

Секція 2

МОВНЕ МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ В УМОВАХ ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЇ

Alautdinova K.

doctorate at the National University of Uzbekistan

RHETORICAL ARGUMENTATION AND PERSUASION METHODS IN BUSINESS MEETINGS

«Success depends on three things: who says it, what he says, how he says it;
and of these three things, what he says is the least important».

John Morley

Abstract. *The paper deals with the problems of rhetorical effect common to another side of the meetings. It is argued that a persuasive speech is very important competence of the rhetor, as nothing can change rhetor's speech. Only directly negotiating, providing evidences, arguments, counterarguments, and controversy the negotiators can move quickly to the overall objective of the agreement. In meetings speaker demonstrates himself, his appearance, mind, manners, emotions, ethics, etiquette knowledge, characteristics of voice, gestures, movements, facial expressions, reactions and their other communication options. If classical rhetoric focused attention on how to convince another part, in modern rhetoric, the emphasis is put on dialogue, interaction between speakers, and harmonization of relations. The originality of this article lies not only in the analysis of business meetings as a subject rather than a tool of research, but especially in placing meetings within a phenomenological perspective as the major sense-making activity taking place in the business environment.*

Keywords: *rhetorical argumentation, business negotiation, persuasion of opponent, logical reasoning, negotiator fervor, ethics of reasoning, prototypical communication.*

The meeting and its language. Johnson (1990) proposes that: «Face-to-face contacts [are] the unbeatable methods to create real two way communication» and he elaborates further thus: «Indeed, all other contact methods can be considered only as substitutes for person-to-person contacts» (p. 318). If person-to-person interaction is prototypical dyadic communication, so meetings are the prototypical form of multiparty communication. But while negotiation is a frequently examined topic in the business literature, meetings are only mentioned on the list of managerial communication activities (Johnson 1990, Stanton 1990, Mintzberg 1973, Katz 1989) or they are the topic of legal manuals (Shaw & Smith 1974, Newport 1944, Crew 1927) or of prescriptive textbooks (Janner 1986, Fletcher 1983, Dunsing & Hormel 1978, Bradford 1976). Only one scholar has so far taken up the challenge of investigating the nature and dynamics of the Meeting. Schwartzman (1986) refers to an earlier survey (McCall et al. 1978) according to which managers tend to overestimate the time they spend in reading, writing and thinking, while they underestimate the time they spend in meetings. Although a theory of meetings is still premature, Schwartzman sketches some useful points that could eventually lead in that direction: «We need to produce field studies that examine what naturally occurring meetings do for Individuals in specific organizations, how Individuals use meetings in

their day-to-day organizational life, and how meetings affect Individuals in specific settings. ...We should also begin to examine relationships between Individuals and meetings, and to compare the structure and uses of meetings across organizations and cross-culturally» (p. 249).

The way scholars view meetings will influence the methodology used and, consequently, the results of research. According to the anthropological perspective, meetings are seen as rituals or ceremonies, laden with symbolic significance and instrumental to the creation and maintenance of organisational life. Schwartzman goes on to suggest that in the so called «organized anarchies» (March & Olsen 1976) meetings could become «social metaphors» allowing «individuals to engage in a variety of expressive activities while they appear to be engaged in instrumental behavior» (251). One characteristic is common to all meetings, however they are viewed, and that is language. In fact, in corporate contexts, there would be no institution called «meeting», without some form of verbal interaction. The review of the literature on negotiation has pointed to some of the issues that have been investigated in both theoretical and empirical studies and the relevance of which extends to the discussion on the Meeting. In a useful review and critique of the literature on the role of communication in bargaining, Putman and Jones (1982) identify three perspectives, which closely match those discussed so far in this study: the mechanistic, the psychological and the pragmatic. All three approaches have shortcomings, especially the first one, which focusing «upon the flow and transmission of messages, rather than upon the type or the meaning of information» is unable to reveal the complex nature and functions of communication in bargaining.

The significance of meetings. The marketers in their study seemed to have a very relaxed attitude towards meetings, confirming Ravn's «folk theory» of organizational meetings: meetings are unexciting events «for discussing things» — either you «put up with them or try to stay away» (Ravn 2013:165). There were thought pre-arranged and rather formal meetings with customers and co-workers would be the most significant components of marketing work from the marketers' perspective. Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris (1997:205–208) makes a theoretical distinction between external and internal “meetings” on one hand, and «service encounters» on the other. All corporate meetings involve decision-making processes with organizational effects, which service encounters do not, they argue. Moreover, meetings are less ritualized, less constrained and less defined than are service encounters.

