of its absorption) and «green blackmail» – the purchase of a large block of shares of the company with a mark-up to the market price (in exchange for the promise not to claim control of the company). In addition, the expressiveness of business-related broadcasting is generally achieved through the use of metaphorical expressions, idioms, proverbs, paraphrases, alliteration [Дубенко 2005, P. 108].

In business communication in any language, according to F. Khmil, it is necessary to take into account the verbal and vocal components. The verbal components – or what we say – are the meaning of the first 10 words, which include words of greeting, introducing yourself, communicating your attitude to the meeting.

The name of the person we want to impress must be stated. Vocal components are how we say these words: speed, intonation, timbre, emphasis, rhythm [Хміль 2004, p. 19].

For each word there is one and only way to spell it and more than a hundred pronounced on hearing and meaning variants of its pronunciation. Vocal flexibility adds semantic diversity to the same words. Business etiquette emphasises the importance of a first impression.

For telephone language business etiquette, for example, it is especially important how words are pronounced. It is necessary to speak at an average pace, with a friendly intonation, to pronounce the first phrases and words clearly and separately without forcing the interlocutor to ask again.

Analysing business broadcasting, G. Bronig says that in addition to the stamps of speech etiquette, in a completely identical situation of communication (when it seems at first glance that it is possible to use «literal translation»), the speech behaviour of multilingual communicators is constructed by different linguistic means. This is because linguistic means of communication bring in a national color, reflecting different speech thinking and different perceptions by means of outwardly equivalent realities. Each conversation involves a set of standard speech turns specific to that language only. Speech etiquette, as part of a single language system, undergoes changes over time that are inherent in both the language itself and the social structure of this language collective [Бройніг 2006, p. 97].

Let's take a closer look at **the peculiarities of speech etiquette in English**.

In English, there is no formal difference between the «you» and «you» forms. The whole range of meanings is included in the pronoun "you". Example:

‒ *«Hey, you, what is the matter?»* (Informal);

‒ *«Excuse me, could you tell me the time, please?»* (Formal).

Label formulas are divided into thematic groups and, depending on the speech situation, can convey different emotional colours and social relationships between communicators in the following styles: formal; informal; consultative; intimate [29, p. 74]

The first thematic group is «Appeal. Drawing attention».

In English, the following formulas are used to attract attention: *«Excuse me», «Pardon me!» («Sorry, sorry»), «I say! Say ..., say ...», «Hi», «Hey»*.

In the context of the proposed situation, *«Pardon me!»* is both a polite form of apology and an apology for the hassle that may be caused by the actions of the communicator.

There is also a stylistically enhanced form of address: *«I am sorry to trouble you, but»*. For example: *«I am sorry to trouble you, but can you move up a bit?»*, The polite question may also be a polite question: *«Could / can you tell me ..., please?»*. Both *«could»* and *«can»* can be used equally in the context of this situation, but *«could»* sounds more polite and it is more commonly used by native speakers. This label unit is somewhat negative in nature and expresses dissatisfaction with the particular situation. For example: *«Look here, did you not take my notes by any chance?»*

Consider forms of treatment. According to a tradition that has evolved over the course of the historical development of the English language, the *Sir* form of address is used when addressing a man who is older, in terms of position and position or social status. The same tradition applies to the form of *«Madam»*, which is emphasised by the polite form of addressing a woman of older, professional and social status. Stylistically reduced forms of appeal are the following expressions: *«Friend!», «Mate!», «Chum!», «Pal! Buddy!», «Young man / woman, young lady, miss»*. The last two examples are not used in English to address strangers: *«Friend!», «Mate!», «Chum!», «Pal! Buddy!»* is not acceptable in business speech.

Teachers and teachers in UK schools are referred to by *«Mr. + surname» / «Sir»*, or *«Miss + surname» / «Miss»* if the teacher is a woman, whether she is married or not. This tradition has been preserved since the reign of Queen Victoria, when only single women were allowed to work at the school. In British universities, *Professor + surname*, or simply *Professor*, is used as an address to those who hold a rank, lead a department, or lead a specific research activity. Other teachers are instructed by *«Mr. + last name»* or *«Miss + last name»*. In the US, the *Professor* can

serve as an address to any teacher at any university or college. In English, the *«comrade»* in English is *«Mr. + last name»*. There is no analogue of the companion passenger in English. If the controller needs to check for a ticket, he or she will say *«Your ticket, please!»*. Contacting medical staff in English may be: *«Doctor + last name»* (address to doctor), *«Mr. + surname»* (referring to surgeon), «Nurse!» («Matron! Sister!»). In the United Kingdom, the position of ward sister is called *«Sister»*, but can be held by both men and women.

When contacting work colleagues, the word *«Colleague»* is rarely used in direct contact. For example, the phrase *«Colleague, you were right»* would have the following English equivalent: *«It looks like if you were right, Professor»* the absence of the person they are referring to, and in its presence. For example: *«My colleague is of a different opinion»*. However, it should be remembered that each particular situation dictates its rules and forms, which depend on the traditions of language.

Analysing the topic group **«Aquaintance»**, we can conclude that it is divided into two subgroups: *«Dating without a mediator»* and *«Dating through a mediator»*. In the first case, in English you can use stylistically neutral formulas «*Hello, my name is ...»*, *«I have been looking forward to meeting you. My name is ...»* , *«I am ...»*, *«I always wanted to meet you»*. Stylistically reduced are the forms: *«Good evening. And I ...»* , *«Hello. My name is ...»*.

Talking to a stranger often begins with a cue about the weather, but then the opportunity to switch to the *«May I introduce myself to you»* form, *«Allow me to introduce myself»*, and *«Allow me to introduce myself»* may arise. The principle of emphatic courtesy is maintained, which requires that a man may be represented to a woman, a young woman to an older woman, but a young man to an older man. For the most part, the mediator first names the name of the person they represent and then the name of the person they represent.

According to the rules of etiquette, in English language you cannot use *«I know you»* expressions.

Let's look at the changes that have taken place in the English label clichés in recent years. *Mrs's* address is increasingly used in the official English language, but

Miss is used at the level of *Mr* since it does not distinguish the woman's marital status. In official documents in English, nouns that have the morphs *«- man»* or *«- ess»* (*chairman – businessman, businessman – salesman*) are replaced by nouns that have no generic: *Chairman – Chairperson; Spokesman (Delegate) – Spokesperson; Foreman (Chief) – Supervisor; Businessman (Executive) – Executive*.

Let us turn to the **«Saying Hello» Group**. Expressions within its label category are limited in time (morning, afternoon or evening) by use. If the meeting takes place in the afternoon – from lunch to sunset – the formula *«Good afternoon»* will be most appropriate, and if from morning to lunch – *«Good morning»*. Stylistically reduced greetings are typical for communication with close people: *«Hi!», «Hello! Hello there! Hello everyone!» , «Morning! Top o 'the morning! Afternoon! Evening!»*. Stylistically elevated greetings are: *«Welcome!», «Allow me to welcome you!», «I am happy to welcome you!»*. It should be noted that in English the greetings *«How do you do?»* literally means *«How are you?»*.

