

# **Translating reality into virtuality: a communication shift from traditional to new media**

## **AIM OF PAPER and PROJECT**

The aim of this paper is to give a short overview of the research I am currently doing in order to complete my PhD at KU Leuven/Catholic University of Louvain thus showing the interdisciplinary nature of the study.

I will give a broad outline of the background to this project, then highlight the main hypothesis and problems and finally look at some practical examples.

In examining this topic, I realised that communicators in multinationals such as banks use the Internet increasingly in addition to traditional channels of communication. However, new media pose new challenges and problems and demand that these institutions review their approach to language in terms of language options, content, medium and adapt it to meet the requirements of the changing society worldwide.

The new media open up new channels of access to many more potential clients. Consequently, the issue of language becomes a potential obstacle or an ace. More often than not language is not even viewed as a problem, therefore translation becomes an invisible tool.

Belgium is the centre of focus as acts as the ideal laboratory: Belgium: geographically the heart of Western Europe Officially the country is trilingual. F, G and D. it has a history of language strife and has a population of 10 million people. In addition, a high concentration of expatriates – who work for Nato or the EU or multinationals- live in the country. Also the increased use of English – world/ commercial language – is seen in Belgian public and social life.

## **BACKGROUND**

In the traditional banking sector communication used to consist of internal and external communication models and channels; with a clear distinction between the two. However, with the emergence of the Internet and WWW this has changed. A website has become a new element of the marketing mix and communication channels, resulting in the convergence of channels.

This project is an attempt to describe the norms, strategies and policies at work in this changing landscape that is increasingly dominated by the technology.

Belgium has a long history of innovative banking systems (eg banksys, smart cards). The country is a leader with its superior technology and infrastructure. Because of its innovative character, studying the transition from traditional to new media might lead the way for other banks in the world.

## **Hypotheses**

<sup>1</sup>Based on all the documentation collected (print and websites), a number of deductions can be made and hypotheses posed.

1. The identified banks claim to use a certain communication (language/translation) policy but do not adhere to it consistently (no correspondence of practice and theory).
2. The identified banks do not distinguish between clients in that they use the same communication strategy in all media (traditional printed communication vs. the Internet) to communicate with their potential and existing clients; as if it was a static customer-base.
3. The identified banks assume that their website (global) addresses the same public as the traditional, print (local) communication does.
4. Language and culture shifts take place from traditional communication to Internet communication. (External communication has to be specific to its medium (web) – why?)

## **DOCUMENTATION**

The documentation under discussion has been taken from the websites of three Belgian banks, namely ING, Fortis and KBC. In addition, brochures and client magazines have also been used.

The URL's are: [www.kbc.be](http://www.kbc.be) , [www.fortisbank.be](http://www.fortisbank.be) , [www.ing.be](http://www.ing.be)

## **Internet and Translation Studies**

When we move into the field of Internet Studies and specifically the language component, it is inevitable that we will deal with inter-disciplinarity. Recently a number of publications have devoted space to the question of Translation Studies and Inter-disciplinarity. Our goal is not to (re)summarize these discussions; on the other hand we cannot ignore them either.

It seems that one of the (unavoidable) weaknesses of a young discipline such as TS is that it cannot cover all areas of cultural/technological innovation; technological developments are taking place so rapidly that it is difficult to keep up...; consequently, the use of language(s) and discourse will continuously be submitted to other/new kinds of innovation which, in turn, will lead to new fields of research and approaches.

It is hard to approach translation in our contemporary society without dealing – unwillingly – with business matters; contemporary international discourse is so heavily conditioned by commercial communication channels that we need to be able to deal with the question of commercial (business) discourse in its various forms.

Translation and business communication were a rather new topic say ten years ago. However, still not much has been written about it in terms of TS.

