

## On the boundaries of special languages for translation of university management documents: Spanish-Russian

Sobre los límites de las lenguas de especialidad para la traducción de documentos de gestión universitaria: español-ruso

MIGUEL ÁNGEL CANDEL-MORA  
Universitat Politècnica de València, España  
mcan-del@upv.es  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8754-6046>

OKSANA POLYAKOVA  
Universitat Politècnica de València, España  
okpolnes@upv.es  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0575-2386>

### Resumen

La investigación sobre las lenguas de especialidad se aborda desde diferentes perspectivas: léxica, morfosintáctica y textual; con diferentes fines: enseñanza de la lengua, terminología, traducción o comunicación entre especialistas; y con metodologías y técnicas de diferentes disciplinas, lo que dificulta el establecimiento de los límites del campo de estudio. Desde el punto de vista de la traducción, una de las cuestiones clave es el establecimiento de límites claros y bien definidos de los textos especializados para transferir tanto los aspectos terminológicos como los estilísticos

### Abstract

Research on special languages is approached from different perspectives: lexical, morpho-syntactic and textual; for different purposes: language teaching, terminology, translation, or communication between specialists; and with methodologies and techniques from different disciplines, which makes it challenging to establish the limits of the field of study. From the point of view of translation, one of the key issues is establishing clear and well-defined boundaries of specialized texts to transfer both terminological and stylistic

---

**To cite this article:** Candel-Mora, M. Á.; Polyakova, O. (2022). On the boundaries of special languages for translation of university management documents: Spanish-Russian. *ELUA*, (37), 221-234. <https://doi.org/10.14198/ELUA.19957>

Recibido: 11/05/2021, Aceptado: 23/09/2021

© 2022 Miguel Ángel Candel-Mora y Oksana Polyakova



Este trabajo está sujeto a una licencia de Reconocimiento 4.0 Internacional de Creative Commons (CC BY 4.0)

al texto de destino. Por lo tanto, el objetivo de este trabajo es contribuir a la investigación sobre la relación entre la traducción y los lenguajes especiales en ruso y español, mediante el estudio de la lengua del contexto de la gestión universitaria después del Proceso de Bolonia, para luego arrojar luz al establecimiento de los límites del dominio en las lenguas de especialidad. La amplia producción de documentos técnicos, informes, declaraciones, manuales, informes anuales, acuerdos institucionales plantea los siguientes objetivos complementarios de esta investigación: definir el papel relevante de la traducción en el proceso de comunicación especializada y presentar una delimitación del campo conceptual adaptada a las necesidades del traductor. Para ello, partimos de la premisa de que el estudio detallado de las características de la terminología universitaria en ambos sistemas educativos ayudará a resolver algunas de las lagunas existentes en el ámbito universitario especializado hispano-ruso. De este modo, en la primera parte del trabajo se presentan los antecedentes teóricos que comparten el estudio de las lenguas de especialidad, la terminología y la traducción para concluir que la cuestión de la identificación del campo conceptual es crucial para las tres disciplinas. En la segunda parte del trabajo se presentan los resultados de un estudio textual y terminológico que pone de manifiesto los principales problemas de equivalencia entre el lenguaje de gestión universitaria en español y en ruso, y especialmente las dificultades para delimitar claramente el ámbito del lenguaje especial debido a la cantidad de áreas que confluyen en este campo junto con la variedad de documentos que se generan.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** EEES; lengua universitaria; traducción; terminología; lenguas de especialidad.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The starting point of this work lies in the delimitation of domains carried out from research studies on special languages, as a means of communication between specialists (Sager 1994; Lerat 1997; Hann 1992; Cabré 1999; Arntz & Picht 1995; Wright 1997, 2001; and Wüster 1998), where, as in translation, the main variables are situationality, communication needs, participants and context. However, the literature coincides in highlighting the fundamental role of specialized terminology. This lexical aspect and the differentiation between the

aspects to the target text. Therefore, this work aims to contribute to the research on the relationship between translation and special languages in Russian and Spanish by studying the language of the university management context after the Bologna Process, and then shed light on the establishment of the domain boundaries in special languages. The vast production of technical documents, reports, declarations, manuals, annual reports, institutional agreements raises the following complementary objectives of this research: to define the relevant role of translation in the specialized communication process, and present a delimitation of the conceptual field adapted to the translator's needs. Therefore, we start from the premise that the detailed study of the characteristics of university terminology in both educational systems will help to solve some of the gaps in the specialized Spanish-Russian university domain. Therefore, the first section of the paper presents the theoretical background shared by the study of special languages, terminology and translation to conclude that identifying the conceptual field is crucial for the three disciplines. The second part of the paper presents the results of a textual and terminological study that highlights the main problems of equivalence between the language of university management in Spanish and Russian, and especially the difficulties of clearly delimiting the scope of the special language due to the number of areas that converge in this field along with the variety of documents generated.