To express English language business etiquette, one must use the following constructions: *Why don't we ...? Shall I ..? Is it Ok for you to do this.? Here is some information about ... Can we start, please? Right, let's begin! Maybe we should .... Let's look at this problem another way .... Let's sort out this question*.

Consent: *said right! And in favor of. I think you are right! I understand what you are saying. I can see your point of view*.

Disagreement: *I see what you mean but .. I am afraid I can't .... I am afraid I am afraid to agree*.

Speech, presentation: *My subject today is ... I am going to talk about .... The main aim / purpose of the meeting is ... By the end of my.you will have a clear idea of. The next item is. Okay, let's summarize*.

Question: *How do you feel about. ? What do you mean by ..? Does anyone have any questions? Would anyone like to ask a question?*

End of conversation, meeting: *Let's see what we've got. We have got a deal. Can I go over what we have agreed to? Let's go over the main points again. I think that covers everything* [245, p. 73].

Business etiquette also includes business telephony, with phrases such as: *Hold on ... I'll put you through ... I'm calling about ... Can you give me some details? Could I say that? Who's calling, please? Can I take a message?*

The most interesting and rich moral and ethical implications are the expressions of gratitude, which occupy an important place among the typical references to the oral language etiquette of the English language. They involve in business communication demonstration of feelings of mutual respect, kindness and, accordingly, have a personal developmental effect. The most typical expression of gratitude is the expression «*Thank you*»; Others include: *«Much obliged to you, You are awfully obliged»*. There are also many options for responding to gratitude: *«Say no more about it, Pleased to have been of service, The pleasure's mine, It's no trouble what ever»*.

M. Ariane points out that the form of apology, which is represented by two main varieties: *«Excuse me»* and *«I am sorry»* occupies an important place in the speech. The phrase *«I am sorry»* is appropriate when the apologising person refuses to accept the invitation or expresses sympathy, even in a business conversation. At the same time, it should be noted that it is advisable to use the form *«Excuse me»* when the etiquette rules have been violated, for example, the interlocutor interrupted the speaker. In this case, the following phrases are also possible: *Excuse my being late, I must apologise (to you), I disturb mean to hurt you, Excuse my disturbing you*.

Thus, considering the specifics of speech etiquette in the field of business communication in English, it can be stated that in cultural matters we have established that there are certain similar points, but for the most part, the national peculiarities of the speech etiquette of English, which characterise its difference: standard label formulas for starting, conducting, and ending a business conversation. They are used by native speakers only in professional, performance-related communication a specialist in his job responsibilities. Knowledge of the national and cultural features of speech etiquette and the use of this knowledge in the professional communication of business will help to successfully solve the problems of business

partnership and will contribute to a better understanding of specialists in the implementation of business policy of our country.

3.2 Grammatical, lexical and semantic features of English speech etiquette in online communication

The system of speech etiquette generally consists of all possible label formulas. Among all thematic groups of English speech etiquette, the frequency of use and the variety of utterances distinguish etiquette formulas of everyday use. We are to speak about the formulas of *greetings, addresses, farewells, gratitudes, apologies, acquaintances, requests*.

Every of these formulas of English speech etiquette has both its specificity of use, as well as **grammatical and lexico-semantic features**.

According to Y. Palekha, **greetings** are the most common custom, which requires both tact and education in daily life and in business communication [Палеха 2008, p. 91]. The words we speak when greeting someone is considered by the scholar, regardless of whether we will ever meet him again or not, can have far-reaching consequences [Палеха 2008, p. 92].

Greeting formulas are very different and diverse in different national communities. English speech etiquette operates with the following etiquette of greetings: *«Good morning!», «Good afternoon!», «Good evening!», «How do you do!», «I congratulate you», «With the arrival of you!», Long live* etc.

The most used of this group of label formulas are the statements: *«How do you do!», «Good morning!», «Good afternoon!», «Good evening!»*. Much less in terms of greetings, the English use the words *«Long live», «I congratulate you»*.

Concerning the grammatical and lexico-semantic features of etiquette greetings, there are a number of greetings in the arsenal of English speech etiquette that have the root good: *Good morning, Good afternoon*, etc.

English speech etiquette is also represented by a large number of conversion formulas. Appeals in English-speaking etiquette belong to the oldest rhetorical

figures. In our opinion, **addressing** is the element of speech etiquette that first of all signals the social relations established within the framework of a communicative act. Therefore, the main factor that influences the choice of a particular appeal is the social status of the communicants, the situation of communication.

English speech etiquette is characterised by the following formulas: *«Mister»*, *«Miss», «Sirs», «Dear sirs», «Dear colleagues», «Dear friends», «Comrades»* and others.

It should be noted that English speech is a grammatically independent and intonationally separate component of a sentence or text that refers to the person or subject directly addressed by the speaker or speaker. As a rule, the categorical means of expressing the appeal in English is the exclamation mark (vocative) of the noun or any equivalent word form to it, in combination with a special clique intonation. Appeal is widespread: *«Hey, man (boy, girl)!»*. The combination of a respectfully polite definition with a stylistically neutral or emotionally coloured component has a certain functional load, because at the same time it expresses respect for the interlocutor and gives more expressive character, defines the nature of the subject-address relations: *«Dear sirs!»*.

It is well known that the final form of communication in speech etiquette is goodbye. The most common in English language etiquette are the following **farewell formulas**: *«Goodbye», «See you soon», «See you tomorrow», «Goodnight», «Be lucky»*. The less commonly used farewell etiquette formulas include: *«Let me tell you Goodbye» , «I'm sorry, but I must go», «Say «Hello» to your parents from me» , «I hope to see you soon» , «Have a good time»*.

It is worth noting that English farewell formulas are marked, first and foremost, by a certain combination of words. So, saying goodbye, the English use the phrase *«Let me tell you» Goodbye»*, or *«Say «Hello» to your parents from me»*.

The specifics of the linguistic behaviour of the English are such that an important place among the typical appeals of linguistic etiquette of the English language are the expressions of gratitude, which are learned and used by them in childhood almost automatically. This adds to the feeling of mutual respect, warmth,

kindness and therefore has a «personal development» effect. On the contrary, the inability to adequately express gratitude can disrupt communication, adversely affect the interlocutors.

A group of label formulas for expressing **gratitude** to the English also has a large arsenal of words and phrases: *«Thank you», «I'm grateful to you», «I'm very grateful to you», «Thank you very much», «Thank you very much» for your care», «I don't know how to thank you»* and others.

In terms of frequency of use in the first place are statements such as *«Thank you», «Thank you very much», «Grateful to you»*. At least English people use the formulas *«Thank you very much», «Said very grateful to you», «Thank you very much for your care»* when communicating.

As you can see, English gratitude labels are basically associated with the words *«Thank you»*.

In saying a word of thanks, the English are guided by a set of rules that allow them to choose the appropriate language form in each situation. For example, when leaving a dinner party, the guest says, *«Thank you for inviting me. I had a great time»*. And when he receives a gift, he exclaims, *«Oh, how beautiful! It's just what you want»*. It is possible to note such regularity of English speech etiquette according to which gratitude is expressed more verbally when a person is more strongly experiencing certain feelings [Григор'єв].