Though, partly under the influence of organization theory, discourse, language(s) and translation have become key issues to organizations and have provided organization theory with new

---

<sup>1</sup> Not only documentation cited but the entire corpus.

models from TS. (Here I refer to Maddy Janssens; Chris Steyaert; Tomasz Dembski; and José Lambert)

In terms of technological development, TS has evolved into a new direction with the introduction of localization of mainly computer software which is: A prime example of the convergence of traditional translation theory and the practical application in a business-driven environment.

Consequently, this had led to new models and principles with which the field could be dealt with in a systematic and scholarly way.

This brings me to the Internet again. Fifteen years ago it would have been hard to imagine what kind of revolution the Internet would bring in terms of new channels of communication.

## **INTERNET AND/OR WEB WRITING**

At this point it would be easy to devote (again) theoretical considerations to Internet.

Or to study the languages on the Internet in cultural terms, or as part of Descriptive Translation Studies. By the way, DTS has its roots in certain traditions rather than others (semiotics, Literary Studies, a certain kind of linguistics), but it deserves to be extended more systematically in, say Media (Screen) translation, or other areas (not to mention Corpus Linguistics).

In fact, my investigation will be oriented mainly towards **methodological** rather than theoretical or cultural questions.

A rather **theoretical** question could be: "What does the Internet have to do with Translation?" An obvious **cultural** approach might be formulated as: "Is there a given tradition on the Internet that is specific for given countries rather than others?", or "How can we discover the origin of the website?"

None of these questions are meaningless, and they may pop up again.

For our purposes today, we shall rather re-formulate the first question: "**What does the Internet have to do with translation?**" and use it as a methodological tool for actual research on particular kinds and traditions on the Internet, in a more or less specific ("technical") area.

When approaching dubbing or subtitling on the basis of such theoretical questions, we often seem to get stuck: "dubbers" and "sub-titlers" (or interpreters) tend to stress the fact that dubbing (subtitling, interpreting) is "**something other than translation**". They already imply that they know exactly what "translation" means, which seems to be a very risky and naïve assumption.

What **translation exactly is** may be an interesting question, but most experts tend to agree that the more they know about it, the more it needs to be studied (again and again). "Dubbers", "sub-titlers" and interpreters seem to assume that there is something like a core definition of translation, and that their specific area is not part of it.

The awareness that translation has more central and more peripheral definitions is probably not useless, but this does not really help us with the ambiguity. Is the Internet (linked with) translation or not?

In this our discussion we shall remember such questions but not use them as our real focus.

Let us rather be pragmatic. In case we want to deal with the Internet and to study it, **can we and how could we benefit from approaches** that are inspired by models borrowed from TS? **How exactly?** Should the Internet have some (more or less obvious) links with translation, how could approaches to translation give added value to our research?

## STARTING POINT

One cannot simply say that web writing on the Internet can be equated to translation. When asking the question whether (mono-lingual) web writing on the Internet is translation, the **obvious** answer is no. Web writing is a **form of discourse** determined by the medium (www). It does not answer to the conventional definitions<sup>2</sup> of translation, even though instances of multiple language options may be present.

But how and why could web writing on the Internet be approached in ways similar to the ones used by Translation scholars? Why and how is the translation question relevant at all?

- Our first reply will be:
  - There are (many) translations on Internet;  
The Internet offers examples of inter-lingual, intra-lingual and inter-semiotic translation, often on one and the same website. Moreover, various shifts take place on a number of levels.
  - Furthermore, it would be hard to produce/use Internet without the support of Translation.

In traditional (verbal) terms more than one language is involved: a source language (SL) being transferred into a target language (TL). In the case of websites, several language options are often given. These options can be on the opening page, indicated by flags which represent a language associated with a specific country. In the case of English, the British flag is used most often and not the American flag, unless a differentiation between the pages pertaining to those countries is made.

Does this imply that the Internet is (necessarily) bilingual or multilingual? And in fact, for many reasons this question makes sense. Is the Internet monolingual / bilingual / multilingual? **Where and how?**

As such these questions are highly interesting in cultural terms; the more so since contemporary society often assumes that societies are rather monolingual but a few exceptions.