**KEYWORDS:** EHEA; university language; translation; terminology; special languages.

classifications of technical terms according to their origin, specialized fields or general language, outlines the first considerations during the approach to the study of LSP translation.

Research on special languages is approached from different perspectives: lexical, morphosyntactic and textual; with different purposes and functions: language teaching, study of terminology, translation, communication between specialists (Johns 2013; Cabré 1999; Wright 1997; Sager 1994; Neubert & Shreve, 1992; Bowker & Pearson 2002), but above all with methodologies and techniques from different disciplines, which makes it difficult to define the boundaries of the field of study. One of the fundamental distinguishing features of special languages is their purpose to exchange technical or specialized knowledge at international level. From the point of view of translation-oriented terminology management, it is equally essential to delimit the field of action and identify the existence of a special language that includes several subgroups depending on the subject area.

Sager (1994: 41) states that “Any classificatory approach to special languages relevant to translation must ultimately be based on the observations resulting from detailed examination of actual text occurrences”, since the knowledge represented in the documents that is relevant to translation rarely corresponds to a single discipline because the knowledge of specialists is a combination of different knowledge structures.

Research on special language emphasizes its differences with the general language such as its use in specialized communication, text types and its specific terminology (Sager 1994). For Dubuc & Lauriston (1997: 81), terminology, in addition to a differentiating factor with the general language, is a distinguishing feature between the different special languages.

According to Wright (2001: 492), one of the key indicators of the quality of a translation lies in its intelligibility based on the appropriate use of the corresponding specialized language where translators acquire their first contact and frame of reference with the texts.

What is clear is that the practice of differentiating translation projects according to text types is common in the professional field of translation. Traditionally, from professional translation, several types of written translation are considered: general, literary, specialized, technical, medical, advertising, audiovisual, etc. (Hurtado 2001), all this reflected in different working conditions and a different approach to translation depending on an established degree of difficulty.

The translation of specialized texts ranks at the top positions of the professional translation market and communication in specialized fields of knowledge has also increased considerably thanks to information and communication technologies and the Internet, in addition to the fast pace of development in science and technology, the media, international relationships and international trade.

In the specific case of the academic environment of the European Higher Education Area, and the corresponding terminology in Spanish and Russian, this work is based on the following hypothesis: the existence of a parallel university documentary classification structure in both languages and terminological equivalence at the university level in Spanish and Russian.

The growing importance of the European economic, financial and political union acquires a new meaning in the field of higher education. This trend, initiated in 1998 with the Sorbonne Declaration and finally established in 1999 with the Bologna Declaration, has posed a complicated challenge: to lead the higher education system of European countries to a common denominator. One of the crucial aspects of European collaboration is to form

a common market for goods and services. However, the creation of the common educational field aims to homogenize higher education in Europe and beyond its borders to meet the main objectives: to promote equivalent and recognizable education outside the initial place of training and, to offer students educational and professional mobility possibilities.

The case at hand of the comparison of the Russian and Spanish higher education systems entails some elements that hinder, at first sight, the attempts to achieve equivalence such as the fact that the Russian Federation is not part of the European Union; the integration of Spain into the EHEA took place in 1999, while the Russian Federation entered in 2003; the linguistic barrier between Russian and Spanish, but above all, the historical and organizational differences between both higher education systems. Therefore, we start from the hypothesis that the detailed study of the characteristics of university terminology in both educational systems will help to solve some of the gaps in the specialized Spanish-Russian university domain. For this reason, this work will focus especially on one of the characteristics that converge in both disciplines: the terminology and the different ways of approaching it in translation when transferring it to other languages.

In this context, based on the study of the conceptual composition of the university management documentation in both languages, and the analysis of common educational terminology, the objective of this work is to contribute to studies on special languages from the perspective of translation.

