

Disagreement: Sociolinguistic Investigations in Conversations

Nusratullaeva Shokhista Sabirjon qizi

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

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

Abstract: The article describes issues based on features of disagreement in language context, national and sociolinguistic features of this process in conversations. Linguistic phenomena reflect the facts of the social life of a given speaking community. The linguistic picture of the world reflects reality through the cultural picture of the world. Therefore, the study of a foreign language as a means of communication is inextricably linked with the study of the social and cultural life of countries and peoples who speak this language. When it comes to communication, especially intercultural communication, it can be very difficult to draw a line between the sociological and psychological aspects of communication. Both those and others deal with complex categories arising in the process of communication or transmitted through it - values, motives, attitudes, stereotypes and prejudices. And all these categories directly affect the communicative behavior of a particular linguistic personality.

Keywords: linguistics, communication, foreign language, the cultural picture of the world, disagreement, the linguistic picture of the world.

INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics is actively developing a direction in which the language is considered as the cultural code of the nation, and not just as an instrument of communication and cognition. Modern scientists position language as a way by which we penetrate into the modern mentality of the nation. It is known that a person from childhood learns the language and, along with it, the culture of his people. All the subtleties of the culture of the people are reflected in their language, which is specific and unique, as it captures the world and the person in it in different ways. In this regard, the significance and relevance of intercultural communication as a science and the intercultural competence that it teaches is quite obvious.

These pragmatic aspects of verbal communication are dealt with by the so-called cross-cultural pragmatics, the tool of which is a comparative analysis of individual principles that characterize communicative activity and the corresponding cultural scenarios. Among the most important and, at the same time, culturally contradictory pragmatic principles, it is necessary to note the "Principle of Politeness" by P. Brown and S. Levinson and numerous works devoted to speech acts, one way or another built on this principle - these include speech acts of praise / compliment . Cross-cultural differences are manifested, in particular, in what type of politeness - based on solidarity or on maintaining a distance - is characteristic of a given culture [2, p. 1].

Cross-cultural pragmatics differs from traditional, proper linguistic comparative studies of the categories of politeness, forms of reference and address, analysis of speech acts, primarily by its functional orientation. Which communicative strategy will be chosen, in which particular cultural scenario this or that statement will be embodied, depends on the cultural characteristics of the corresponding communicative community [1, p. 1].

DISCUSSIONS

A speech act is the minimum unit of speech activity, singled out and studied in the theory of speech acts - a doctrine that, as noted earlier, is the most important component of linguistic pragmatics [1, p. 1]. N.D. Arutyunova's speech act is defined as the minimum basic unit of speech communication, in which one communicative goal of the speaker is realized and the addressee is affected [3, p. 98]. Since a speech act is a type of action, its analysis uses essentially the same categories that are necessary to characterize and evaluate any action: subject, goal, method, tool, means, result, conditions, success, etc. The subject of the speech act - the speaker - produces an utterance, as a rule, calculated on the perception of it by the addressee - the listener. The utterance acts both as a product of a speech act and as a tool for achieving a specific goal. Depending on the circumstances or conditions in which a speech act is performed, it can either achieve its goal and thus be successful, or not achieve it. The principles and rules on which normal human communication is built were formulated by G.P. Grice [3, pp. 217-237]; one of them says that "the statement must be in essence" (the rule of relation or relevance). This rule requires communicators to make their statements relevant to the topic, situation. In other words, to be successful, a speech act must be at least appropriate. Otherwise, the speaker will face a communicative failure. The actual use of words in speech, the actual production of speech, is largely determined by the knowledge of the social and cultural life of the speech community speaking the given language. The communicative behavior of the Russian and English linguistic personality reflects the features of the national character of Russians and Englishmen. Accordingly, the use of speech acts of praise/compliment in Russian and English communicative cultures is largely determined by the cultural characteristics of the two ethnic communities.

