

The Organization of Turns in the Disagreements

Nusratullaeva Shokhista Sabirjon qizi

Teacher, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages
gamletovash@gmail.com

-----***-----

Abstract: The article deals with the study of the speech act of disagreement in the modern pragmatic theory of the English language. The studied problems in the field of pragmatics, and in particular, the speech act of disagreement, are undoubtedly important and relevant in connection with the development of communicative linguistics, which is based on the study of communicative competence, which is the internal ability and readiness of an individual to carry out a speech act of communication in a foreign language.

Keywords: speech act, disagreement, linguistics, communicative competence.

INTRODUCTION

The speech act of disagreement is one of the types of speech acts of a negative reaction, to which some scientists also include acts of prohibition and refusal. (9, p. 38)

However, in this work, speech acts of prohibition and refusal are not considered, and a speech act of disagreement is understood as an act that combines all types of negative reactions: *refutation, objection, judgment, expression of dissatisfaction, disapproval*. (10, p. 56)

So, the speech act of a negative reaction is a reactive act that expresses the negative attitude of the speaker to the action or statement of the interlocutor, which is an informative, evaluative or imperative statement with various emotional connotations (judgment, disapproval, and others) and has a certain embodiment in speech. (10, p. 63)

DISCUSSIONS

In a comprehensive study of the speech act of disagreement, the following factors are taken into account:

Communicative goal.

- ✓ *I think that this Sunday will be suitable for visiting Jane and tell her everything what I think of her.*
- ✓ *I don't see any sense in it. These your actions, Kate, are wrong and ungrounded. You should stay at home or phone her to make peace. (2, p.14)*

In this example, the communicative goal is to express the lack of agreement in relation to the interlocutor's statement. In this case, the objection is an assessment of the information of the interlocutor.

Speaker concept

- ✓ *You are the best mother in the world*
- ✓ *No, I'm not. You want me to be. And I want to be, I really do. But just wanting something doesn't make it true. (3, p. 68)*

Performing a speech act of disagreement, the speaker expresses a certain point of view, while being on opposite positions with the interlocutor on one issue.

Interlocutor concept

- ✓ *You can't cook at all. You are a good-for-nothing person.*
- ✓ *That is not true. I can cook and always cook tasty things. You can't appreciate my talent in cooking. (2, p. 17)*

In this speech act of disagreement, the interlocutor provokes a certain negative reaction of the speaker.

Event content

- ✓ *Patrick is a great guy. He is very sensitive and kind.*
- ✓ *I don't agree with you. He is very selfish and cunning. I can't understand why you don't notice it. (11, p. 26)*

The event basis of this speech act of disagreement includes informing the interlocutor about the negative attitude of the speaker to his action.

Factor of the communicative past. In this study, replicas-reactions of disagreement were subjected to a comprehensive analysis:

- a) neutral remarks: *I don't agree; I am not sure; No, I don't think; I disagree; etc.*
- b) informal remarks: *I don't see any sense in it; Nonsense!; no way!; You must be joking!; etc.*
- c) formal remarks: *I'm afraid I don't share your point of view; I see things rather differently myself; etc.*

factor of the communicative future.

How many times have I told you not to make friends with this awful girl. She has a terrible background: her father is a drunker and her mother ...Oh, my God!

But Marty only stood up and went away. (12, p. 103)

In this example, the factor of the communicative future is expressed in the absence of a response to the interlocutor's remark.

7) linguistic embodiment. Each subtype of speech acts of disagreement has a certain embodiment in speech. (6, p. 103)

English speech etiquette is a set of special words and expressions that give a polite form to English speech, as well as the rules according to which these words and expressions are used in practice in various communication situations.

Skillful possession of speech etiquette is a sign of a well-bred person. England and other English-speaking countries have not undergone those historical catastrophes that befell Russia, therefore English speech etiquette has a long and very authoritative tradition - any deviation from speech etiquette is perceived as a manifestation of bad manners and as deliberate rudeness.

Thus, we can say that English speech etiquette (however, like the speech etiquette of any other language) is one of the constituent forces of art, it likes to win over people. (7, p. 39)

A feature of English speech etiquette is politeness and tact. Thus, even if an Englishman disagrees with his interlocutor in some way, he will never openly and rudely say this, but will try to argue his point of view as tactfully and politely as possible, using, for example, such expressions:

It is not the way I see it.