From the point of view of translation, the immense production of technical documents, reports, declarations, manuals, annual reports, institutional agreements, conventions, etc., raises the following complementary objectives of this research: to define the relevant role of translation in the specialized communication process, and present a delimitation of the conceptual field adapted to the needs of the translator.

The first section of the paper presents the common theoretical background between special languages, terminology and translation to conclude that the identification of the conceptual field of the special language is crucial for the three disciplines.

The second part of the paper presents the results based on a previous large-scale terminology study (Polyakova & Candel-Mora 2014; 2019) that highlighted the main problems of terminological equivalence between the language of university management in Spanish and Russian, and especially the difficulties of clearly delimiting the scope of the special language due to the number of areas that converge in this field along with the variety of documents generated.

## **2. SPECIAL LANGUAGES, TERMINOLOGY AND TRANSLATION**

### **2.1. Special Languages**

It is mainly from the 1980s when research on special languages begins to be interested in studying the way in which words or terms from the general language are used in specialized texts (Hoffmann 1998: 80). Among the linguistic manifestations of special languages are also the different types of specific texts within a specific field of specialized communication (Schröder 1991).

Research in specialized languages uses methods and techniques from different disciplines, although it has a series of characteristics that Hoffmann (1998) classifies into

seven methodological orientations for analysis and description: the lexical or terminological orientation, centered on the study of the specific vocabulary of a specialized field; the orientation of functional linguistics, characterized mainly by its communicative function; the study of the language of commerce; the approach from functional stylistics and the use of linguistic resources according to their communicative purpose; the philosophical orientation on whether natural language can help obtain and establish the knowledge of its field of expertise and communicate it; the translation orientation, in particular on the problem of equivalence and the contrastive analysis of the linguistic resources of the different languages; and the orientation based on the sublanguage theory, according to which, each field of knowledge uses a specific sublanguage whose purpose is to facilitate communication between professionals in that field.

The characterization of special languages is not without controversy. The debate, at first, focused on determining whether special languages are independent systems from the general language or, on the contrary, are contained within it. In this sense, Cabré (1999: 132-4) classifies the different positions that the most representative authors of this field have adopted, and distinguishes three main aspects: special languages form an autonomous system within the general language as a whole; special languages are lexical variants of the general language, thus reducing their specificity to the lexicon; and finally, special languages as subsets - fundamentally pragmatic - of a global language.

Among the differences that distinguish scientific-technical texts from other types of texts there is the intention to transmit information and highlight the informational function compared to the formal one, in addition to its didactic and informative nature. According to Ciapuscio & Kuguel (2002: 56), texts with higher specialization aim to achieve acceptance of scientific advancement and influence on the information of experts, while the most informative levels are oriented to achieve a positive attitude about science and attract interest. Among other characteristics, they are distinguished by the use of specialized languages and specific terminologies and by requiring specific expertise in a field of knowledge for their understanding.

From the linguistic point of view, Lerat (1997: 18) presents a text-centered approach that does not reduce the specialized language to a terminology since, in addition to specialized denominations, LSP use non-linguistic symbols. This author refines each of these aspects and concludes with three of the most important concepts: professional context, user communication needs and specialized knowledge.

For Alcaraz (2000: 15), a special language is the specific language that professionals and specialists use to transmit information and negotiate terms, concepts and knowledge of a certain area of knowledge. Specialized languages constitute the instruments of technical communication, through which modern society transmits its achievements and experiences from generation to generation and from individual to individual (Galinski 1991: 243). With regard to the users of special languages, Nedobity (1991: 260) outlines three types: the media, responsible for transmitting specialized languages of certain subjects into everyday language; the specialist-creator, the main user of special languages; and, finally, terminologists, in charge of recording specialized vocabulary.

This brief review of the main orientations followed to address the study of special languages allows to conclude that the two main axes around which this discipline revolves lay their foundations in the observation and analysis of terminological aspects that characterize

this type of language, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, in the study of its communicative and functional aspects.

## 2.2. Terminology

The opinion that terminology is the most outstanding feature of a specialized text is shared by different authors (Sager 1990; Arntz & Picht 1995; Dubuc & Lauriston 1997; Lerat 1997; Alcaraz 2000). However, the literature on terminology leads to the conclusion that translation-oriented terminology management should not be limited solely to the construction of a terminology database for reference, but also be closely related to what Lerat (1997) calls “*terme et vocabulaire de soutien*”, that is, the vocabulary that belongs to a morphological series of words with specialized meaning within the language considered; the syntagmatic conditioning within a specialized field; and the dependency relationships with the language of specialists.

