

DOI 10.20544/HORIZONS.A.26.3.20.P19
UDC 338.48-6:811.111'276.6
338.48-6:811.163.3'276.6

REPRESENTING VOICES IN TOURISM – CROSS- CULTURAL ANALYSES

Irina Petrovska

University “St. Kliment Ohridski”- Bitola, Faculty of Tourism and
Hospitality – Ohrid

irina.petrovska@uklo.edu.mk

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this paper is through analysis and description of the language of tourism in the English and Macedonian to evaluate similarities and differences in the tourism communication and to highlight their cultural aspects. The accent is put on differences and similarities of both cultures that have their own realization through language interactions, where the subcultures and individual variables that motivate people to speak as they do, are deeply integrated. Following the basic principles of the ethnography of communication and its key components that are part of language interactions, the ethnographies observed showed existence of certain culturally specific similarities and differences in the communicative competence of the speakers of both languages. The differences in the ethnographies in the English and Macedonian language are due to the fact that the cultural systems of both languages are organized differently.

Key words: ethnography of communication, culture, tourism.

INTRODUCTION

The main objective of this research is the analyses of the language of tourism in the English and Macedonian language from the aspect of the ethnography of communication. By presenting the similarities and differences in tourism communication, we try to enlighten the cultural aspects in tourism in the English and Macedonian language.

Communication interactions, processes and experiences are central aspects of tourism studies. Even though they represent a relatively novel, undiscovered field of research, it is a fact that since recently, the experts in linguistics have turned their research attention towards the language of tourism. The idea of undertaking a research from tourism discourse originates from the fact that in the literature there is no special monograph completely dedicated to the issues of ethnographic description of tourism communication in the English and Macedonian language. The research of how communication flows in tourism discourse reflects the interdisciplinary approach in this paper: on the one hand, tourism as an exceptionally important and strong agent and channel of globalization, and on the other hand, the ethnography of communication, which basic postulates are being reflected in the tourism communication. Both disciplines, merged together, reflect the changes and transition, and at the same time they grow into treasures of diverse discourses, from the very beginning of tourism development until present day.

The accent is put on the differences and similarities of both cultures realized through communicative strategies, where the subcultures and individual variables are deeply integrated, and that motivate people to speak as they do. An attempt to separate is neither possible nor desirable, especially for the fact that their relations are culturally interwoven. It is of great importance to make a difference between the realization of one culture in a language and its realization through the language that belongs to that culture (that this culture speaks). Following the basic postulates of the ethnography of communication for the key components that are part of the communicative interactions, the analyzed ethnographies from the tourism discourse showed that there are certain culturally specific similarities, but also differences in the communicative competences of the speakers in both cultures.

Globalization inevitably brings the disappearance of the ethnography of communication of an ethnos. The contribution of this paper is seen in the implementation of the results which should indicate how it is important and necessary, especially on the territory as the Balkan is, to preserve the ethnographic values.

DIRECTNESS/INDIRECTNESS

How people communicate in tourism domain depends to great degree on the type of culture to which the speakers belong. When we discuss the ways of communication in the English language one has to pay attention to the so called *understatement* which can be paraphrased as 'not to impose oneself'. The author Markovic (1963), explains this occurrence as a typical characteristic of the culture of expression in the English language, as insufficient, or incomplete expression, saying less than the truth, minimizing, too modest or too moderate statement that is typical for the English. In this way they achieve greater emphasis, whereas the same occurrence in the Slavic languages is achieved by overloud statement or with exaggeration. (pp.39).

The statement that the speakers of the Anglo-American culture do not use unobtrusiveness is well known. (Wierzbicka, 1985:163). When we analyze this occurrence in the English language and the culture that is expressed through this language, it is inevitably to mention the statements and views expressed by well-known researchers from this field. Most of them, Brown and Levinson (1978), Blum-Kulka, (Wierzbicka, 1985), generalize on the basis of the English language a statement that when people ask something, suggest or offer an advice, they do that indirectly. (pp.145-178). According Wierzbicka (1985), it is obvious that such generalization is concluded only through the English language, that is, what is right for the speakers of the English language must be right for all the speakers in general. (pp.145-178).

The corpus analysis indicated that the dichotomy directness/indirectness appears in communicative strategies in the tourism communication in the following ethnographies:

expressing politeness, dissatisfaction, giving orders, complaining and giving compliments.