Corporate meetings are either external meetings involving actors detached from the organization, or internal meetings that gather participants from the same organization in which internal power positions more important, according to Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris. It is troublesome to uphold a clear distinction between meetings and service encounters in marketing work. When analysing the context of marketing work in the light of Bitzer (1968). It was concluded that marketing work was undertaken in loosely structured and weak rhetorical situations, which is consistent with Lenney's finding that marketing managers do their work in «weak situations characterized by fundamental indeterminacy» (Lenney 2009:151).

It was also highly problematic to separate one rhetorical situation from another, particularly because marketers engaged in the immediate context to talk a favourable situation into existence. Seen through the perspective of Vatz (1973), «external

circumstances» were used as stuff, means, props or bridges (pick your metaphor) when constructing the context to which they seemed to belong. The initial representation of a meeting is itself part of an argument. For example, arranging a «sales meeting» compared to a «work-shop» would produce entirely different expectations, although the purpose and content could be the same. Then again, a meeting seldom remained intact, «in character» so to speak, from start to end. As Holmes (in Handford 2007:58) explains, meetings typically embrace parallel characters because people skilfully and very subtly depart from «core business» discourse to «social» talk, and back again, which makes it problematic to uphold a clear distinction between formal and informal meetings. Likewise, it is difficult to distinguish between planned and unplanned meetings, as Boden (1994:84) does, since marketers explore, invent and exploit the time, place and circumstances in which every marketing activity is embedded. Hence it is impossible to distinguish interpretation from creation when marketers' account for the external circumstances of their work. In this respect, marketers may be understood as something of «ontological sculptors» (Lenney 2009:153).

Our point is that meetings blur for persuasive purposes. In the analysis of rhetorical subjects, it was argued that marketers could be understood as *homo rhetoricus* who plays with cultural stereotypes to rearrange the interlocutor's self. If it fails, they offer another frame, they cast the audience «in another play» (Lanham 1976:14), which is an informative description of a commonly used rhetorical strategy used by the marketers when arguing for business purposes. When they fail to argue convincingly, they change topic but continue to talk about business matters related to some form of customer need, or they might talk about sport, careers, friends, politics, etc. or they might declare that the meeting is over and then continue to talk, and thus change the meeting with the aim of putting themselves in a better argumentative position.

Argumentation and persuasion means: The negotiating parties are trying to convince each other in the correctness of their views, positions in business negotiations. For this purpose, the usage of variety of tools starting from logic diagrams and finishing with various appeals, speculation, sophistries are discussed in scientific literature (Wetlaufer 2005; Zarefsky 2006, 2008a, 2008b; Estrada 2010; King 2010).

Rhetoric extending from Aristotle, is «not only as the word art to persuade, but also as structured science of persuasive speech with its own structure, definition, terminology, categories, rules» (Koženiauskienė 2009).

Persuasive speaking is very important competence of the negotiator. Nothing can replace the persuasion of a live word by the negotiator. Only directly negotiating, submitting evidence, arguments, counter-arguments, polemicizing, negotiators can move quickly towards the joint target of the agreement (Eckhouse 1999; Hallahan 1999; Andersen 2001; Tindale 2004; Ulbert et al. 2004 Maaravi et al. 2011). If in the rhetoric of Aristotle communication act was a one-way, so the modern rhetoric says that there are no passive sides in the act of communication — and the speaker and the listener are playing an active role (Arvanitis, Karampatzos 2011). Even with a well-developed modern means of communication, the Internet, electronic negotiation support systems, negotiators move to another part of the world for live, direct negotiations. The negotiator in the process of a negotiating express himself, his look, mind, manners, emotions, ethics, etiquette knowledge, features of his own voice, gestures, movements, facial expressions,

and other reactions of his communicational capabilities (Nauckūnaitė 1998, Nauckūnaitė 2002, Nauckūnaitė 2007a, Nauckūnaitė 2007b). As indicated by R. Koženiauskienė, «in rhetorical theory the rhetorical tools are estimated at several hundreds, and they are quite different, each has its own purpose, carries out certain functions, and helps to influence the addressee.