Hann (1992: 11) presents a similar vision and points out that the main error in translations is not the technical terminology, but the terms that come from the general vocabulary but acquire a specific meaning in a technical field. In these cases, the translator who is not aware of that polysemy may try to translate the terms without locating the actual equivalent in the specific context.

Cabré (1999: 137) justifies the importance of terminology for the special language from the communicative point of view, by including the participants and the context of communication and adds that any type of discourse that moves away from the general language characteristics is specialized due to any of the following elements: the topic, the specific characteristics of the interlocutors, the specific characteristics of the communicative situation, and the communication channel”.

Most definitions of terminology are based on one of the four approaches distinguished by Cabré (1999), depending on the purpose of each of each group of users: specialists, as a conceptual organization oriented towards professional communication; linguists, who contemplate terminology as part of the specialized lexicon by thematic and pragmatic criteria; users, who perceive it as a set of communication units based on criteria of economy, precision and adequacy; and, language planners, who use it as a means to reaffirm the existence, usefulness and survival of a language and guarantee its continuity. In conclusion, Cabré groups terminology users into two typologies, those who use it for communication and those who work on it. Among the lexical aspects that characterize specialized texts are technical, semi-technical, neologisms and compounds and derivatives terms.

## 2.3. Translation

Upon delineating the notion of special language and its contribution to terminology and translation studies, the next step is to define the main characteristics that make a text differ from another for translation purposes (Thompson 1991: 57; Rabadán 1998: 55 ; Ciapuscio & Kuguel 2002: 41). Text typology and textual analysis applied to translation provide the key elements to decipher the source text and prepare the ground for the translation process, in addition to contributing to the selection of the most adequate reference material, terminology or parallel texts to be used. Neubert & Shreve (1992: 15) state that “As soon as the translator recognizes which text type a particular document belongs to, he or she can con-

centrate on the specific special language more traditionally associated with that category.” In specialized translation it is essential to be able to determine not only the characteristics of each individual text, but also to assign it within a more or less established classification in order to focus decision-making on the common characteristics of the text type to which it belongs. From the functional approach to translation, represented by Reiss & Vermeer (1996: 154), text types are defined as types of oral or written speech acts of a supra-individual nature and subject to recurrent communicative acts, which have generated characteristic models in the use of language and in the structuring of texts precisely due to its constant repetition. Hurtado (2001: 59) prefers the denomination of translation of specialized texts instead of specialized translation since translation, in one way or another, aims to a specialized field, and defines it as the translation of texts aimed at specialists and belonging to special languages.

The study of textual typology as a preliminary step during the translation process, both in the common stages of understanding the source text and subsequent production of the target text, is approached by Reiss and Vermeer (1996) from the twofold perspective of the source and target languages: the first step in establishing a hierarchy of equivalence levels consists in assigning the text to a type or a class of text type, since communicative translation must replace the conventions observed by the source culture with conventions typical of the target culture.

As stated above, specific terminology is the fundamental characteristic of specialized texts, and in turn, the vehicle to provide specialized texts with more conciseness, precision and adequacy. These criteria are essential to determine the degree of specialization of a text, compared to general texts that use criteria of expressiveness, variety and originality, among others. Galinski (1991: 243) describes in more detail that the need to add more precision to human thought and to communication itself led to the creation of terms as representations of clearly defined concepts, formed by human thought from the objects of the internal and external world.

At this point, it is worth highlighting the contributions from the study of professional and academic English to text analysis. For Alcaraz (2000: 135), technical vocabulary is not the main source of difficulties for the comprehension of a text, but the lack of familiarization of the recipient of the message with the macrostructure of the genre, since everything in the text has meaning. Alcaraz describes two types of macrostructures: primary, which consists of the characteristic sections of the type of text, and secondary, formed by the parts of each section. From the sentence perspective, Alcaraz (2000: 23) uses the term *register*, defined as the variety of a language aimed to fulfill a communicative purpose in a specific professional or academic framework.