One of the important points that distinguishes the British in a situation of gratitude is the particular intonations of warmth and sincerity. So, to express gratitude, the English use the phrase *«I thank you so much»*.

An equally important manifestation of tact and courtesy in English speech etiquette is **apology**. Labeling apologies are often used to maintain contact in a communicative act. The English apology formulas include: *«Excuse me»* and *«I'm sorry», «I beg your pardon», «Please excuse me», «Sorry sorry for troubling you»*.

English etiquette formulas usually have a label component – the language formula «Please ...»: *«Excuse me, please»*.

It is worth noting that English speaking etiquette is mainly represented by two types of apologies: *«Excuse me»* and *«sorry sorry»*. Although these expressions are a form of apology, they are not always used by native speakers for this purpose. First of all, the English use these forms to express pity, annoyance, etc., so such linguistic constructions are quite appropriate, even when there is nothing to apologise for.

Even when the forms *Excuse me* and *I'm sorry* are interchangeable, each of them has its own meaning: *Excuse me* expresses, above all, the speaker's attitude to certain social rules adopted in a certain society, and the phrase *«I'm sorry»* refers to another person.

Speech constructs that express the urge or request of the speaker to forgive him of any guilt are combined with the words *to apologise, to forgive, to give* in the form of a prescriptive manner.

The semantics of the verbs are intensified to excuse and forgive in conjunction with the verb to ask, resulting in the formulas of courtesy *«I apologize», «I forgive»*.

Commonly used label formulas include **acquaintances formulas**. According to Yu. Palekha, *acquaintance* can be described as establishing contact between people with the message to them or about them communicative minimum of knowledge required for communication [Палеха 2008, p. 104].

English speaking etiquette provides many variants of relevant phrases and some established dating rules. So, if people get to know each other directly, i.e. without a third party, then they use the following verbal formulas: *«glad hung to meet you», «I want (would like) to get acquaintance with you»*. The following formulas are followed by self-naming phrases: *«I am ...», «My name is ...», «My surname is ...»* and others. Of course, the choice of the name, surname, first name or all three components of a personal name depends on the nature of the situation, the composition of the participants in the communication, their age, occupation, gender, etc.

The lexico-stylistic feature of English acquaintances formulas is that they necessarily have the possessive pronoun *«I», «mine ...»* in their structure.

Another common feature of English speech etiquette is **request formulas**.

The direct request of the English is expressed, first of all, at the expense of such a component as the verb – the concept of *«bag, ask»* to *«ask»* in a personal form. The content of the request is usually expressed by a verb with the semantics of the main action: *«ask»*.

The etiquette of the request is distributed through various components. In diplomatic texts, various types of common linguistic formulas are observed: the verb-concept of «ask» in conjunction with the verb of the main action can be expressed by the unaddressed nuclear construction: *«we ask to inform you ...»*, or the verb-concept of *«ask ... + Address + main action verb»*: *«we ask you to inform ...»*.

A more sophisticated form of request is achieved by adding to the preceding formula the *«let»* expander component, which is used only in the second plural person and has the semantics of a formal etiquette request: *«let us ask you ...»*.

In terms of content, the request formula can vary from one's own request in an exquisite courtesy to almost an order and even a request. Such tolerance of demand is a feature of diplomatic broadcasting, a form of request-order conditioned by diplomatic courtesy as a duty of diplomatic litter. Using label formulas – requests like *«I ask to give ...»*, *«I ask you to inform ...»*, *«I ask you to consider ...»*, *«I ask you to pay attention ...»* , *«I ask to fulfill ...»* and so on, the speakers give the binding orders, i.e. orders. The request component is contained in many texts, rather than tradition, as a component of the final formula indicating the courtesy of the text, respect for the addressee: *«Dear Minister, let me show my high honor to you ...»* is a formula of a formal request.

The polite form of the request is realised by a combination of the language formula of the request with the label formulas *«please ...»*, *«would you be so kind ...»* or even more sophisticated label formulas characteristic of certain texts: *«please, don't refuse in your kindness»*, as well as using formulas with subordinate constructions of the conditions: *«It would be great if you.»*, *«We will be very grateful if you ...»*, *«We will be hungry if you ...»*, etc. .

A request expressed by a formula with a subordination, as a rule, has a superhuman status: *«We would like to have an honor to invite you to participate ...», «if you kindly agreed ...»* and so on.

It is worth noting that the request expressed by the verb could sound more polite. The modal verb may (form of the past tense might) is used to express the request: *«May I see your license»*.

The wish formulas also belong to the most commonly used expressions in English speech etiquette.

The essence of the wish is, first and foremost, to express the interest of the addressee in doing something for the addressee. For English label formulas, wishes have a modal meaning in the expression of the subject of the speech of the wishes of *health, success, long age, deprivation of troubles*, etc.: *«Congratulations», «I wish you ...», «Let me congratulate you ...»* etc.

English etiquette formulas are mostly expressed by the motive forms of the verb be happy, let it be happy, the verb be in the form of a prepositional method + the adjective: *«Be happy»* and so on.

English negation formulas also constitute a considerable group of expressions characterized by certain grammatical and lexical-semantic features.

The most commonly used of the English negation formulas are: *«You are mistaken», «not a waste of time», «No, I cannot»*. Much less English people use *«a pity, but I must refuse», «You are not right», «No, I don't want»*.

It should be noted that the English, in order to express objection (rejection), often use one word *«no», «not»*, rarely – *in a few words*.

Analysing English speech etiquette, we can conclude that the most common expressions of everyday use include such groups as requests, acquaintances, wishes, and forgiveness. Fewer examples present groups of label formulas of apology, thanks, replies to gratitude, invitations, greetings, consents. Expressions of speech etiquette of everyday use, assigned to certain situations of polite relations between the communicants, as a result of repeated repetition have become stable formulas of communication, stereotypes – typical, stable repetitive constructions used in almost

all points of formulation. morphological and syntactic structure, but also in terms of their lexical content. Without such stereotypical expressions, mechanically reproduced in typical speech situations of politeness, it is obviously impossible. They are motivated stylistically and functionally, as they ensure the accuracy, uniqueness and economy of communication processes.

3.3 Formulas of English speech etiquette in online communication

Speech etiquette formulas are the most culturally specific units. In other words, the verbal reflection of the situation of reality (gratitude, apology, regret, etc.) has features characteristic of a particular society. By their nature, they are closely related to the practical experience and cultural, but also the historical traditions of the people who speak the given language.

Formulas of speech etiquette, like phraseological units, accumulate specific national characteristics. First of all, they are characterized by idioms that ensure the integrity and indivisibility of meaning. At the same time, they have a dual nature: on the one hand, outside the context they can be considered as separate lexemes, on the other hand, they can be considered as phraseological units, because they have the features of stable statements in a communicative situation [Третьякова 1995, с. 43]. Moreover, stability as a category of speech stereotypes is associated with the category of time and a number of social factors that determine the dynamics of the development of functional values. The class of speech etiquette formulas is the most stable class of speech stereotypes; these are units of speech behaviour related to the level of regulation of speech activity, which is based on past experience of the people. The communicative potential of a speech situation consists of typical sequences of speech actions associated with constantly reproduced methods of interpersonal interaction» [Третьякова 1995].