I can't say that I share your point of view.

I see things rather differently myself. (7, p. 26)

On very rare occasions or in an informal setting, the English can afford the following expressions of disagreement:

rubbish!

Nonsense!

Are you joking? (7, p. 26)

In addition, if an Englishman is invited, for example, to visit or to a party, he will never refuse directly, for example: I'd like you to go to my party today.

I'm sorry, I don't see any opportunity to except your invitation. (2, p.48)

Expressions of politeness are acquired and used by the English in early childhood almost automatically. This brings to interpersonal communication a sense of mutual respect, warmth, goodwill. On the contrary, the inability to adequately respond in a timely manner or politely respond in a given communication situation can disrupt communication and adversely affect the relationship of the interlocutors. (1, p.203)

Another distinctive specific feature of English speech behavior is non-conflict. For example, the conversation is conducted in such a way as to avoid disagreement in every possible way, and even more so an open clash of opinions. The British always know how to listen to the interlocutor without objecting to him, but this does not mean at all that they agree, for example:

If, for example, representatives of other nations want to have conflict-free communication with them, they should not touch on topics related to money and personal life in a conversation, for example:

What is your monthly salary?

I wouldn't like to discuss this business

As can be seen from the example, the British answer such questions briefly and restrainedly. Thus, in order to avoid linguistic and cultural errors, as well as to communicate effectively with representatives of another culture, it is necessary to know the peculiarities of speech behavior and etiquette of any people, and in particular, the British.

According to A.A. Shakhmatova, attracting the attention of the addressee, burdened with additional semantic shades of reproach, warning, etc. (like: Well, mom! - meaning: Why are you saying this? or Don't say that) leads to the formation of a one-part sentence. This view was supported by some syntaxists. However, it remains unclear how additional semantic increments convert the unit of one level into the unit of another, i.e. word into a sentence. It is also unclear why an appeal, attracting the interlocutor's attention, has less semantic weight than, for example, a reproach.

In speech etiquette, as to the system of socially defined and nationally specific rules of speech behavior that regulate the choice of code when making contact with the interlocutor and maintaining communication, the

appeal occupies a central position and constitutes the most numerous, consisting of a number of thematic groups, functional-semantic association of units [5].

In the semantic structure of the addresses, there are such "atomic" components of the situation: the addressee as the object of attracting attention and the addresser as the subject of such an action, the motive as the need to attract the attention of the interlocutor and the associated goal - establishing contact in the chosen key, as well as the "theme of the event". Such a "theme" is revealed, first of all, through the meaning of a hypernym in a synonymic or thematic series. Explanatory dictionaries explain the word appeal through the verb apply: "I. Send your words, request, etc. to someone, something; address someone (with any words, request, etc.)". Clarifying the dictionary interpretation, we note: in order to send words to someone, to address someone, it is necessary to name him, i.e. use the nomination that, from the point of view of the addresser, most corresponds to the social status and role of the addressee. But, in accordance with the motive and purpose, such a nomination must be combined with predication, i.e. not just name the addressee, but at the same time and at the same time call him ("to call", according to the Dictionary - "to invite with a voice, gesture to approach, approach, respond"). If the nomination is not chosen due to uncertainty, or too much generalization of the social characteristics of the addressee, or due to the lack of a suitable nomination in the language and usage, or the lack of need (or desire) to implement such a nomination in given speech conditions, then the attraction unit is used attention like *Sorry...*, *Excuse me...* etc. - functionally equal to the treatment of the nominative basis. In some cases, the hyperonymic name turns out to be explicit - cf. in the speech of the military: Allow me to apply! Comrade! - politely and with dignity he turned to the watchman, but the watchman did not even look in his direction.

Depending on the way of expression, Searle proposed a classification of speech acts. He distinguished direct and indirect speech acts. (10, p. 126)

Based on this classification, we will consider direct and indirect means of expressing a speech act of disagreement.

Direct speech acts are transmitted by means whose language semantics corresponds to the illocutionary force of the speech act. (10, p. 129)

For example,

- ✓ *Harry, I think that you are just walking away from your child.*
- ✓ *No, you are quite wrong. I am not walking away from him. I am not giving up. But I know how much he loves to be with his mother although he tries not to show it because he thinks it will hurt me. (12, p. 56)*

In the response (reaction-reaction), the direct means of expressing disagreement was used 'No, you are quite wrong. I am not quite walking away from him.'