As in the translation of any type of text, technical, literary or general, the complete understanding of the source text requires a total comprehension of the extra-linguistic knowledge of the subject. The translator has to transfer the technical and scientific information to the target text, not only by means of precise terms but by the selection of the appropriate method of expression according to the target audience, and the style of the target language. According to Neubert & Shreve (1992: 14):

The translation of a technical text must be technically correct. This means it must correctly reproduce the technical content of the original document both in all its details and in its entirety. It must also be linguistically correct, which means specifically that the common language components must be correct, even phraseologically correct.

Maillot (1997) coincides with Vázquez-Ayora (1977) in stating that the target text must meet the following conditions in order to be considered correct: the translation must be correct from the technical point of view; regarding general language, terminologically correct; it must represent the technical language in its proper context, it must meet the requirements of the textual typology and must take into account the expected characteristics in the target culture.

In sum, according to the specifications of a professional translation project of specialized texts, the first step is to identify the characteristics of the source text, to familiarize with the subject, detect possible transfer difficulties and define the conceptual structure of the terms found in the text and, thus, guide the subsequent search for resources and reference materials; or, in other words, start the decision-making process pointed out by some translation studies (Hann 1992; Neubert & Shreve 1992). Regarding formal aspects, it is essential to identify the text type of the source text, the receiver of the original and the use of that text.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this work can be summarized in three stages: documentary work, corpus preparation and terminology extraction and processing. First, the texts involved in the specialized communication of the university management setting were identified and documentary work was carried out with the collection of approximately 1,250 documents and a total of 2,127,457 words. During the collection of data, special attention was paid to the correct choice of information sources, based on factors such as the representativeness of the author (institution), date, target audience, objectives, and geographical origin, among others. The document search is carried out in two directions: the selection of parallel bilingual reference information (official Spanish and Russian declarations and agreements, for example) and thematic data in each language (sample letters, applications, and reports from each country that meet the criteria of originality and typical expression). The documentary sources are of three types: web pages (specialized university content from institutional web pages), original documentation, and legislative and normative documents (higher education specialized texts).

Secondly, after completing the search, organization and document classification process, data was structured for further processing and analysis in three corpora: one consisting of general university and institutional administrative documents, and a final corpus with legal documents in the context of higher education. In this case, given the availability of documents already translated, an aligned bilingual corpus is prepared. Three corpora were designed in total: monolingual and reference Corpus in Spanish; Monolingual and reference Corpus in Russian; Bilingual parallel Russian-Spanish Corpus.

Finally, we proceeded to the extraction of term candidates from the different corpora with the tool *Synchroterm*, which, by means of statistical algorithms, automatically identifies equivalent terms in two languages, from different file formats, which accelerated the terminology extraction process and creation of terminological records.

This methodology was based on previous studies (Polyakova & Candel-Mora 2014; 2019) focused on the study of the peculiarities of terminology in the academic environment of the European Higher Education Area in Russian and in Spanish. Overall, a total of 700 bilingual records were collected that were classified into 10 domains, according to an adaptation of Eurydice glossaries, the Education Information Network in the European Com-

munity (Eurydice, 2010; 2018) with the following headings: Students, Exams, Certificate and degrees, Institutions and educational spaces, Legislation, Organs and forms of advice, Management staff, Processes and training resources, Teaching staff, Teaching systems and levels, and Society.

#### **4. THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SPECIAL LANGUAGE OF UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT**

The documentary and design phase of the corpus of this work on the special language of university management revealed one of the main difficulties mentioned in the literature on special languages: the difficulty of establishing well-defined boundaries. Despite sharing the same kind of formal style, the large number of genres and the variety of conceptual fields and domains identified hindered the correct identification of only one special language. As mentioned in the methodology section, reports, applications, certificates, declarations, project proposals, collaboration agreements and institutional agreements, among other documents, were collected to design the corpus, all with clear textual and terminological differences, as well as belonging to different special languages.

Varela Fernández (2002), for the translation of academic-administrative, specialized and legal language within the Spanish-English university environment, proposes the classification of documentation into 3 categories: administrative correspondence, specialized and institutional texts and legal documents. For their part, Verba & Guzmán Tirado (2005), in their study on the didactics of legal-administrative translation (Russian-Spanish), propose a classification based on two types: legal language and administrative language. The first one includes legal texts (laws, official bulletins); judicial texts (lawsuits, declarations...); and doctrinal texts (the constitution, royal decrees, ministerial order). While, the second includes forms, official letters, curriculum vitae, certificates, diplomas, applications, notifications, communications, invitations, calls, minutes, affidavits, contracts, agreements, statutes, powers and authorizations, or notary seals, such as the Hague Apostille.