On the one hand, the speaker reproduces ready-made expressions, but, on the other hand, he does not act mechanically, but he performs the operation of selecting the formula that is as accurate as possible for a given situation. In this case, the

expression chosen by him will be [Формановская 2003, c. 10]: a) the most appropriate for a given communication situation, b) the most familiar for the speaker in connection with his differential social and individual characteristics, c) the most acceptable for the interlocutor, etc.

Another important feature of the correct use of etiquette formulas is background knowledge (lexical background), which allows a native speaker to determine the appropriateness of using a particular etiquette unit in a particular speech situation. The lexical background is understood as «the totality of non-conceptual semantic shares» [Верещагин и др. 2014, c. 66]. In other words, this is the environment in which the lexical concept is formed and exists. And since this background is specific in every linguistic culture, it is possible to use both equivalent (translatable) and non-equivalent (non-translatable) formulas of speech etiquette.

Depending on the context of the situation, the combinatorics of speech etiquette formulas varies in the following range: *you are welcome, don't mention it, not at all, thank you, it's nothing, it's OK, any time, my pleasure, no problem*, etc. taking into account their variations and transformations. Therefore, these units can be called combinatorially determined, i.e. to be interchangeable within the same communication situation.

As you know, in English the response to gratitude sounds much more often. This is due to the fact that native English speakers are characterised by an emphasis on good manners, or impeccable etiquette of behaviour. The use of speech stereotypes is an indicator of good tone – this forms the image of the speaker as a person with a high speech culture. For native English speakers, one of the most important intentions in communication is the formation of a positive image of oneself in the eyes of others.

The response to gratitude is an integral part of communication, it can be omitted only in communication with very close people. Speech etiquette in English-language linguistic culture is a means of demonstrating mutual respect and attention to others.

The response to gratitude is a politeness category, its frequent inclusion in speech is a national-specific feature of native English speakers. However, sometimes additional functions are added to the main ritual function that these speech clichés perform.

The most common gratitude etiquette *(You're) welcome* is universal and can be used in any area of communication.

(1) Conversation with the dispatcher of the telephone help desk.

— *Your number is 34553573.*

— *Thank you.*

— *You 're welcome.*

The stylistically neutral formula *(You're) welcome* performs a ritual function and is a syntactically and semantically seamless combination. The full version is a simple two-part sentence. In the communicative past, the formula expresses gratitude, in the communicative future – completion of contact with the possibility of its continuation in the same tonality. A truncated version – *Welcome* is typical for a casual conversation. Another version of this formula, *You're very welcome* with an amplifying particle *very*, indicates that the service provided was not burdensome for the contractor. Another option, *You're more than welcome*, which adds a comparative design, emphasiszes the special attitude and respect for the interlocutor.

(2) The conversation of neighbors.

— *Mss Worth, can you please give me the receipt of your chocolate pie? I'll try to make it on my own.*

— *Oh, of course. Take this little booklet, there are lots of different pies! If you need a piece of advice - just let me know.*

— *You're very dear! Thank you very much.*

— *You're more than welcome.*

This option can be called obsolete, since it is used to a greater extent by representatives of the older generation.

Analyzing the variants of the speech formula *You're welcome*, it must be emphasizsd that gratitude in the English-language picture of the world, as a rule, is

expressed often and for no apparent reason. Therefore, one can observe the desemantisation of some etiquette formulas, as a result of which they become speech cliches. Thus, the purpose of these etiquette formulas is to express special gratitude to the interlocutor. The response to gratitude is built by analogy with the expression of gratitude and implies the continuation of friendly relations between the interlocutors.

The etiquette formula *Don't mention* is stylistically neutral, emotionally coloured, it performs a ritual function and it is syntactically expressed in a simple two-part sentence.

(3) Conversation of colleagues

— *You 're a star. Thank you very much.*

— *Don't mention it. I'm delighted to be able to help.*

The imperative mood indicates a request not to mention an act that was very insignificant for the performer and does not require gratitude. In a more expressive version of *Please, don't mention it,* the additional lexical unit *please* emphasises the speaker's categorical requirement not to mention gratitude.

(4) Dialogue on the street.

— *I would definitely get lost without you. Thank you.*

— *Please, don't mention it.*

This etiquette formula can be used both to interrupt and to continue contact.

The following *Thank you* formula is ritual, stylistically neutral, syntactically expressed in a simple two-part incomplete sentence that has the function of completing contact. The lexical repetition of the previous phrase with a shift in emphasis on the pronoun leads to a rearrangement of semantic accents – who is grateful to someone.

(5) The dialogue in the cafe.

— *It was very delicious. Thank you.*

— *Thank you.*

Mutual gratitude using *Thank you* is often observed in the service sector, when gratitude does not have a specific object. On the one hand, this formula indicates a

certain appreciation to the person, on the other hand, it officially completes contact in this situation.

The etiquette replica of *Not at all* is a semantically and syntactically indivisible whole, consisting of non-significant parts of speech, which together form a unit of extra-communal affiliation, stylistically neutral, performing a ritual function and used in a variety of situations.

(6) Dialogue on the street.

— *Sorry how can I get to the St. Julian S beach?*

— *It's right there, behind this huge McDinald S, the entrance I mean.*

— *Thank you very much for your help.*

— *Not at all.*

(7) Dialogue of colleagues

— *Oh thanks. That would be very kind of you.*

— *Not at all. I'd enjoy it.*

As can be seen from the examples, the communicative past in these situations is an expression of gratitude, the communicative future involves the completion of contact (6), although it is possible to continue it in the chosen style (7).

It's nothing is emotionally coloured, syntactically representing a simple two-part complete sentence. It is used if the communicant considers that gratitude is unnecessary.

(8) Dialogue of friends.

— *I'd surely follow your advice. Thanks!*

— *It's nothing.*

From the mini-dialogue you can understand that giving advice did not cost one of the communicants, so he dropped the phrase *It's nothing*. It indicates that in the communicative future, continuation of contact is possible. As background knowledge, we can distinguish the insignificance of the service, which is implied in this context.

It's OK is a familiar, emotionally coloured remark in response to gratitude, which is very common in English and is used in the meaning – «everything is in order».

(9) The conversation of old friends.

— *You don t have to stay here with me, really. I feel much better now.*

— *No. I'll stay here and keep you company.*

— *Thanks.*

— *It's OK.*

OK is an abbreviation and in this conversation it acts as an adjective with qualitative semantics. There are at least two options for replicating *It's OK – It's all right* and *You're alright*. Both answers are a simple, complete, two-part sentence.

(10) Dialogue between father and son.

— *May I borrow your car this evening? I really need it today.*

— *Of course you do. You every Friday do. Take it.*

— *Thanks. Dad!*

— *You're alright.*

This answer also has a truncated version, which is used only in the speech of close friends or relatives – *Alright*.

 (11) The dialogue between the owner and his tenant.

— *And what if I come home late at night?*

— *I'll leave the door open.*

— *It's great, thanks.*

— *Any time. Happy to help you.*

Any time is a truncated phrase that is commonly used in American English. It reflects the semantics of time, that is, it updates the permission to apply at any time. However, you can use the full design – *I'm ready to help at any time*.