To what extent does the success of the Internet **affect** our societies or communities in terms of **language**? And how is translation (proper) part of it?

While anticipating, I could already indicate how (the production of) websites are more bilingual/ multilingual in certain countries than in others.

---

<sup>2</sup> Webster dictionary ([www.webster.com](http://www.webster.com)): 1: an act, process, or instance of translating: as a : a rendering from one language into another; also : the product of such a rendering b : a change to a different substance, form, or appearance],

And we can imagine that this will have an impact on language, on society, maybe on oral/written speech and language traditions, etc.

**But there are quite a few other reasons for exploring translation as more than an accidental component of websites:**

It is assumed that every person or institution (whether public or private) going onto the Internet knows that they will **enter** other societies and be **confronted** by new language rules.

One of the implications is that the Internet is not so much bound by **territorial** principles, and much more with a **global society**; of course, certain websites attempt not to follow these unwritten laws of the Internet.

From the moment translation becomes one of the **consequences** of this option, it is supposed to **fulfil** given (functional) purposes, and **thus** the role played by Translation is worth being investigated.

Another issue starts on the basis of Roman Jakobson's view of "internal" or "intra-lingual" translation, i.e. **translation within a given language**.

Whenever the **construction** of websites is supposed to be based on previous textual material or explicit models, it is a "translation" ("adaptation") of previous models or not? The distinction between translation and adaptation, again, confirms that these difficulties are not new at all, on the contrary. For **DTS** there can never be a clear distinction between Translation and Adaptation, whereas, of course, usage supposes that this distinction is easy to make.

An **additional reason** for connecting translation and web writing on the Internet is that websites are at least **partly borrowed from previous** textual material, whether in one clearly identified or in another one. From this point of view and in still common terms, websites may appear to be "adapted" as well as "translated".

Given the **hypertextual** principle underlying the continuous flow of discourse on the Internet, we could even assume that one of the **formal difficulties** will be the identification/location of the exact model of so many websites where the **exact origin** of discourse(s) is hard to establish. Whether local or not, foreign or not, the "**models**" of our website discourse(s) is **hard** to find.

Such difficulty is not unknown within TS, but it is not often really solved. "Translations" with unknown origins tend to be **ignored** by T scholars. For many intellectuals/scholars, translations stop being translated as long as their exact "**original**" is not known. How could we assume translations are translations when we do not know their origins?

Other elements that deserve consideration are the **role of the translator** and the **position of languages** within a given company. When dealing with the websites of our case study banks: ING, Fortis and KBC, one should ask **who the translator** (s) was and how he fits into the communication of the organisation. Also, the **status of language**, a possible language policy and the use of institutionalized and official languages within a company are **vital** pointers in establishing or describing **norms** prevalent on a website.

The **treatment** of national or foreign languages on a website is **indicative** of the translation policy or lack of it. The same goes for the exact **standardisation of language(s)**. Do language

use and/or choice **reflect** the origin of the company, in other words is it territory-bound or not? Or does the website reflect a **monolingual culture** with incidental offerings in other languages?

## LET US HAVE A LOOK

The specimen material will demonstrate how the **questions borrowed** from (D)TS can help us to **analyse** the material at hand.

### Documentation

The material chosen for this paper deals with a **central theme**, namely summer holiday 2003. Each bank has dedicated web pages to this theme and also produced special external communication such as brochures, leaflets and posters.

### ING

The bank has a portfolio-like brochure with information on all aspects related to their products and holidays. This portfolio is only available in French and Dutch. However, the website offers the same information in three languages namely English, Dutch and French.

A client magazine for July/Aug is also dedicated to the holiday theme. The magazine is only available in French and Dutch.

- the entire website uses three languages;
- Previously the Bank was known as BBL, after the takeover it changed into ING-BBL used mainly F and D and a few pages in E on the website (2% or less);
- Now: 3 languages on website – identical but not the printed material

### ING

If you compare the web pages to the actual brochure you can see many similarities. The cover of the brochure was used on the webpage. The wording “vakantie pass” or holiday pass was not used on the webpage. The brochure also uses a number of photos which are not used on the website.