Theoretically, all the rhetorical tools are neutral; their positive or negative influence is determined by the speaker's purpose and the circumstances under which the instrument is being used. Rhetorical measures primarily have to embody and help to clarify the content, to convey and clarify certain information, reinforce arguments, to lead by the way of wisdom, truth and proof, rather than oratory. Knowledge of rhetorical tools helps to reveal a logical order, the consistency of the information provided, the links of sentences causality. Another important feature of rhetoric tools — is to maintain a successful contact with the audience» (Koženiauskienė 2009). The use of rhetorical measures in the negotiating, the success of staying in contact with other part of the negotiations are important factors for effective negotiations. If classical rhetoric is focused on how to convince the other part, so in modern rhetoric greater focus is on the dialogue, mutual interaction, harmonization of relations between speakers (Koženiauskienė 2009). There are some statements provided by S. Palazzi about rhetoric of negotiations: «rhetoric — that is to say the right things at the right time in the right place at the right way to gain the chosen goal» (Koženiauskienė 2009).

Thus, the rhetorical competence of the negotiator could be described as the ability to speak well, to prove, to argue, to use correctly, properly rhetorical measures necessary to evaluate the bargaining situation, the context of the negotiations, the peculiarities of communication (rhetorical) situation, be able to analyze and critically evaluate own discourses and of other negotiator, to reveal the cause of effective and ineffective speaking, recognize manipulation and bluffing, to know how to convince the other side of the negotiation.

The most important function of rhetoric is persuasive impact, covering very extensive range to other person (or group of persons) — from persuasion, suggestion, inspiration, faith reinforcement, encouragement to captivating (Koženiauskienė 2013). Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* not only put much attention to rational arguments in persuasion, appealing to logos, to mind thinking, reasoning and consideration, but also provided an important role for other factors of persuasion.

R. Koženiauskienė (2009) and Z. Nauckūnaitė (2007) presented the most important features of logos, ethos and pathos.

1. Logos is designed that speaker with accurate and clear words can convince listeners, affect them by professional freedom of thoughts and speech logic, wisdom and the right words seeking to their goals. Logos — is an appeal to the mind, or a synonym of justice criterion, it is faithfulness to the truth. Logos — is the facts, events, actions, clear evidence supporting by witnesses, and documents, expert conclusions, language (Koženiauskienė 2009, p. 431–432). Logos principle states that in order to convince the audience, addresser must consistently provide the evidence and follow the logic of the rules — regular course of reasoning. It seems that logic and rationality should be seen much more than the image of the addressee or the addressee's appeal to the emotions, but

the formal reasoning of addressee is usually unacceptable (heavy and boring), so have to rely on rhetorical reasoning types.

2. Ethos — is loyalty to yourself, everything what is related with the ethics and etiquette — the speaker's general values, the ability to listen and understand the other person, to adapt the words of the topic, audience, circumstances, with respect to the law, as well as to the ordinary citizen, to the listener, to the opponent. This is the respect that is shown by the behavior and expressed in appropriate words. Ethos arguments appeal to the speaker's and the listener's moral norms (justice, fairness, sense of responsibility) commonality. Usually there are two kinds of psychological arguments: 1) arguments of understanding and acceptance, in order to characterize a person; 2) arguments of general condemnation, in order to characterize the behavior.

In fact ethos is an appeal to human behavior (suggestion and linguistic behavior), or synonym of sincerity criterion. Each speaker is allowed to claim only what he believes himself. Aristotle notices that we listen not to the language but to the person who is speaking, and had opinion that from all three categories most persuasive is ethos. Values and beliefs or personal moral authority, becomes the basis of rhetorical appeals (Koženiauskienė 2009, p. 432–433). Ethos refers to the speaker's moral qualities. From Greek language ethos arose ethics, ethical, and modern communication science ethos tends to interpret by the word image because Aristotle ethos used to describe such features of the speaker's character, which he reveals to the audience. Aristotle said that we tend to trust more the speaker, who is «wise, honest, and kind-hearted». Today near the features of the common sense, as good character and good will are attached the competence — addresser must be not only a great man, but also well versed in the subject matter about which he is speaking or writing.