(It's) my pleasure is a stylistically neutral speech formula with a ritual function. In short, it is a combination of a personal pronoun and a noun with the meaning «pleasure». In the expanded version, the formula is a simple two-part complete sentence.

(12) Dialogue between driver and passenger.

— *You are so kind to get me to the airport.*

— *My pleasure.*

The meaning of this formula is that one of the communicants was pleased to provide help or service to the other. This replica can be called universal, because it is most often used by representatives of English-speaking linguistic culture.

Another version of the *My pleasure* formula is the pleasure was all mine, which is a somewhat outdated answer. From a syntactic point of view, this formula is a simple two-part complete sentence. It is often used to create a comic effect, as it is considered high-flown, and it is usually used by representatives of the younger generation in everyday speech.

(13) Dialogue of a young man and a girl.

— *You're cold? Take this.*

— *And you?*

— *I'm OK. I've grown up here, I'm used to such weather.*

— *Thanks.*

— *The pleasure was all mine.*

The response replica is designed to cause certain emotions in the interlocutor. In this situation, the communicative past is an orientation toward a free tone of communication, the future is the continuation of contact in the same tonality and the opportunity to once again seek help. The token all expresses the importance of the communicant's highest degree of pleasure from his act: he says that he was very pleased to do something good to the girl.

The informal and emotional formula *No problem* is used when both communicants are equal in social status. The combination of a negative particle and a noun is a truncation from a complete two-part simple sentence. There is no problem. The etiquette formula *No problem* is used in a number of situations, including in situations of response to gratitude.

(14) Dialogue on the street.

— *Then just turn right and you'll get there.*

— *Oh, thank you. Thank you very much.*

— *No problem.*

The communicative future of this situation is interruption of contact or change of subject. No problem means that the service provided did not create any difficulties for the communicant. There is an even more truncated version of *No probs*, however, it is typical for the Australian version of the English language.

(15) Dialogue of colleagues.

— *Thanks for the interesting book.*

— *No probs. I'm glad you liked it.*

The following formula for the «response to gratitude» situation – *Think nothing of it* – has a ritual function, in terms of syntax it is a simple sentence.

(16) Dialogue between boss and subordinate.

— *I appreciate you coming. Thanks a lot for your support.*

— *Think nothing of it. I had to, it's my duty.*

In this example, the communicants are not equal in status, at the same time, the relations between them can be any. *Think nothing of it* is the official answer, as it is expressed by an imperative mood. This is a call not to think about the service rendered, to forget about it. In the communicative future, it is possible to continue contact in the same tonality.

It's water under the bridge is an idiomatic phrase expressed in a simple two-part full sentence and is a formula of etiquette in a situation of responding to gratitude. Its peculiarity is semantic and situational universality, which allows it to be used in different contexts. The meaning of this formula is approximately the following: *«Since then, much time has passed, much has changed and the situation is no longer the same»*.

(17) Dialogue between friends.

— *I'm really sorry, it was all my fault.*

— *You don't have to apologize. I'll have already forgotten about it.*

— *Thank you. You're so kind.*

— *It's water under the bridge.*

Thus, in a response to gratitude situation, this formula calls not to return to the past and forget about everything that happened before. Communicative past is gratitude; communicative future is continued contact.

Let the bygones be bygones is another etiquette formula and at the same time a phraseological unit. Syntactically, it is represented by a simple two-part full sentence, where the verb has the form of an imperative mood, and means the following: «everything is forgiven, everything is forgotten, so we will leave everything in the past».

(18) Dialogue of colleagues.

— *By the way, it was you who first told me I can t do it. I should immediately hold by you. Your advice was really useful. Thank you very much.*

— *Let the bygones be bygones.*

In this context, the phraseological and etiquette unit *Let the bygones be bygones* has the additional function of asking for forgiveness. In other contexts, it is hardly possible to use it. The communicative past is gratitude for forgiveness, the future is the restoration of former relations. The formula calls not to remember the past.

Conclusions to Chapter 3

The specifics of speech etiquette in the field of business communication in English can be stated that in cultural matters we have established that there are certain similar points, but for the most part, the national peculiarities of the speech etiquette of English, which characterise its difference: standard label formulas for starting, conducting, and ending a business conversation. They are used by native speakers only in professional, performance-related communication a specialist in his job responsibilities. Knowledge of the national and cultural features of speech etiquette and the use of this knowledge in the professional communication of business will help to successfully solve the problems of business partnership and will contribute to a better understanding of specialists in the implementation of business policy of our country.

The system of speech etiquette generally consists of all possible label formulas. Among all thematic groups of English speech etiquette, the frequency of use and the variety of utterances distinguish etiquette formulas of everyday use. We are to speak about the formulas of *greetings, addresses, farewells, gratitudes, apologies, acquaintances, requests*.

These formulas are used in a specific communication situation, contain similar semantics – a positive assessment of any action and have one function – a courtesy demonstration associated with the manifestation of a reaction in response to gratitude for some noble deed. Therefore, the number of label formulas used in this situation is combinatorially limited.

Formulas of speech etiquette have the following features. They are nationally specific, since they reflect the tradition of a given ethnic group to demonstrate a response to gratitude, are characterized by idiomaticity (integrity of meaning) and stability, relate to the level of regulation of speech activity based on the past experience of the people, and their use depends on background knowledge that provides the appropriateness of using the appropriate etiquette formula in a given situation.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Speech netiquette is one of the necessary components of human communication. It is a set of standardised speech forms, which are stereotypes of speech, ready-made formulas with a certain syntactic organisation and lexical content. In the speech netiquette of native speakers of different languages, the coordinate system of interpersonal communication is organised in the same way.

Speech etiquette can be considered in a narrow and broad sense. Speech etiquette in a narrow sense is a formula that ensures that people are accepted in a certain environment, in a certain group of people and in a certain communicative situation, engage in speech contact, maintain communication in the chosen tone. And in a broad sense, these are all rules of speech behaviour, all linguistic permissions and prohibitions related to the social characteristics of speakers, in our case future managers, and their environment, on the one hand, and stylistic resources of the language, on the other.

Business communication can be understood in a narrow and broad sense. In a broad sense, business communication is a process of speech interaction between people, in which speech activity, information and experience are exchanged in order to achieve a certain result. Business communication is a special layer of literary language, which is distinguished by vocabulary, semantics, certain composite forms, practically suitable for conducting business papers, business correspondence. Business communication are not limited only to information areas, it is "not only the transfer of administrative, instructive, strategic information, but also the management of people's activities».

Due to the fact that in every linguistic culture the lexical background contains both universal and idio-ethnic characteristics, in the «response to gratitude» situation, it is possible to use equivalent (translatable) formulas for the two languages (*You're welcome, Not at all, Thank you*), and for the equivalent (untranslatable) formulas of speech etiquette (*Don't mention it, It's nothing, It's OK, It's alright, Any time, My*

pleasure, Think nothing of it, It's water under the bridge, Let the bygones be bygones, etc.).