The dichotomy directness/indirectness is specifically present in the communicative strategies when one expresses politeness. The indirectness in the speakers' conversation in the English language is especially expressed in the ethnographies of politeness through the forms of polite request.

Hotel room reservation /Restaurant reservation by phone

*Could you reserve a single
една
room for me from August, 15th
август.
to August, 25th?*

*Сакам да резервирам
двокреветна соба за 12ти*

Asking for information for hotel room, hotel entertainments, services and weather:

*Could you tell me please,
игралишта?
where the tennis courts are?*

Каде се тениските

Asking for information for hotel animations and the surrounding:

*Can you tell me please, where
концерт.
it is possible to go out here?*

Вечерва сакаме да одиме на

*Ќе можете ли да ни
обезбедите карти?*

Paying hotel bill:

*My bill, please.
молам.
Can you give me my bill?*

Ако може да платам, ќе ве

Asking for information in a tourist agency:

*Could you recommend a resort
on the East Coast?*

*Ме интересира аражманот
За летување во Тунис.
Колку чини една недела?*

The communicative strategy of politeness is part of the tourism employee's communicative competence, and as such it is common for the speakers of both cultures.

Information asked by the receptionist during guest room reservation:

*Could you tell me when
дине?
do you require the room, Sir?*

За кој термин ви треба собата 2-

During check- in process the receptionist uses the following ethnographies of politeness:

How can I help you?

Добар ден. Повелете.

When guests check in, if the receptionist did not understand the guest clearly, the ethnographies of polite addressing will be used in order the communication between host-guest goes flowingly:

Sorry?

Простете.

I beg your pardon?

Се извинувам.

The receptionist politely offers the services that are available to the hotel guests:

Would you like to go

Би сакале ли да одите на разглед

на градом? a sightseeing tour?

The services offered by the waiter, are most often expressed by the indirectness in the culture of English language, whereas the services that are offered by the waiter in the culture of Macedonian language are expressed through the direct mode, or through a mild form of the imperative:

May I take your coats?

Вашиите палта можете да ми ги

дадете.

Accepting orders

The ethnographies used by the waiter when accepting orders are also in indirect form in the culture of English language, whereas the ethnographies that the waiter uses in the culture of Macedonian language when receiving meal orders are in direct form:

Can I help you?

May I help you?

What can I do for you?

What would you like?

Повелете.

Would you like to order now?

And what would you like to drink?

Is there anything else you would like to order?

The interrogative forms of polite request in the English language explicitly invite to verbal response, as well as to non-verbal one. (*OK, allright, sure, etc.*). In this way the cultural value, which is typical especially for the American culture - culture of showing that the speaker approaches the listener as an independent, free personality, with his own feelings and free

will, and who may at any point during the conversation oppose or agree with the speaker.

Analysing the ethnographies of politeness, it is obvious that there is a difference in the realization in both cultures. As opposed to the Macedonian culture, in the Anglo-American cultural tradition there is a presence of a number of interrogative mechanisms of polite requests. It is interesting to notice that in the communication of the speakers of English, there is a presence of strong refusal in the use of the imperative, whereas with the speakers of Macedonian, the imperative was constructed as one of the milder form when expressing direct requests. In the Macedonian language such similar constructions do not exist, which is certified with the samples from the corpus. This can be explained with the existence of restriction of interrogative forms in the Macedonian language outside the range of questions. Similarly, the question form in the Macedonian language is not valued from the cultural point of view as a means for giving directives, that is, there is no cultural need for developing interrogative mechanisms used for communicative strategies different from questions, or more precisely for expressing directives.

The expression *would you mind* simply does not have a translatable equivalent in the Macedonian language. That does not mean that in the Macedonian language speakers never use interrogative forms for polite requests. Examples of this type of ethnographies are mostly found in the sets of conversation *receptionist- guest*, or *waiter – guest*, but rarely in the everyday communication. For instance, the guest might express polite request through pretending to ask about the listener's capability to do something, or asking about his politeness:

*Ќе можете ли...?Would
you ...
Ќе бидете ли така добри
да...?Could you possibly...
Ќе бидете ли така
љубезни да...?Would you
be so kind to...*

However, the correct Macedonian equivalents of the phrases *would you do it*, *won't you do it*, *why don't you do it*, *do you want to do it* or *would you like to do it* are not used as communicative strategies in the tourism discourse when someone asks politely something. The pseudo-questions that seemingly refer to the speaker's wishes, but actually should be interpreted as

polite requests (*would you like to, do you want to*), appear to be especially weird and funny for the Macedonian speakers as these phrases look like naïve hypocrisy (as transparent acts of what looks like naïve hypocrisy). (Wierzbicka, 1985:153). This is why the realizations of the Macedonian ethnographies will be different from the English ones in this domain.