The **content** of the brochure deals with tips, URLs related to holiday matters, a countdown checklist, competition rules, Master card info, ING assistance numbers and info and an entry form. The **website** offers **exactly** the same info, only more product related news. The rules of the competition on the website can be **downloaded** as a PDF file which is an **exact copy** of the printed brochure.

### How particular is the printed presentation in relation to the Internet presentation?

One can clearly see that the **website is an extension** of the brochure but both can work autonomously. Both website and brochure were clearly designed to complement one another. The packing of the brochure is the only distinguishing factor.

### FORTIS

[www.fortisbank.be/vakantie](http://www.fortisbank.be/vakantie)

For Fortis the following material was used:

- A special Holiday section/pages were created for the season – temporary
- The pages are identical in F and D – the only language options
- On the webpage a brochure – which is available in print from the bank branch – can also be downloaded.

- Nothing in E or G

The brochure consists of a checklist for those going on holiday. The identical information is available on the webpage. The brochure consists of only 4 pages whereas the website offers 20 categories of information, consisting of at least one page each.

It has to be pointed out that more emphasis is placed on the content on the website. The holiday information on the website is much more comprehensive than the traditional print option.

When **comparing communication strategies**, one sees that this bank wants clients to use the Internet rather than tradition communication channels. A **shift** away from primarily traditional print channels to new media, the Internet has taken place. The client is thus obliged to become dependant on the new channel as the offer of traditional print is getting smaller.

Compared to ING bank, it appears that Fortis bank is openly trying to **attract** more clients to its website. If one looks at the web pages, they offer brightly coloured photos, a friendly layout and inviting content. In the case of ING, this was more subtle; the print brochure tied in with the website but appeared more appealing due to its design and format i.e a handy pocket-sized folder.

It is of **basic importance** to notice that in **diachronic terms** the banking strategies keep changing / fluctuating:

Say, about 5 years ago, the communication strategies in terms of the marketing mix consisted mainly of print, TV and radio. With the **advent** of the Internet, this mix has **changed**.

First the vast stock of material for external communication was available as print, at least in the case of traditional banks;

In the case of **banks** that were **online only**, this was not the case; quite the contrary happened.

For example the English online only bank, called **EGG**, has had to follow the traditional route by advertising in newspapers and other print.

Website banking provided by non-traditional banks (web-based only) does not prohibit downloading, on the contrary, nor printing.

This brings us to the **changing relationships of channels of communication** within the banking sector in terms of print and the Internet.

Schemata for print/Internet relationships:

<b>Example 1</b>	PRINT.....INTERNET	....dominantly INTERNET
Traditional banks	&	also PRINT
	PRINT	

Trad. Banks (brick and mortar) move on a continuum between (primarily) print and the Internet. However, when the Internet offer is more prominent, print material (as the brochure in the bank) can be downloaded by the client himself.

## Example 2

Online only banks  
(new technology)

INTERNET.....INTERNET  
&  
PRINT

In this case, the Internet is the prominent channel of communication, often supported by the traditional print channel.

This brings one to the question: **why is this important?**

The reasons are that it may influence the priorities and basic norms and options

- in terms of language(s) selected
- in terms of identity (location/territory) & target audiences
- in terms of approaches/strategies

As the examples suggest, a **convergence** of media are increasingly taken place. The **boundaries** between traditional and new media are getting **blurred**. The one cannot function without the other. One could speculate about the reasons for this. One reason could be cost-related. Updating a website is quicker and cheaper than having to print new brochures every week.

Distribution is not a problem either. However, this brings us to the issue of the digital haves and the digital have-nots. By using the Internet as primary means of communication with clients, one directly excludes those who do not have access to the technology...which leads to a hornet's nest of other problems and issues...

## **BACK TO OUR CASE(S): What is the environment?**

First of all, we have to look at the **environment of the ING bank**. Previously it was known as BBL, but since 22 April 2003 it has been fully incorporated into the ING banking group with its HQ in the Netherlands.