The main motive for expressing gratitude is to follow the etiquette of the language and perform the ritual. However, the intentions of creating a special speech image of a communicant, for example, saving an interlocutor from a sense of duty, a call not to recall the past, can join

The English formulas of speech etiquette in the situation of «response to gratitude» are varied, they have brief and complete options. Since representatives of English-speaking linguistic culture often give thanks for any occasion, one can observe the erasure, or «devastation», of the values of etiquette formulas in the situation of a response to gratitude. Therefore, to enhance the function of gratitude and express a certain emotion or a good attitude towards the interlocutor, native speakers of English in etiquette formulas often use amplifying components (intensifiers) – always / very / more than / most, etc. This manifests a strategy to enhance politeness.

RESUME

Проведене дослідження дозволило з'ясувати поняття і характеристики віртуальної комунікації, що поєднує риси писемного й усного спілкування. Масова міжкультурна комунікація в Інтернет підпорядковується неофіційним правилам нетикету, сформованим на основі принципів загальнолюдської ввічливості, призначеним регулювати комунікативну взаємодію у віртуальному просторі, сприяти успішності спілкування і створювати привабливий віртуальний образ мовця. Мережевий етикет не лише регулює комунікативну поведінку мовців у стандартних ситуаціях вітання, знайомства, прохання, прощання тощо, але також поширюється на мовленнєву взаємодію в Інтернет в цілому. В ширшому розумінні нетикет стосується не лише мовленнєвої комунікації, але й охоплює багато інших питань, пов'язаних із різнобічною діяльністю в Інтернет. Подібно до мовленнєвого етикету нетикет є універсальним явищем, однак його загальні правила звичайно підлягають певним трансформаціям у різних сферах віртуального простору. Результати дослідження наголошують на важливості невербальних компонентів комунікації, відсутність яких у віртуальному просторі вимагає від комунікантів залучення специфічних графічних прийомів емотиконів (смайликів), пунктуації, капіталізації, повторення графем та інших засобів. Поява графічних елементів зумовлена складностями письмового вираження емоцій, однак у дипломі показано, що сьогодні існує ціла низка емотиконів, які виражають різноманітні мовленнєві, фізичні й ментальні дії, дають опис, характеристику осіб, визначають стосунки між мовцями. Емотикони можуть вживатися самостійно, а також доповнювати вербальні повідомлення, посилюючи їх експресивність. Невербальні компоненти часто комбінуються між собою, утворюючи нові значення. Дослідження онлайн комунікації показало, що факторами комунікативних помилок є психологічний (анонімність, дистантність, цензура, цілі), етнокультурний, віковий, ґендерний і фактор досвіду спілкування в мережі. Під час комунікації у приват-чаті і за допомогою

програм швидкого зв'язку, дія правил мережевого етикету дещо послаблюється, що можна пояснити психологічним фактором відсутністю цензури, зовнішнього контролю з боку модератора та інших комунікантів. Етнокультурний чинник залучає до віртуального простору етнічні стереотипи, а також є джерелом появи нових упереджень, пов'язаних з особливостями діяльності в Інтернет. Етнічні стереотипи негативно позначаються на тональності комунікації у міжнародних чатах, стають причинами комунікативних конфліктів. В ситуаціях міжкультурного спілкування комунікативні невдачі також виникають внаслідок порушення принципу автономії особистості. Причиною несвідомого порушення нетикету є недостатній досвід чатлайнового спілкування. Різноманітні скорочення, які служать ефективними засобами економії мовленнєвих зусиль адресанта, можуть ускладнити інтерпретацію повідомлень адресатом. Комунікативні помилки виникають через відсутність навичок спрощеного викладу думок і набору тексту, швидкого сприйняття й опрацювання інформації, помилкову адресацію повідомлень. Вплив факторів віку і статі очевидний у процесі пошуку співрозмовника, в ситуації знайомства. Мовці встановлюють комунікативний контакт з урахуванням вже сформованого образу адресата, тому невідповідність антропометричних даних веде до розриву контакту. Комунікативні помилки виникають під впливом соціальних стереотипів, під час обговорення ґендеро-специфічних тем.

LIST OF REFERENCE SOURSES

1.   Азимов Э. Г. Словарь методических терминов (теория и практика преподавания языков) / Э. Г. Азимов, А. Н. Щукин. - СПб. : Златоуст, 1999. - 472с.

2.   Азнаурьян, Б. Э. Когнитивно-прагматические особенности делового дискурса (На материале документооборота табачной промышленности) [Текст] : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / Б. Э. Азнаурьян. - Краснодар, 2005. - 330 с.

3.   Андреев В. И. Деловая риторика. (Практический курс делового общения и ораторского мастерства) / В. И. Андреев. - М. : Народное образование, 1995. - 208с. (Библ. 202-205).

4.   Андреева Г. М. Социальная психология: [учебник для высших учебных заведений] / Г. М. Андреева. - М. : Наука, 1996. - 324с.

5.   Апатова Н. В. Информационные технологии в школьном образовании / Н. В. Апатова. - М. : РАО, 1994. - 228 с.

6.   Арутюнова, Н. Д. Предложение и его смысл [Текст] / Н. Д. Арутюнова. - М. : Знание, 1990. - 225 с.

7.   Астафурова, Т. Н. Лингвистические аспекты межкультурной деловой коммуникации / Т. Н. Астафурова. - Волгоград : Изд-во Волгоградского гос. университета, 1997. - 108 с.

8.   Белолипецкий В. К. Этика и культура управления / К. Белолипецкий. - М. : ИЦ «МарТ «, 2004. - 384с.

9.   Бисималиева, М. К. О понятиях «текст» и «дискурс» [Текст] / М. К. Биси- малиева // Филологические науки. - 1999. - №2. - С. 78-85.

10.   Богдан С. Мовний етикет українців : традиціі і сучасність : [монографія] / Світлана Калениківна Богдан / [відп. ред. Пустовіт Л. О.]. - К. : Рідна мова, 1998. - 475 с.

11.   Бориснев, С. В. Социология коммуникации [Текст] / С. В. Бориснев. - М. : ЮНИТИ-ДАННА, 2003. - 270 с.

12. Бройніг Г. Руководство по ведению переговоров / Г. Бройніг. - М. : Русское издательство, 2006. - 214 с.

13. Бутенко Н. Ю. Комунікативні процеси у навчанні : [Підручник] / Н. Ю. Бутенко // К. : КНЕУ, 2004. - 383 с.

14. Валгина, Н. С. Теория текста [Текст] : учеб. пособие / Н. С. Валгина. - М. : Логос, 2003. - 280 с.

15. Введенская Л. А. Культура и искусство речи. Современная риторика / Л. А. Введенская, Л. Г. Павлова. - Ростов-на-Дону : Издательство «Феникс», 1995. - 576 с.

16. Верещагин Е. М. Язык и культура. Три лингвострановедческие концепции : лексического фона, речеповеденческих тактик и сапиентемы / Е. М. Верещагин, В. Г. Костомаров. — Москва ; Берлин : Директ-Медиа, 2014. — 509 с.

17. Веселов П. В. Современное деловое письмо в промышленности. [3-е изд., доп.]. - М. : Издательство стандартов, 1990. - 160 с.