Complaints

The ethnographies that express complaints and regrets are present in the corpus, and they are part of the communicative competence of the guest, whereas the ethnographies of expressing regrets are used as strategies on behalf of the host (receptionist, waiter, housekeeper, tourist agent), in both cultures. Complaints are integrated section in the tourism discourse, being well elaborated ethnographies, that are used quite often by the speakers with higher social status.

The corpus analysis indicated that the ethnographies of expressing complaints by the speaker are more often present in the culture of English language than in the culture of Macedonian speakers' competence. These communicative strategies are expressed indirectly in the English language, too. It seems that Macedonian speakers very rarely use such communicative realizations. Complaints are very often commented in the everyday *tat-a-tat* conversations than to be made on official level, verbally or in interrogative form. However, when they use this communicative strategy, it is realized through direct mode of expression:

*Excuse me, but
the heating is out of order.*

*Собата не е со поглед на езеро.
Извинете, но во бањата
нема доволно крпи.*

I'm sorry but my room is too noisy.

Could you please take it back?

Овде недостасува нож!

It's too greasy.

Келнер, супата не е топла!

Excuse me, the steak is raw.

Овој прилог е пресолен!

*Excuse me I've been waiting for
минути 20
my dish for more than ten minutes.*

*Извинете, но веќе дваесет
Чекам јадењето.*

<i>Olives Garden?</i>	<i>На екскурзија во 6 часот</i>
<i>наутро.</i>	
<i>How about TGIF's.</i>	
<i>Let's go to Arbot's.</i>	<i>Зарем не е подобро во 7</i>
<i>часот?</i>	
<i>We can book double-room.</i>	<i>Можете да земете две</i>
<i>Twin-bedded with king size beds</i>	<i>двокреветни соби..</i>
<i>would be better.</i>	<i>Подобро една двокреветна со</i>
	<i>помошен лежај.</i>

- postponing

There are situations when the value of the negative answer to an invitation or request has an answer that expresses postponing. Such situation is being recorded in both corpuses:

<i>Can we visit the cathedral today?</i>	<i>Моќеме ли да ја посетиме</i>
<i>I think that's a great idea,</i>	<i>катедралата денес?</i>
<i>but I don't think we have time.</i>	<i>Идејата ти е добра,но</i>
	<i>денес навистина немаме</i>
	<i>време за тоа..</i>

-transferring guilt to the third or to something that is impossible to control

Did you buy the plane tickets?
Yes, but we are on the waiting list.

театар?

броеви на

Shall we go on a cruise this summer?
We might, but they say it's all sold out.

Купи карти за на

Секако, иако немаме

седиштата.

-avoiding

One of the modes to a negative response to a question or an offer is to avoid a direct answer:

How do you like the agency's
каталог на

Ти се допаѓа ли новиот

new booklet? It's interesting.

Охридско лето?

Па, интересен е.

The expression *It's interesting* ' is neutral without real meaning but actually the listener gives negative response.

- general acceptance of offer without closer determination

In the American culture, the phrase *Drop it any time*, is not considered as an invitation. It is the same situation with the phrase *Call me when you're in town*. In the Macedonian language phrases that are used in this manner, such as *Наврати понекогаш* (*Pop in sometimes*) or *Јави се* (*Call me*), *Ќе се видим* (*See you around*), are not understood by the listener as a serious invitation, but one of the common ways to end the conversation.

- distracting or confusing the listener

This effect in the culture of English language is achieved when a listener answers with a question to a question, especially this is the case in the American culture, but it is also present in the corpus of the Macedonian language.