This international group has **offices** around the **globe**. However, every country has its own website. The **ING.com** website gives one an overview of the holding company with a menu option to all the websites for the bank in other parts of the world. The homepage has a clear link to ING USA. These web pages are only in **English**.

For example, the **Netherlands** has [www.ing.nl](http://www.ing.nl), **Belgium** has [www.ing.be](http://www.ing.be) etc. The official languages of the specific country are given as options on every site. Eg. Belgium has F, D and E. **Switzerland's** site offers Italian, German, French, English, Spanish, Dutch.

It seems that even if **English** is not an official language of a country, most of the websites offer their pages in English. This is yet further proof that English is the language of finance and commerce.

The “**origins**” of the websites are still **visible** to a certain extent, as they belong to the same banking group similar bank. However, a client in Switzerland would not necessarily know that the bank is Dutch, neither would a client in the Czech Republic. Thus the origin becomes blurred which is also rather irrelevant in most cases.

However, when we look at the **language planning** and **translation** of the various texts, one has to **bear origin in mind**.

The distribution principle used to be that **printed material** would be available in a **certain geographical area** and not outside of it. This could mean that clients in one area would receive material not available to others, depending on the profile or other criteria selected by the bank’s strategic marketing dept.

So the **material** would **correspond** to the **language and cultural needs** of the potential receivers in that area, e.g. Dutch in Flanders –Flemish part – or French in Liege – Wallonia. Or just Dutch in the Netherlands.

The **material** is always **monolingual**. In other words, a brochure would be available in one language not multiple. However, in Belgium this is a rather recent policy.

Before federalization (1980 – 1981) in Belgium – as in trains – such material was often provided in F and D in the same document – recto verso; today even in Brussels the printed circulars are always **either** Dutch or French; Ever since, promotional material such as a brochure has become only monolingual. Bilingual or multilingual circulars are not common any more in Belgium.

### **One could thus say, so what?**

Yes, but researchers in (D)TS are aware of the difference [*in use of discourse between “monolingual” and “multilingual” environments*], between illusionistic and anti-illusionistic (Jiri Levy !) Translation strategies.

We ASSUME that the use of language and discourse is **adapted** to meet the **syntactic, semantic and idiomatic requirements** of the target language – in the case of translation – but also in the case of original writing. In other words, it should **sound** like an utterance made by a **mother-tongue** speaker. **However**, the reality seems different...

### **EXAMPLE:**

1. Unidiomatic translation: clear indication of the source language- Dutch in this case.

### **Easy ways to pay: ING**

*Dutch:* in uw eigen straat

English: in your own area – [at home/in your own neighbourhood]

*D:* Sleep geen grote hoeveelheden contant geld mee op reis

*E:* Don’t take large amounts of cash with your own your holiday [Don’t take a lot of cash on holiday]

*French:* "N'emportez pas de grosses sommes d'argent liquide en voyage".

'grote hoeveelheden' was not translated as (quantité) but as 'large sums'. Not a translation of Dutch maybe taken from Eng?

*Word order was changed.* NI: redengevende bysin + tussensin (byw. bep. van plaats, verklaring van 'vakantiecomfort') + hoofsin

Om uw vakantiecomfort, thuis of in het buitenland, nog te verhogen, geven we u graag enkele nuttige tips mee.

Fr: hoofsin + redengevende bysin + bysin by 'vacances'

Nous vous donnons volontiers quelques conseils utiles pour encore améliorer le confort de vos vacances, que ce soit chez vous ou à l'étranger.]

D: Al lang kent en al jaren toepast

E: you have probably been acting on for years [ have been doing for years]

D: Doe mee aan onze vakantiewedstrijd

E: Win a traveller's cheque

We could ask how multilingual the websites really are. **Are there indications that this multilingualism is (also) an illusion?**

**Yes**, in the case of the ING **holiday promotion material**. The online info was in 3 languages but the printed material, e.g. the Passport and the magazine were only in D and F. **Eng as a fully fledged** and acknowledged foreign language is an **illusion**.