3. Pathos, according to today's understanding are speaker's emotions — everything that shows the strength of the speaker's position, his sincere determination to defend justice and explain the truth after the movement of the audience's feelings.

Aristotle's pathos — is an appeal to the senses, and the most important — the ability to put themselves in another person's emotional state, nowadays commonly called empathy, which is a synonym of relevance criterion (relevance is understood as mutual feelings of fulfillment, balance between the speaker's and the listener's emotions). Relevance criterion requires that the speaker to know the audience emotions and starved the same, what feelings he expects from the audience, that he do not go from the subject, do not lie, do not to play, that he would be sincere (Koženiauskienė 2009, p. 434–435). Pathos refers to the speaker's ability to connect with audience's feelings, desires, wishes, fears and desires. Assessing in the addressee's perspective, it is necessary to stress that the addressee would hear and understand you (if you are unable to connect with the audience, do not neither speak nor write).

There is the need to use only reasonable and fair arguments because at least one unreasonable, unconvincing argument provokes a danger that the opponent will doubt justice of reasoning overall. Thus, the adequacy of arguments must be understood not in terms of quantity but by their meaningfulness and plausibility. Rhetorical argumentation in business negotiations — is an attempt through a number of certain statements or evidence to convince someone to change their position or belief and acceptance of this position.

References

1. Andersen, P. H. 2001. Relationship development and marketing communication: an integrative model, *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 16(3).
2. Arvanitis, A.; Karampatzos, A. 2011. Negotiation and Aristotle's Rhetoric: Truth over interests, *Philosophical Psychology* 24: 845–860.
3. Eckhouse, B. 1999. *Competitive Communication: A Rhetoric for Modern Business*. New York: Oxford University Press.
4. Kearney, C.; Hisrich, R. D.; Antoncic, B. 2013. The mediating role of corporate entrepreneurship for external environment effects on performance, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 14 (Supplement 1).
5. King, C.L. 2010. Beyond persuasion: the rhetoric of negotiation in business communication, *Journal of Business Communication* 47(1): 69–78.
6. Koženiauskienė, R. 2009. *Basics of Legal Rhetoric*. Monograph. Vilnius.
7. Laužikas, M.; Mokšėckienė. 2013. The role of creativity in sustainable business, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 1(1): 10–22.
8. Zarefsky, D. 2008 b. Knowledge claims in rhetorical criticism, *Journal of communication* 58: 629–640.

Березинська Н.О.

старший викладач кафедри німецької мови

Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана

РОЗВИТОК І ПОПУЛЯРИЗАЦІЯ ГЕНДЕРНО-КОРЕКТНОЇ МОВИ В НІМЕЧЧИНІ

Анотація: В статті розглядається ситуація, що склалась в Німеччині з реалізацією положень гендерно коректного використання німецької мови. Наявність у німецькій мові гендерних особливостей іменників, які відносяться до людей, стала причиною публічних дискусій щодо статі та мови, які тривають вже декілька десятиліть. Феміністки стверджують — якщо загальні формулювання містять граматичний чоловічий рід, то відбувається ігнорування жінок на лінгвістичному рівні. Як наслідок, це сприяє ігноруванню досягнень жінок, їх прав та інтересів. На основі останніх досліджень складається враження, що найкращим рішенням є використання гендерних пар для створення рівного представництва. Вивчення питання дозволило зробити висновок, що відношення до гендерно-коректного використання німецької мови не є загальновизнаним, що використання гендерно-нейтральної мови в Німеччині має як прихильників, так і противників.

Abstract. This article has set the goal to study the realization of the provisions on gender-correct use of the German language. The fact, that since nouns referring to people are gender-specific in the German language, gender and language have been a topic of public discourse in Germany over the past several decades. When general statements are formulated in the masculine, feminists argue, women are linguistically ignored. As a consequence, women's achievements, their rights, and their interests are easily overlooked. Based on lately research, it seems that the best solution is to include the use of gender pairs in order to create equal representation. Studying of the issue has allowed concluding that relation to the subject of gender correct use of the German language is not universally recognized. The use of gender-neutral language in German has both supporters and opponents.

Ключові слова: німецька мова, гендерно-нейтральне формулювання, гендерно-коректна мова, жінки.

Keywords: German language, gender-neutral formula, gender-correct language, women.