*Please, give me some
еднокреветни соби
information about this trip.
дине?
Why?
истиот кам?*

*Дали сакате две
Или една двокреветна, г-
Имате ли апартмани на*

-generalized acceptance with apology is present in both analyzed cultures:

It's a good idea, but...

*Убаво кажуваш, само, кој
да го
стори тоа?*

- to say that the offer is inadequate

*Can we have room service
на
in this hotel?
You're in the wrong place.*

*Да побараме рум сервис
рецепција.
Идејата не ти е лоша, но,*

This a youth hostel, not

*се наоѓаме во
одморалиште, а не во
хотел.*

a five star hotel.

It is obvious that the ethnographies that express complaints and regrets in both cultures share certain similarities and differences. In the culture of English the indirectness appears again as a mode to express unobtrusive negation, which is not an often case in the culture of Macedonian language.

CONCLUSION

Speakers of a given culture very often and much more are exposed to the influence of a foreign culture and ever since before, as a result of the demand of their profession or as a result of the socio-economic changes, which contribute towards the ethic profile of a country being quite picturesque. In that diversity of cultures customs and traditions, languages and dialects, insufficiently informed person can go through a cultural shock, confronting him with every day diverse influences. That is why, the systematic study of the cultural phenomena in general and especially of the specific cultural conventions of the speaker's encounters becomes an inseparable part of the modern educational system in the tourism studies.

REFERENCES:

1. Abbot, G. (1991), "Encouraging communication in English: a paradox". *ELT Journal* 35:228-230.
2. Archer, C.M. (1986). "Culture bump and beyond". In Valdes J. (ed) *Culture Bound: Bridging The Cultural Gap In Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 170-178.
3. Babamova, E. (1984). "Sociolingvisticatakomponentavonastavata: kodovizaobrananjevomakedonskioti angliskiotjzik". *Jazicnitekontakti, Zborniknatrudovi, SDPL, Ohrid 1984:141-146*.
4. Benson, P.(2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. Longman. London.
5. Blue, G. and Harun, M.(2002). "Hospitality language as a professional skill", *ESP Volume 22. Issue1:73*.
6. Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Bugarski, R. (1986). *Jezik u društvu*. Beograd: Prosveta.
8. Buttjes, D. &Byram, M (eds) (1991). *Mediating Languages and Cultures*. Multilingual Matters, England.

9. Coulthard, M.(1977). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
10. Council of Europe (2003), *Mirrors and windows: An intercultural communication textbook*, Graz: Council of Europe Publishing.
11. Fasold, R. (1997). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
12. Goffman E. (1976). Replies and responses. In Hymes, D. (ed.) *Language in Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 257-313.
13. Đorđević, R. (1975). *Kulturakaofaktor u nastaviengleskogjezikakaostranogjezika*. Beograd.Izdavačkoinformativnicentarstudenata.
14. Hammersley, M. &Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: TavistockPublications.
15. Hymens, D. (ed) (1964). *Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers
16. Kramsch, C. (1994). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*, 2nd edition, Oxford: OUP.
17. Lado, R. (1976). *Linguistics Across Culture*. The University of Michigan Press. Ann Arbor.
18. Lakoff, R. (1972). Language in context. *Language*. Vol.48, pp.907-927.
19. Marković, V. (1963). *Engleski roman XX veka*. Beograd: Naučnaknjiga.
20. Petrovska, I. (2004) “Communicative Strategies in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry in English and Macedonian.”. In Perić, J. et al. (eds) *Tourism& Hospitality Industry 2004: New Trends in Tourism and Hospitality Management*. Opatija, pp.545-555.
21. Prodromou, L. (1992). “What culture? Which culture? Cross-cultural factors in language learning”. *ELT Journal*, Vol.46/1,OUP.
22. Stefanovski, Lj. (1996).“Etnografijatanagovorot, deminutivotikulturata”. *VoLettreInternationale*. Skopje: OSI – Macedonia: 82-86.
23. Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational Style*. Ablex.
24. Valdes, J.M. (ed) (1986). *Culture Bound. Bridging the Cultural Gap*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Wardraugh, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*.Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
26. Wierzbicka, A. (1985). “Different Cultures, Different Languages, Different Speech Acts”. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol.9, pp.145-78.

27. Widdowson, H. G. (1983). *Learning Purpose and Language Use*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press.
28. Wolfson, N. & Judd, E. (eds) (1983). *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.