Following these authors, the first step consisted in grouping the documents into two main classifications in order to simplify the delimitation of the special language in the context of higher education. These two classifications were labeled as administrative-institutional language and legal language in the university context.

In the first type, documents such as administrative correspondence, reports, applications, proposals, academic certification, research projects and general publications of dissemination of the institution's activities were included. In the second type, much more homogeneous in both university systems and in both languages, with regards to the special language and terminology used, documents such as statements, institutional agreements, agreements, contracts, letters of cooperation, intentions, understanding, were included.

While the higher education setting develops the communicative activity mostly in the administrative field with some legal contributions, the official style is assigned the informative linguistic function inseparable from social legal awareness. The tone of the official language is usually neutral, verifies the facts, and establishes norms in the legal context, which transcends the public through direct and indirect communication in the form of a written monologue.

With regard to the documents belonging to the administrative-institutional field, although initially there is a parallelism of types of documents and functions, there are some

extreme cases such as certifications, transcripts and documents related to qualifications and academic performance that highlight the main differences due to the differences in the trajectory of each university system and their institutional context. For example, in the case of the presentation of projects, or documents that present the development, practical implementation of results of an academic action, on the border between administrative and legal, despite being destined to public or private organizations (for example, a research project to obtain funding), each language has a different style of formulating such action.

The communicative situation where administrative language is mainly used, such as filling out an application or writing correspondence, conforms to its representative model, with the pre-established language form and norm. In addition, the administrative written nature demands extreme expressive clarity, use of pre-established templates and a general tendency to avoid ambiguity to achieve greater informational value.

In the case of legal language, it is a unidirectional style (legislator-citizen) where the communicative situation is prescriptive (according to legal norms valid in a community or state) that emanate from the state organization and includes different varieties that official institutions use in their internal communications and with the citizen (Verba & Guzmán Tirado 2005: 13).

With regard to the legal language in the university context, something similar is observed. While collaboration agreements, letters of intent or understanding reveal very homogeneous patterns in terms of terminology and application of supranational legislation, it is in documents such as contracts or agreements that establish the rights and responsibilities of two or more parties, where the main purpose of the official style is revealed: the regulation of the linguistic means pertaining to communication between institutions, natural and legal persons, and therefore they are more subject to the peculiarities of each national university system.

Secondly, an extraction of terminology was carried out to verify the degree of equivalence of both university systems, theoretically within a common higher education system, the EHEA. The role of terminology as a transmitter of knowledge and peculiarities of the language of the domain studied is an excellent opportunity to observe at first sight the main differences of the conceptual organization of the same domain in two languages.

Thus, the analysis and structuring of terminology, facilitates a cognitive approach to the samples of the university management language, focused on the terminological organization of this thematic area. The terms selected were then classified in subgroups, according to previous terminology works on the same domain such as EURYDICE, the Education Information Network in the European Community (<https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice>). The solution proposed consisted in distribution of the general concept field divided into ten domains where each bilingual terminological unit is linked to a node-term (Polyakova & Candel-Mora 2014; 2019). The domains are as follows: 1. Students; 2. Examinations, certificates and diplomas; 3. Institutions and educational facilities; 4. Legislation; 5. Advisory bodies; 6. Managing staff; 7. Training processes and resources; 8. Teaching staff; 9. Systems and levels of education; 10. Society.

After the initial extraction of 2,500 term candidates from the corpora and the first approach to alignment between equivalent terms in Russian and Spanish from both corpora, a total of 700 terms with the highest degree of equivalence were selected. This indicates that there is a total of approximately 1800 terms that in one way or another retain the characteristics of the university environment and the language of each national university system.

Domain	Total number of bilingual records	Number of bilingual records from aligned corpus	
1. Students	10	10	100 %
2. Examinations, certificates and diplomas	59	29	49.1 %
3. Institutions and educational facilities	32	16	50 %
4. Legislation	57	47	82.4 %
5. Advisory bodies	95	62	65.2 %
6. Managing staff	24	10	41.6 %
7. Training processes and resources	232	155	66.8 %
8. Teaching staff	12	4	33.3 %
9. Systems and levels of education	64	42	65.6 %
10. Society	115	78	67.8 %
TOTAL	700	453	64.7 %

Table 1. Distribution of terms in domains.