As E. Sapir said, "Language does not exist outside of culture, i.e. outside the socially inherited set of practical skills and ideas that characterize our way of life" [2, p. 31]. Thus, sociocultural structures underlie linguistic structures.

The problems of intercultural communication, in addition to language barriers, are created by national-specific components of cultures. As I.Yu. Markovin and Yu.A. Sorokin, "the components of culture that carry a nationally specific coloration include at least the following:

- a) traditions (or stable elements of culture), as well as customs (defined as traditions in the "socio-normative" sphere of culture) and rituals (performing the function of unconscious familiarization with the normative requirements prevailing in this system);
- b) everyday culture, closely related to traditions, as a result of which it is often called traditional-everyday culture;
- c) everyday behavior (habits of representatives of a certain culture, norms of communication accepted in a certain society), as well as mimic and pantomimic codes associated with it, used by carriers of a certain linguocultural community;
- d) "national pictures of the world", reflecting the specifics of the perception of the surrounding world, the national characteristics of the thinking of representatives of a particular culture;
- e) artistic culture, reflecting the cultural traditions of a particular ethnic group" [2, p. 77].

In intercultural communication, it is necessary to take into account the peculiarities of the national character of the communicants, the specifics of their emotional make-up, national-specific features of thinking" [2, p. 77].

The native speaker of the national language and culture also has individual characteristics.

The study of the national character and culture of native speakers is aimed at helping to understand the peculiarities of speech usage, additional semantic loads, political, cultural, historical and similar connotations of units of language and speech. Particular attention is paid to the realities, since a deep knowledge of the realities is necessary for a correct understanding of the phenomena and facts related to the everyday reality of the peoples who speak this language.

The world around a person is presented in three forms:

- 1) The real picture of the world is an objective non-human given; the world around man.
- 2) The cultural (conceptual) picture of the world is a reflection of the real picture through the prism of concepts formed on the basis of a person's ideas, received with the help of the senses and passed through his consciousness, both collective and individual. The cultural picture of the world is specific and differs among different peoples. This is due to a number of factors: geography, climate, natural conditions, history, social structure, beliefs, traditions, lifestyle, etc.
- 3) The linguistic picture of the world reflects reality through the cultural picture of the world [2, p. 77].

All attempts by different linguistic schools to tear language away from reality have failed for a simple and obvious reason: it is necessary to take into account not only the linguistic form, but also the content - this is the only possible way to comprehensively study any phenomenon.

Of course, the national cultural picture of the world is primary in relation to the linguistic one. It is fuller, richer and deeper than the corresponding language. However, it is the language that realizes, verbalizes the national cultural picture of the world, stores it and passes it on from generation to generation. Language captures far from everything that is in the national vision of the world, but it is able to describe everything.

The speech act of disagreement in the context of communication is expressed by a number of grammatical and lexical means.

The grammatical means of expressing disagreement are models and structures combined into sentences, with the help of which the speaker, in the process of communication, expresses his disagreement in relation to some communication situation. An example of such structures can be the following widespread grammatical forms: do not; do not agree with; cannot; is not. The use of these structures to express a speech act of disagreement can be illustrated by the following examples:

1) *Jane, I'd like to visit our Granny today?*

✓ *Oh, I don't think that Monday is a suitable day for a visit. I don't see any sense in it. (2, p. 13)*

In this example, such a grammatical structure as: do not was used.

✓ *I think that Mr. Dick will be kicked from this job. He is very careless and inexperienced.*

✓ *I do not agree with you. He knows his job and works hard to gain some good results. (2, p.29)*

In this example, disagreement is expressed using the grammatical model: do not agree with.

✓ *I do not believe that Jack will try to help us. He is so busy with chasing that stupid girl.*

✓ *I can't share your view because Jack is a real friend and moreover he is in love with Julia. (2, p. 30)*

Along with grammatical means, there are also lexical means of expressing disagreement.

Lexical means of expressing disagreement is a set of certain lexical units and expressions that help communicants express their disagreement with something or someone.