The **concept of multinational** would suggest **multilingualism** – with the benefit of providing mother tongue quality text in various languages, but this is also an **illusion**. Since their origin is either German or French or American.

The country of origin still **determines** to a large degree the language policy and strategy, the **perspective is culture-bound**, if not language bound. *The illusion of one size fits all does not exist;*

Banks and their respective websites for different countries are **predominantly local in their treatment** of languages (and also in their use/treatment of translation).

#### **EXAMPLE:**

FORTIS HOLIDAY PAGE

Culture specific holiday ideal: sea, coast, Eiffel Tower in Paris;

Also image of Happy Days shopping card – local incentive card in Belgium

**Let us now come to the translation options/strategies:**

We could start by asking an organizational question/principle:

Who exactly takes care of the multilingual writing/editing of texts for websites ("web writing")?

The answer may give us a further clue to the translation issue. Within large Belgian banks, such as ING (previously BBL), KBC and Fortis, external communication material such as brochures

are **written** in either French or Dutch. It is then translated by a **separate team** of translators – most of the time internally into the other language and sometimes English and German.

Web texts are written/created by a separate team of people; not by the translators or copy writers.

Who then is taking care of what?

In itself, these options have their social, strategic, linguistic, cultural **relevance**. So far, the answer is that the **web texts are not translations** of the printed material. That's what banks themselves tell us **implicitly**.

BUT the **general treatment of language/discourse** is often (very) similar to the one traditional material is submitted to.

One of the most **strategic changes** in the communication strategy of international banks is the **increased use of English**.

In traditional banking, translators were supposed to be '**native speakers**'. In Belgian banks that meant either **Flemish** or **francophones** or even German (at least in the case of CERA bank)

But **English** was never an issue or a priority. This was linked to the **notion** that English was "a foreign language" within the given geo-political territory.

But the **Internet** has **changed** all of this. In cyberspace English is not a foreign language any more (nowhere on this planet).

This **shift** has significant consequences in terms of **relationships** between: (1) languages; (2) their treatment; (3) the organization of the job; (4) potential clients, etc.

- It has been demonstrated (and can easily be demonstrated), even on the basis of tourist information documentation (e.g. Brussels, the Belgian seaside) that
  - 1° Dutch/French are treated more or less "equally" in the more bilingual areas;
  - 2° the "native speaker" principle weakens when we move into the (either) francophone or Flemish territory;
  - 3° the "native speaker" principle hardly applied to English texts (on banking) in the printing age;
  - 4° the "native speaker" principle becomes more important in the Internet age;
  - 5° (web) banking is still much more monolingual than it claims / intends to be since there is no absolute "democracy" of languages in statistical terms (no language is "complete" except for the mother-tongue), which means that even banks on the Internet still privilege only the mother-tongue.

**Now the real test would be:**

**Can consumers locate the origin of the "banking discourse":**

- In the case of printed material
- and websites?

- A similar test would be: can WE distinguish (scholars who watch texts)?

But one could very well go without the other: scholars may be able to detect the origin of their discursive partners. For banks it is rather important whether the consumer obeys the principles they want to favour.

In case a **Dutch tourist** is satisfied with the English used on the website or in printed material (which could have been written by Belgian francophones), things are fine (for these banks).

From the **point of view** of societies / politicians / even economists, there may be quite different consequences with significant relevance (e.g. the disconnection between territory and language, discourse, style, foreign words).

The basic redefinition of language(s), geography, institutions etc. is of limited relevance (surely) for bank directors. But teachers, parents, politicians may have very different views.

We need scholars who, first of all, **examine** the case and **establish** whether at all this “banking landscape” is subject to change in the age of the Internet, and further more, what **kind of changes**.

But to the extent we assume that traditional statements about the links between language and society have any relevance, we cannot avoid **supposing** that societies are being changed by the new circulation of discourses and languages. Or is it the opposite? What was first: the chicken or the egg?