18. Винарская, Л. С. Информационная структура рекламного текста [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук (10.02.19) / Л. С. Винарская. - М., 1995. 25 с.

19. Власов Л. В. Деловое общение / Л. В. Власов, В. К. Сементовская. - Л. : Лениздат, 1980. - 79 с.

20. Всемирная энциклопедия: Философия / А. А. Грицанов. - М. : АСТ, Мн. : Харвест, современный литератор, 2001. - 1312 с.

21. Гез Н. И. Формирование коммуникативной компетенции как объект зарубежных методических исследований / Н. И. Гез // Иностранные языки в школе. - 1985. - № 2. - С. 17-24.

22. Головин Б. Н. Основы культуры речи: [учеб. для вузов по спец. «Рус. яз. и лит.»]. / Б. Н. Головин. - 2-е изд. испр. - Высш. шк., 1998. - 320 с.

23. Головина, Н. П. Формирование дискурсивной компетенции у учащихся старших классов в процессе обучения репродукции и продукции иноязычных письменных текстов (Школа с углубленным изучением

английского языка) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук (13.00.02) / Н. П. Головина. - СПб., 2004. - 17 с.

24.   Грайс Г. П. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике / Г. П. Грайс. - М. : 1985. - Вып. №.16. - С. 8-15.

25.   Григор'єв Л. Л. Англійський мовний етикет [Електронний ресурс] / Л. Л. Григор'єв // Практичний інтернет-курс для студентів, яківивчають англійську мову. - Режим доступу: http://englishhome/english-k.html

26.   Гриценко Т. Б. Етика ділового спілкування: [за редакцією Т. Б. Гриценко, Т. Д. Іщенко, Т. Ф. Мельничук, Н. В. Чуприк, Л. П. Анохіна] . - Навч. посібник. - К. : Центр учбової літератури, 2007. - 344 с.

27.   Грушевицкая, Т. Г. Основы межкультурной коммуникации [Текст] : учеб. для вузов / Т. Г. Грушевицкая, В. Д. Попков, А. П. Садохин / Под ред. А. П. Садохина. - М. : ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, 2002. - 352 с.

28.   Губенко, Н. В. Экспрессивность средств выражения утверждения и отрицания в

29.   Гумбольдт фон В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества // Гумбольдт В. фон. Избранные труды по языкознанию / Вильгельм фон Гумбольдт. - М. : Прогресс, 2000. - 400 с.

30.   Гутнова, З. К. Методика обучения идиоматичной диалогической речи на продвинутых этапах обучения английскому языку в лингвистическом вузе [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук (13.00.02) / З. К. Гутнова. - М., 2000. - 26 с.

31.   Деркаченко В. П. Деловое общение руководителя: [пособие для менеджеров, бизнесменов и политиков] / В. П. Деркаченко. - СПб. : Издательский дом «Бизнес-пресса», 2004. - 368 с.

32.   Дубенко О. Ю. Порівняльна стилістика англійської та українських мов : [посібник для студентів та викладачів вищих навчальних закладів] / О. Ю. Дубенко. - Вінниця: НОВА КНИГА, 2005. - 224 с.

33. Елизарова, Г. В. Культура и обучение иностранным языкам [Текст] / Г. В. Елизарова. - СПб. : КАРО, 2005. - 352 с.

34. Елизарова, Г. В. Формирование межкультурной компетенции студентов в процессе обучения иноязычному общению [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... д-ра пед. наук (13.00.02) / Г. В. Елизарова. - СПб., 2001. - 38 с.

35. Етика ділового спілкування : [курс лекцій] / Т. К. Чмут, Г. Л. Чайка, М. П. Лукашевич, І. Б. Осечинська. - 2-ге вид., стереотип. - К. : МАУП, 2003. - 208 с. : іл.. - Бібліогр. у кінці розділів

36. Журавлев, А. Л. Социальная психология [Текст] / А. Л. Журавлев. - М. : ПЕР СЭ, 1999. - 319 с.

37. Казанцева, А. А. Методика формирования у студентов старших курсов способности продуцировать адресованное деловое письмо (Французский язык, языковой вуз) [Текст] : дис. ... канд. пед. наук : 13.00.02 / А. А. Казанцева. - Иркутск, 2004. - 192 с.

38. Казарцева О. М. Культура речевого общения : теория и практика обучения / О. М. Казарцева. - М. : Флинта : Наука, 2003. - 496с.

39. Каменская, О. Л. Компоненты семантической структуры текста [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук (10.02.19) / О. Л. Каменская. - М., 1988. 49 с.

40. Каплич, Л. В. Начало обучения продуктивной письменной речи в лингвистическом вузе [Текст] : дис. ... канд. пед. наук : 13.00.02 / Л. В. Каплич. - М., 1996. - 232 с.

41. Катлип С. М. Паблик рилейшнз. Теория и практика : [учеб. пособие]. - пер. с англ. - 8-е изд. / С. М. Катлип, А. Х. Сентер, Г. М. Брун. - М. : Издательский дом « Вильямс», 2000. - 624 с.

42. Ковшикова, Е. В. Категория коммуникативной точности (на материале текстов деловых писем) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. Наук / Е. В. Ковшикова. - Волгоград, 1997. - 23 с.

43. Колтунова М.В. Язык и деловое общение. Нормы. Риторика. Этикет. / М. В. Колтунова. - М.: ОАО «НПО «Экономика», 2000. - 271 с.

44. Копыловская, М. Ю. Лингводидактический потенциал ошибок в обучении официально-деловой письменной коммуникации на английском языке (для студентов гуманитарных специальностей) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук (13.00.02) / М. Ю. Копыловская. - СПб., 2000. - 21 с.

45. Кубрякова, Е. С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке : Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира (Язык. Семантика. Культура) [Текст] / Е. С. Кубрякова. - М. : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. - 506 с.

46. Кузьменкова Ю. Б. От традиций культуры к нормам речевого поведения британцев, американцев и россиян / Ю. Б. Кузьменкова. - М. : Изд. дом ГУ ВШЭ, 2005. - 316 с.

47. Культура української мови: [довідник] / [уклад. С. Я. Єрмоленко, Н. Я. Дзюбишина-Мельник, К. В. Ленець та ін.] - К. : Либідь, 1990. - 304 с.

48. Леонтович, О. А. Русские и американцы: парадоксы межкультурного общения [Текст] : монография / О. А. Леонтович. - М. : Гнозис, 2005. - 352 с.

49. Леонтьев А. А. Лекция как общение / А. А. Леонтьев. - М. : Просвещение, 1974. - 170 с.

50. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / [гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева]. - М. : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. - 684 с.

51. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь [Текст] / Гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева. - М. : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. - 685 с.

52. Льюис Р. Деловые культуры в международном бизнесе / Роберт Льюис. - М. : Дело - 1999. - 78 с.

53. Мескон М. Х. Основы менеджмента / М. Х Мескон., М. Альберт, Ф. Хедоури Ф.- М. : «Дело», 1993. - 415 с.