Lexical means of expressing disagreement include the following lexical units and models: *Nonsense!*; *Rubbish!*; *you are crazy*; *Are you a fool?*; *You must be joking!*; *I see things rather differently myself*; *hardly*; *impossible, sorry but*.

For example,

- ✓ *Harry, I want Pat to live with us, with me and Richard. I love him and he loves me and Pat greatly.*
- ✓ *Rubbish! How can he love my child if he doesn't even know him, his habits, his likes and dislikes. (23, p.155)*

In this example, the communicant's disagreement is expressed using the lexical unit '*Rubbish*'

- ✓ *Nigel, I decided to return Pat to Gina. It will be better for him.*
- ✓ *You must be joking! You are crazy. You shouldn't do it because we are going to win the process and the judge is on our side. (3, p. 181)*

In this dialogue, two lexical expressions are used to express disagreement: '*You must be joking!*'; '*You are crazy*', which helps the author reinforce the negative reaction of the speaker.

Lexical and grammatical means play an important role in English speech behavior for expressing disagreement. They function in the speaker's speech in combination with each other, and the behavior of communicants depends on the choice of these means.

CONCLUSION

In a comprehensive review of the main means of expression and structures of the speech act of disagreement in the context of communication, following conclusions were drawn and a number of features of the use of this speech act in English speech behavior were highlighted. First of all, the concept of a speech act of disagreement was defined, which is interpreted as a functional-pragmatic field that has a content plan - the communicative intention of the speaker and an expression plan - a variety of linguistic and speech means of conveying a negative illocutionary goal.

Based on the purpose of our study, one of the methods for achieving which is the comparative method, we paid special attention to the study of the national character of a linguistic personality. Features of the national character are reflected in the cultural and speech traditions of the people, and those, in turn, are embodied in the system of general requirements for speech and speech behavior, historically established in a particular culture and reflecting the system of its ethical and aesthetic values. Thus, having compiled psychological portraits of representatives of the English nation, we came to the conclusion that the dominant features of the Russian national character are simplicity, kindness, openness, sincerity, spontaneity of behavior, honesty and collective consciousness. The same are the main characteristics of communicative behavior.

References:

1. Apresyan Yu.D. Performatives in grammar and vocabulary. T. 46. 1986. No. 3. - P. 208-222.
2. Arutyunova N.D., Paducheva E.V. Origins, problems and categories of pragmatics // New in foreign linguistics: linguistic pragmatics. - Issue. XVI. - M., 1985.- P. 3-42.
3. Grice G.P. Logic and speech communication // New in foreign linguistics: linguistic pragmatics. Issue. XVI. - M., 1985. - P. 217-237.
4. Searl J. Indirect speech acts // New in foreign linguistics: theory of speech acts. Issue. XVII. - M., 1986. - P. 195-283.

5. Suleimenova E.D. The concept of meaning in modern linguistics. - Alma-ata: Mektep, 1989. - 160 p.
6. Karasik V.I. The language of social status. - M.: Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Volgograd state. ped. Institute, 1992. - 330 p.
7. Bakhtin M.M. Research in linguistics. - L. 1983. - 416 p.
8. Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and intercultural communication: textbook. – M.: Slovo/Slovo, 2000. – 624 p.
9. Antipov G.A., Donskikh O.A., Markovina I.Yu., Sorokin Yu.A. Text as a phenomenon of culture. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1989.- P. 77.
10. Vezhbitskaya A. Speech acts // New in foreign linguistics: linguistic pragmatics. Issue. XVI. - M. 1985. - P. 251-275.
11. Nedobuh A.S. Formation of intercultural competence // Linguistic Bulletin. Issue. 1. - Izhevsk, 1999. - P. 70-76.
12. Mikhalskaya A.K. Fundamentals of rhetoric. Thought and word. Textbook for students in grades 10-11 of educational institutions. - M., 1996. - 426 p.