-----  
**KBC** [www: homepage/jongeren/festivals](http://www.kbc.com)

Press releases on [www.kbc.com](http://www.kbc.com) – 4 languages (in E/F/D from 1998; G from 2002)\*\*\*\*\*  
 - nowhere indication that these can be read in 4 languages. !!!!! [Lacking]

French

Miet et Griet

- Vocabulary represents advertising discourse – aimed at young people who like to go to music festivals.
- Ellipse is strange...what does it mean? Does not mean anything otherwise.

**Vous êtes un habitué des festivals? Alors, vous souhaiteriez peut-être recevoir un traitement VIP?**

**Tenez donc cette page à l'oeil, car Miet et Griet peuvent veiller à ce que vous receviez ce traitement VIP!**

- Despite the tone, good grammatical constructions are used – the ‘conditionnel’ (souhaiteriez) and ‘subjonctif’ (receviez) – not a familiar

**Une rencontre avec... Un regard en coulisses... C'est possible. En tant que gagnant de notre concours du moins ...**

**Que devez-vous faire à cet effet?**

**Vous convaincre et nous convaincre que vous êtes la personne idéale pour recevoir la rencontre ou l'invitation.**

- Stilted style - **recevoir la rencontre** – literally means ‘receiving the meeting’

- Not good style
- The same verb used twice for the 2 saakwoorde – should be *aller au rendez-vous / aller à la rencontre et recevoir l'invitation*
- 

French is more formal than Dutch – French uses 'vous' form but Dutch uses 'jy'

**Remporte un 'Miet et Griet' au festival Cactus !  
Les gagnants sont connus:**

- These 2 sentences are not in the Dutch text.
- Remporte – takes "jij" form while the rest is written in 'vous' form : informal mixed with formal form
- Not done in French – resembles Dutch habit of mixing personal pronouns
- Last sentence means "the names of the winners have been announced" while the instructions lead one to believe that people still have the opportunity to participate
- Miet en Griet" play on "meet and greet" – does not work in French; connotation and sound is lost.

**Miet en Griet!**

**Een festivalganger in hart en nieren? Dan ben jij wellicht wel voor een VIP-behandeling te vinden.**

**Hou dus zeker deze pagina in de gaten, want die VIP-behandeling kunnen Miet en Griet voor je regelen! Een ontmoeting met ... Een kijkje achter de schermen van ... Het ligt binnen handbereik. Als je winnaar van onze wedstrijd wordt tenminste ...**