The negation of 'no' and the particle 'not' help reinforce the speaker's disagreement.

- ✓ *What about the guy Gina lived with? This Richard? You don't know anything about him. Are you happy to turn your son over to him?*
- ✓ *I don't agree with you. I'm not turning Pat over to anyone. He's my son and he will always be my son. I'm his father and I'll always be his father. But I have to assume that Gina hasn't got completely lousy taste in men. (12, p. 209)*

This example also uses the direct means of expressing disagreement 'I don't agree with you', as well as the negative construct 'I'm not turning Pat over to anyone.'

- ✓ *I had a really good performance last night. What do you think of it, Mike?*
- ✓ *Oh, I don't think that it was so brilliant as you see it. You can act better.' (12, p. 111)*

Also, the direct expression of disagreement 'Oh, I don't think that it was so brilliant as you see it' is used very rarely by the British, due to the fact that they are very reserved and tolerant people.

Direct means of expressing disagreement are often used by the English in communication, as well as by writers when writing works of art, to more clearly and clearly convey the meaning of the statement to the interlocutor or reader.

Due to the fact that the British are a very tactful and tolerant people, they tend to express disagreement in a veiled way. Therefore, along with direct means of expressing disagreement, they use indirect ones. The English prefer not to communicate their communicative intentions directly; in such cases, they perform one speech action using another.

Thus, indirect speech acts, and in this case indirect speech acts of disagreement, are expressed by linguistic forms, the illocutionary force of which is not part of their semantics, but is derived in a logical-inferential way from the literal meaning of the form, taking into account the situation of pronunciation. (9, p. 101)

CONCLUSION

The speech act of disagreement is a complex phenomenon that expresses a negative attitude towards the action or statement of the interlocutor and has a certain set of means of expression, the use of which in a particular situation depends on the speaker's intentions, the nature of the stimulus reaction and the characteristics of the speech situation. A speech act of disagreement in a certain situation, depending on the method and form of expression, can belong to any of the following classes: representatives, directives or declarations.

In the study of the speech act of disagreement, the following aspects are considered: the communicative goal, the concept of the speaker, the concept of the interlocutor, the event content, the factor of the communicative past and future, and the linguistic embodiment. Modern pragmatic studies show that the English are characterized by non-conflict communication, thus, in most situations, they use indirect means to express disagreement.

References:

1. Kazartseva, O.M. Culture of speech communication: theory and practice of communication: Proc. Benefit. – 4 edition. / O.M. Kazartsev. – M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2001. – 496 p.
2. Karpushina E.E. Pragmatic characteristics of speech moves in the English-speaking dialogue. / HER. Karpushin. //Communicative aspect of language: processes and units: Interuniversity collection of scientific works. - L., 1991. - 102 p.
3. Klyuev E.V. Speech communication: Proc. manual for universities and institutes. / E.V. Klyuev. - M., 2002. - 320 p.
4. Kobozeva I.M. The theory of speech acts as one of the variants of the theory of speech activity. / THEM. Kobozeva. – M.: Progress. - 1986. - Issue 17. - 88 p.
5. Linsky, L.M. linguistic theories. / L.M. Linsky. - M., 1997. - 398 p.
6. Mayol, E. These Strange Englishmen. / E. Mayol, D. Milstead. - Moscow: Egmont. - 2001. - 72 p.
7. Metsler, A.A. Pragmatics of communicative units. / A.A. Metsler. - Chisinau. - 1990. - 103 p.

8. Semenenko, L.P. Indirect speech acts are amalgams. / L.P. Semenenko. - Tula. - 1991. - 118 p.
9. Serafimova, M.A. Shaevich, A.M. Topical Dialogues. / M.A. Serafimova, A.M. Shaevich. - M., 1978. - 78 p.
10. Searle, J. Theories of speech acts. / J. Searle. - M., 1998. - 180 p.
11. Mitchell M. Gone with the wind. / M. Mitchell. London, Penguin Books. – 2002. – 688 p.
12. Parsons T. Man and boy / T. Parsons. London, Harper Collins Publishers. - 2002. - 344 p.