54. Мишланова, С. Л. Межкультурная парадигма и перспективы межкультур- ной коммуникации. Стереотипность и творчество в тексте [Текст] : Меж- вуз. сб. науч. трудов / С. Л. Мишланова, Т. М. Пермякова. - Пермь, 2005. С. 340-350.

55. Мусульбес, С. Н. Обучение аргументирующему дискурсу в сфере письменного общения (языковой вуз, продвинутый этап, английский язык) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук (13.00.02) / С. Н. Мусульбес. - М., 2005. - 22 с.

56. Нгуен Тхи Бик Лан Лингвостилистические особенности русской коммерческой корреспонденции [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук (10.02.01) / Нгуен Тхи Бик Лан. - М., 2006. - 15 с.

57. Основы теории коммуникации [Текст] / под ред. проф. М. А. Василика. - М. : Гардарики, 2003. - 615 с.

58. Палеха Ю. І. Ділова етика / Ю. І. Палеха: [навч.-метод. посіб.]. — К. : Вид-во Європ. ун-ту фінансів, інформ. систем, менеджм. і бізнесу, 2004.— 350 с.

59. Палеха Ю. І. Спілкування з представниками Америки та Австралії / Ю. І. Палеха // Етика ділових відносин. - К., 2008. - С. 323-338.

60. Парыгин, Б. Д. Анатомия общения [Текст] / Б. Д. Парыгин. - СПб. : Хро- нос, 1999. - С. 44, 46.

61. Перфильева, Н. П. Метатекст : текстоцентрический и лексикографический аспекты [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук (10.02.01) / Н. П. Перфильева. - Новосибирск, 2006. - 45 с.

62. Рытченко Т. А. Психология деловых отношений / Т. А. Рытченко, Н. В. Татаркова. -М. : МГУЭСИ, 2008. - 168 с.

63. Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія / О. О. Селіванова. - Полтава : Довкілля. - К., 2006. - 716 с.

64. Словарь по этике / А. А. Гусейнов, И. С. Кон. - 6-е изд. - М. : Политиздат, 1989. - 447 с/

65. Социальная психология. Хрестоматия [Текст] : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов / Сост. Е. П. Белинская, О. А. Тихомандрицкая. - М. : Аспект Пресс, 2003. - 475 с.

66. Стернин И. А. Очерк английского коммуникативного поведения / И. А. Стернин, Т. В. Ларина, М. А. Стернина. - Воронеж : Истоки, 2003. - 185 с.

67. Томахин Г. Д. Теоретические основы лингвострановедения (на материале лексики американского английского языка) / Г. Д. Томахин. - АДД. - М., 1984. - 246 с.

68. Третьякова Т. П. Английские речевые стереотипы : функционально-семантический аспект / Т. П. Третьякова. — Санкт-Петербург : Издательство СПбГУ, 1995. — 128 с.

69. Тутатчикова, И. Н. Методика обучения письменной речи на английском языке на первом курсе языкового вуза с использованием печатного пособия и компьютерной программы [Текст] : дис. … канд. пед. наук / И. Н. Тутатчикова. - М., 2003. - 158 с.

70. Уедерспан Г. Изящное искусство ведения международных переговоров / Г. Уедерспан // HR NEWS. - 1993. - 127 с.

71. Уедерспан Г. Изящное искусство ведения международных переговоров / Г. Уедерспан // HR NEWS. - 1993. - 127 с.

72. Федюрко, С. Ю. Стилистические особенности русского делового письма как жанровой разновидности официально-делового стиля [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук (10.02.01) / С. Ю. Федюрко. - Елец, 2002. - 15 с.

73. Формановская Н. И. Культура общения и речевой етикет / Н. И. Формановская. - М. : Генеза, 2005. - 246 с.

74. Формановская Н. И. Русский речевой ЭТикет : нормативный социокультурНЫЙ аспект / Н. И. Формановская. — Москва : Русский язык, 2003. — 160 с.

75. Халеева И. И. Понимание иноязычного текста как аспекта межкультурной коммуникации/ И. И. Халеева // Глядя в будущее. Первый советско-американский симпозиум по теоретическим проблемам преподавания и изучения иностранных языков. - М. : РЕМА, МГЛУ, 1992. - 120-127.

76. Халеева, И. И. О гендерных подходах к теории обучения языкам и культурам [Текст] / И. И. Халеева // Известия Российской Академии образования. 2000. - №1. - С. 11-12. Чигридова, Н. Ю. Речевое поведение коммуниканта в жанре деловых эпи- столярий (на материале немецкого языка)

[Текст] : автореф. дис. . канд. филол. наук (10.02.04) / Н. Ю. Чигридова. - Волгоград, 2000. - 14 с.

77. Хміль Ф. І. Ділове спілкування: [навчальний посібник] / І. Ф. Хміль. - К.: «Академвидав», 2004. - 280 с.

78. Хміль Ф. І. Ділове спілкування: [навчальний посібник] / І. Ф. Хміль. - К.: «Академвидав», 2004. - 280 с.

79. Цивьян Т. В. Модель мира и ее лингвистические основы / Татьяна Владимировна Цивьян. - М. : Либроком, 2009. - 278 с.

80. Яковлева А. М., Афонська Т. М. Сучасний тлумачний словник української мови / М. Яковлева, Т. М. Афонська / [під ред. Ломакович С. В.]. - Харків : ТОРСІНГ ПЛЮС, 2007. - 672 с.

81. Fisher E. Access to learning: problems and policies / E. Fisher. - London and New York : Routledge, 1993. - P. 75-90.

82. Fried-Booth D.L. Project work / D.L. Fried-Booth. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. - 89 p.

83. Glowlish B. Business Speech Etiquette / B. Glowlish. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. - 284 p.

84. Hofstede G.I. Exploring culture. Exercises, Stories and Synthetic Cultures / G. I. Hofstede, P. B. Pedersen. - Intercultural Press, 2002. - 220 p.

85. Hutchison T. English for Specific Purposes : A Learning-Centered Approach / Tom Hutchinson, Alan Waters. - Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1993. - 183 p.

86. Hymes D. Competence and perfomance in linguistic theory / D. Hymes // Language Acquisition: Models and Methods / [ed. by B. Huxley and E. Ingram]. London : Academic Press, 1971. - P. 3-24.

87. Hymes D. On Communicative Competence / D. Hymes, J. B. Pride, J. Holmes. Sociolinguistics // Harmonsworth Penguin, 1972. - P. 269-293.

88. Johnson C. Intelligent Business. Coursebook. Pre-Intermediate Business English / C. Johnson. - Pearson Education Limited, 2006. - 176 p.

89. Johnson R. K. Immersion education / R. K. Johnson, M. Swain. -

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. - 315 p.

90.   Jordan R. English for Academic Purposes : A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers / Robert Jordan. - Cambridge University Press, 1997. - 172 p.

91.   Lougheed Lin. Business Correspondence / Lin Lougheed - Longman. 1993. - 143 p.

92.   McDonough J. Materials and Methods in ELT: [A teacher's guide] / Jo McDonough, Christopher Shaw. - Blackwell, 1998. - 245 p.

93.   McKennon K. R. The challenge of Attracting Professionals / Keith R. McKennon. - Presidential Issue : 1998. - 55 p.