**Wat moet je ervoor doen?**

**Jezelf zijn en ons overtuigen dat jij de geknipte persoon bent om de ontmoeting of uitnodiging te krijgen.**

## References

- Adler, N.J. & Bartholomew, S. 1992. Managing globally competent people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(3):52-65.
- Bassnett, S. & Trivedi, H. 1998. *Postcolonial translation theory*. London: Routledge.
- Berman, A. 1985. La traduction comme épreuve de l'étranger. *Texte*, 4: 67-81.
- Black, J.S., Gregersen, H.B., Mendenhall, M.E. & Stroh, L. 1999. *Globalizing people through international assignments*. London: Addison Wesley.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication*: 17-35. Tübingen: Narr.
- Bourdieu, P. 1992. *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Brislin, R.W. 1980. Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In H.C. Triandis, & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Methodology*: 389-444. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Canney Davison, S. & Ward, K. 1999. *Leading international teams*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Corman, S.R., & Poole, M.S. (Eds.). 2000. *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Early, C.P. & Mosakowski, E. 2000. Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 26-49.
- Even-Zohar, I. 1978. *Papers in historical poetics*. Tel-Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel-Aviv University.
- Fishman, J.A. 1993. Ethnolinguistic democracy: Varieties, degrees and limits. *Language International*, V(1): 11-17.
- Gentzler, E. 2001. *Contemporary translation theories*. London: Routledge.
- Grant, D., Keenoy, T.W., & Osrick, C. 1998. (Eds.). *Discourse and organization*. London: Sage.
- Greenblatt, S. 1991. *Marvellous possessions: The wonder of the new world*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Gudykunst, W. 1988. *Language and ethnic identity*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gutt, E.-A. 1991. *Translation and relevance: Cognition and text*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, K. 1998. Translating camp talk: Gay identities and cultural transfer. *The Translator*, 4(2): 295-320.
- Herrlitz, W., & Loos, E. 1994. Taal en taalgebruik in de internationale bedrijfscommunicatie. *Mens & Ondernemen*, 2: 144-160.
- Hermans, T. (Ed.) 1985. *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hermans, T. 1999. *Translation in systems. Descriptive and system-oriented approaches in translation studies*. Manchester: St.Jerome.
- Hermans, J. & Lambert, J. 1998. From translation markets to language management: The implications of translation services. *Target*, 10(1): 113-132
- Hermans, Johan & Simoens, Peter. Ed. Peter Jansen, 1994. *Taal, Vertaling, Management. Verkenningen in een economisch niemandsland*. Leuven: CERA Chair (CERA Papers, 1)
- Holmes, J.S. 1972. *The name and nature of translation studies*. Amsterdam: Translation Studies Section, University of Amsterdam.
- Holmes, J.S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holz-Mänttari, J. 1984. *Translatorisches handeln: Theorie und methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Huntington, S.P. 1996. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Lambert, J. 1989. La traduction, les langues et la communication de masse. Les ambiguïtés du discours international. *Target*, 1(2): 215-237.
- Lambert, J. 1994. The cultural component reconsidered. In M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker, & K. Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation studies: An interdiscipline*: 17-26. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Lambert, J., & Van Gorp, H. 1985. On describing translations. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*: 42-53. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Lecerclé, J.-J. 1990. *The violence of language*. London: Routledge.
- Lefevere, A. 1995. *Translation and power*. Paper presented at CERA Chair for Translation, Communication and Cultures, Belgium.
- Leonardi, V. 2000. Equivalence in translation: Between myth and reality. *Translation Journal*, 4(4)8942.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J. 1994. Globalisation as hybridisation. *International Sociology*, 9(2): 161-184.
- Nida, E., & Taber, C. 1968. *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- O'Hara-Devereaux, M., & Johansen, R. 1994. *Globalwork*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ong, W. 1982. *Orality and literacy. The technologizing of the word*. London: Methuen.
- Parker, B. 1997. Evolution and revolution: from international business to globalization. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*: 484-506. London: Sage.
- Pym, A. 1998. *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Pym, A. 1993. Coming to terms with and against nationalist cultural specificity: Notes for ethos of translation studies. *Folia Translatologica*, II: 49-69.
- Reed, M., & Hughes, M. (Eds.). 1992. *Rethinking organizations*. London: Sage.
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H.J. 1991. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ricks, D. A. 1999. *Blunders in international business*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Robyns, C. 1994. (Ed.) *Translation and the (re)production of culture*. Leuven: CETRA.
- Simon, S. 1996. *Gender in translation: Cultural identity and the politics of transmission*. London: Routledge.

- Snell-Hornby, M. 1989. ***Translation studies: An integrated approach***. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Steyaert, C., & Janssens, M. 1997. Language and translation in an international business context: Beyond an instrumental approach. ***Target***, 9(1): 131-154.
- Tayeb, M.H. 2000. ***International business***. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Toury, G. 1980. ***In search of a theory of translation***. Tel-Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Toury, G. 1995. ***Descriptive translation studies and beyond***. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vanden Broeck, R., & Lefevere, A. 1979. ***Uitnodiging tot de vertaalwetenschap***. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Vanderauwera R. 1990. What translation can (and should) do for little-known languages. ***Language & Communication***, 10(1): 63-67.
- Venuti, L. 1998. ***The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference***. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. 2000. ***The translation studies reader***. London: Routledge.
- Von Flotow, L. 1997. ***Translation and gender: Translating in the "era of feminism."***