As shown in Table 1, most domains have an acceptable percentage of equivalence of terms, from 100% in the case of Students, to the Legislation domain, with 82.4%. However, four of the domains stand out for a degree of equivalence equal or less than 50%: Teaching staff, 33.3%; Managing staff, 41.6%; Examinations, certificates and diplomas, 49.1%; and, Institutions and educational facilities, with 50%.

The first two categories, *Teaching staff* and *Managing staff*, reveal the lowest percentage of equivalences. These domains contain a necessary part of the university structure: the administration personnel responsible for performing administrative and executive duties, and the faculty responsible for the academic activity.

Although the corpus analyzed does not offer greater detail of the typology of teachers and instructors, some similarity of the ranks and hierarchy of teaching is observed with the exception of extreme cases with no exact equivalence in the educational systems studied. This is the case in Russian of “assistant (chair)” [ассистент], a university graduate in the process to obtain the degree of doctor candidate who is instructed by a senior professor; or the case of the Spanish civil servant professors after going through accreditation and public competitive exam processes.

The study of the aligned corpus reveals a higher number of synonyms in Spanish for “teaching staff” than in the Russian education system. In general, the organization of the terminology examined in the *Teaching staff* domain differs depending on the cultural traditions of Spain and Russia, being somewhat isolated from the common denominators of the Bologna Process, which proves the need for further harmonization. In this domain, key roles of the university administration such as “University manager” and “university Ombudsman” were not identified in the Russian corpus.

As far as the domain *Examinations, certificates and diplomas* is concerned, while the Spanish academic system has incorporated Bologna degrees, the Russian Federation still retains singularities: there is still a specialist or graduate degree (5 years of study) corresponding to the first level or the degree of doctor candidate. As the data within this domain are examined, several concepts still lead to confusion: “degree” and “diploma”, “exam” and “preliminary exam”, “PhD degree” and “doctor candidate degree”. For example, preliminary examination [зачет], which refers to the early stage of exams that any Russian student should pass in order to start the exam period, was not documented in the Spanish corpus.

The domain *Institutions and educational facilities* contains the information on the infrastructures located on the university campus, from teaching facilities to infrastructures to organize the daily life of students and teachers, including scientific and teaching activities, medical, recreational, sports and technical facilities. The parallelism is quite homogeneous, with the exception of Spanish concepts such as “International excellence campus” and “language center”, among others, that do not appear in the Russian corpus.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The study of the special language of the Spanish and Russian higher education systems from the common stand of the European Higher Education Area highlights the difficulty of establishing the boundaries of special languages even when it comes to the same domain and a common idea of unification of educational contexts. Similarly, the need to resort to various methodological approaches such as terminology and lexicography studies, special languages and corpus linguistics for the study of the peculiarities of special languages is also confirmed.

It is in the legal language where most documents share the most similar characteristics of genre and the degree of standardization of the terminology identified was much higher, possibly due to the degree of consolidation of the legal language in both languages, and the low capacity of ambiguity, characteristic of this style.

The most notable difficulties encountered during the work with the corpus compiled have been related to the incompatibility of the computer application for extracting parallel terms with Cyrillic characters. This problem has been solved by resorting to manual processing, comparing the aligned paragraphs in the working languages and then selecting the terms in Spanish and their Russian equivalent individually. During the data processing stage, the methodology used paves the way for the study of other professional areas and new ways of further research.

The academic-professional language of university management in each country includes a series of typical features inherited from their corresponding historical evolution and language structure, of which the varied documentation used is an example.

The compilation of the bilingual terminological records in Spanish and Russian on the university management context has further exploitation possibilities: in addition to translators, teachers and university staff, students or international university services may benefit from this attempt of terminology standardization.

## REFERENCES

- Alcaraz, E. (2000). *El inglés profesional y académico*. Alianza Editorial.
- Arntz, R. y Picht, H. (1995). *Introducción a la terminología*. Pirámide.
- Bowker, L. y Pearson, J. (2002). *Working with Specialized Language. A practical guide using corpora*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203469255>
- Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. John Benjamins.
- Ciapuscio, G. y Kuguel, I. (2002). *Hacia una tipología del discurso especializado: aspectos teóricos y aplicados*. En J. García Palacios y T. Fuentes Morán (eds.). *Texto, Terminología y Traducción* (pp. 37-74). Almar.
- Dubuc, R. y Lauriston, A. (1997). *Terms and Contexts*. En S. E. Wright y G. Budin (eds.). *Handbook of Terminology Management* (pp. 80-88). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.htm1.11dub>
- EURYDICE. (2010). *Organización del sistema educativo español 2009-2010*. Eurydice.
- EURYDICE. (2018). *The European Higher Education Area in 2018: Bologna Process Implementation Report*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>.
- Galinski, C. (1991). *Terminología y sociedad moderna: el papel de INFOTERM*. En J. Vidal Beneyto (dir.). *Las industrias de la lengua* (pp. 243-251). Pirámide.
- Hann, M. (1992). *The Key to Technical Translation. Volume I. Concept Specification*. John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.ktt1>
- Hoffmann, L. (1998). *Llenguatges d'especialitat*. IULA, Universidad Pompeu Fabra.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2001). *Traducción y Traductología. Introducción a la traducción*. Cátedra.
- Johns, Ann M. (2013). The History of English for Specific Purposes Research. En B. Paltridge y S. Starfield (eds.). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (pp. 5-30). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855.ch1>
- Lerat, P. (1997). *Las lenguas especializadas*. Ariel.
- Maillot, J. (1997). *La traducción científica y técnica*. Gredos.
- Nedobity, W. (1991). Perspectivas para la elaboración de una metodología común en la descripción del lenguaje. En J. Vidal Beneyto (ed.). *Las industrias de la lengua* (pp. 257-264). Pirámide.
- Neubert, A. y Shreve, G. (1992). *Translation as a Text*. Kent State University Press.
- Polyakova, O. y Candel-Mora, M. A. (2014). Aproximación a la equivalencia de la terminología de la gestión universitaria, español ruso. In C. Vargas (coord.). *TIC, trabajo colaborativo e interacción en Terminología y Traducción* (pp. 437-448). Comares.
- Polyakova, O. y Candel-Mora, M. A. (2019). Building a corpus-based glossary of Spanish-Russian higher education for specialised translation. *Sendebarr*, 30, 141-162.
- Rabadán, R. (1994). Traducción, intertextualidad, manipulación. En A. Hurtado Albir (ed.). *Estudis sobre la traducció* (pp. 129-140). Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Reiss, K. y Vermeer, H. (1996). *Fundamentos para una teoría funcional de la traducción*. Akal.
- Sager, J. C. (1990). *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.44>
- Sager, J. C. (1994). *Language engineering and translation: consequences of automation (Vol. 1)*. John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.1>
- Schröder, H. (1991). Linguistic and Text-theoretical Research on Languages for Special Purposes. A thematic and bibliographical guide. En H. Schröder (ed.). *Subject-oriented Texts. Languages for Special Purposes and Text Theory* (pp. 1-48). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110858747.1>
- Thompson, H. (1991). Análisis del texto: situación actual. En J. Vidal Beneyto (dir.). *Las industrias de la lengua* (pp. 55-63). Pirámide.
- Vázquez Ayora, G. (1977). *Introducción a la traductología*. Georgetown University Press.
- Varela Fernández, H. (2002). *La traducción del lenguaje académico-administrativo, especializado y jurídico dentro del ambiente universitario: el caso de la Universidad Nacional (Costa Rica)*. Universidad Nacional.

- Verba, G. y Guzmán Tirado, R. (2005). *Curso de traducción jurídico-administrativa (ruso/español y español/ruso)*. Centro de Lingüística Aplicada ATENEA.
- Wright, S. E. (1997). Term selection: The initial phase of Terminology Management. En S. E. Wright y G. Budin (eds.). *Handbook of terminology management. Volume 1* (pp. 13-24). John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.htm1.04wri>
- Wright, S. E. (2001). Terminology Management and Total Quality Management. En S. E. Wright y G. Budin (eds.). *Handbook of Terminology Management, Volume 2. Application-Oriented Terminology Management* (pp. 488-502). John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.htm2>
- Wüster, E. (1998). *Introducción a la teoría general de la terminología y a la lexicografía terminológica*. IULA, Universidad Pompeu Fabra.