

THE EXPRESSION OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES OF REJECTION IN DISCOURSE

Ro'ziyeva Nilufar Kamtarovna,
PhD student of Bukhara state university,
Teacher of Bukhara state pedagogical institution,
n.k.roziyeva@buxdu.uz

Abstract. The study of the various characteristics of discourse is considered as one of the earliest areas of attention for modern linguists. In many scientific works, we can see that discourse types, such as political, legal, medical, and advertising, have been studied. Communicative strategies expressed in any kind of discourse are directly related to “choice” and allow the communicator to use the most appropriate language tools in the given situations and achieve the desired result with them. Correct usage of communicative strategies is considered as a tool that ensures effective communication, free from misunderstandings.

Key words: communicative act, pragmalinguistics, tactics, discourse, interlocutor, refusal function, face-threatening act, politeness strategy.

Аннотация. Изучение различных характеристик дискурса считается одним из самых ранних направлений внимания современных лингвистов. Во многих научных работах мы видим, что изучались такие типы дискурса, как политический, юридический, медицинский и рекламный. Коммуникативные стратегии, выраженные в любом виде дискурса, напрямую связаны с «выбором» и позволяют коммуникатору использовать наиболее подходящие в данных ситуациях языковые средства и достигать с их помощью желаемого результата. Правильное использование коммуникативных стратегий рассматривается как инструмент, обеспечивающий эффективную коммуникацию, свободную от недоразумений.

Ключевые слова: коммуникативный акт, прагматлингвистика, тактика, дискурс, собеседник, функция отказа, акт угрозы лицу, стратегия вежливости.

Annotatsiya. Diskursning turli xil-xususiyatlarini o'rganish zamonaviy tilshunoslarning diqqat e'tibori qaratilgan eng dastlabki nuqtalardan bo'lib hisoblanmoqda. Ko'plab ilmiy ishlarda diskurs turlaridan – siyosiy, qonuniy, tibbiyotga va reklama sohasiga oid diskurs tadqiqot ostiga olinganiga guvoh bo'lamiz. Kommunikativ strategiyalarning diskursda ifodalanishi bevosita “tanlov”ga bog'liq bo'lib, kommunikantga qo'yilgan vaziyatlarda eng maqbul til vositalarini

qo'llash hamda u bilan ko'zlangan natijaga erishish imkonini beradi. Kommunikativ strategiyalar – nutq aktlari ta'limotining muhim bir bo'lagi sifatida muloqotning samarali hamda ortiqcha tushunmovchiliklardan xoli ravishda kechishini ta'minlovchi vosita sifatida qarash maqsadga muvofiqdir.

Kalit so'zlar: kommunikativ akt, pragmatlingvistika, taktika, nutq, interlokutor, rad etish funktsiyasi, xushmuomalalik strategiyasi.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that deals with the meaning derived from context, and how pragmatic meaning is expressed and understood depends on the context, that is, where, when, and how a particular conversation takes place. Some sentences can have different meanings in different contexts. As the linguist Birner noted, pragmatic meaning is not given in any dictionaries, because contextual meaning is expressed according to the situation.

As we know, any speech is one of the most important factors in the formation of human behavior and relationships between people. Accordingly, many studies have been conducted on the different understandings of a particular speech by speakers of different languages, and the formation and distribution of speech has been recognized as one of the important ways to ensure human immortality. That is, if speech is preserved through literature, it has been found that this strategy is of great importance in creating new ways of understanding the world. Since every work of literature created is an example of discourse, our understanding of artistic discourse is crucial to our understanding of literature.

Studies on the term discourse in Uzbek linguistics were conducted by the linguist Sh. Safarov. In his studies on text and discourse, the linguist notes the following: "If both text and discourse are the result of human linguistic activity, I suspect that it is possible to distinguish them only by the qualities of "oral" and "written" based on an external - formal indicator. It is also difficult to imagine one of them as a material phenomenon, and the other as a phenomenon devoid of this feature. After all, if both of these are the products of productive activity, then the achieved result should have a material appearance, right? The purposefully expressed communicative content and the informative content that is formed in the perception of the listener, independent of the speaker's desire, do not negate each other; on the contrary, they mix and merge, becoming a factor ensuring the effectiveness of communication. The harmony of communicative and informative contents ensures the integrity of the macro-unity of the communication system. It is currently recognized that only discourse possesses this integrity.[3]

There are different views among Western scholars about literary discourse and its types. When someone uses speech to communicate, they are using discourse. So, a writer

primarily relies on discourse to tell stories, exchange ideas, and disseminate information. In fact, there is no literature without discourse. However, not all discourse is the same, and literary scholars divide it into four basic types: argumentative, descriptive, existential, and narrative.

It is no secret that many meanings are conveyed through speech acts, that is, we can express the meanings of promising, swearing, ordering and refusing in different ways through the context. For example, refusal is carried out in different ways and through strategies. By using one or more of these, we can express our rejection of the idea or proposal of our interlocutor to a certain extent. Also, refusal can find its expression not only in real life, but also in works of art, as opposed to real life. Because in any context, it is natural for us to encounter the phenomenon of refusal depending on the situation, and awareness of the different ways of implementing this act is useful in preventing misunderstandings in relations with the interlocutor.

We cannot always use the phrase “no” to reject the proposal, request, or, in general, the idea of our interlocutor. The situation can be especially acute when the interlocutor, that is, our interlocutor, differs from us in age, gender, or social status. Accordingly, communicators express the act of refusal in speech in several other ways. Linguist Felix Brasdefer divides the act of refusal into several categories, and these categories embody the strategies that implement refusal. They are:

1. Direct refusal

According to the teachings of Felix Brasdefer, direct refusal is a method of explicit refusal, which is precisely saying “no”, that is, using the word “no” without any obstacles or internal modifications. For example:

A: May I see your paper?

B: No.

2. Indirect refusal also includes several strategies:

a) Mild refusal - in this strategy, the speaker, when given a refusal, reduces the negative impact on it and it is pre-formed in the speaker's mind through a number of means. For example:

A: Will you come to my birthday party?

B: Unfortunately, I have some urgent work to do.

Although interlocutor B rejects interlocutor A's offer, he does so without offending his interlocutor.

b) Giving a reason or explanation – this strategy is used when the speaker cannot fulfill the desire, proposal or request of his interlocutor. In this case, the speaker is required to give, explain or explain the reason for not being able to perform the action. For example:

A: Will you come to my birthday party?

B: I have to visit my grandmother next week.

In this dialogue, speaker B gives a reason why he cannot come to the party in order to indirectly reject speaker A's proposal.

c) Giving an ambiguous answer – according to this principle, the speaker chooses to give an ambiguous answer, thereby leaving the conversation without a clear conclusion.

A: Will you come to my birthday party?

B: Let's see.

In the above conversation, it is unclear whether the interlocutor B will come or not, because he did not say whether he will come or not.

d) Apologizing or regretting – this strategy ensures that the interlocutor does not feel upset by receiving a rejection, and is considered a form of politeness. For example:

A: Will you come to my birthday party?

B: I'm very sorry, for I won't be able to attend your party.

e) Alternative offer – when choosing an alternative strategy, the interlocutor does not limit himself to refusing the proposed action, but serves to invite his interlocutor to compromise by offering another alternative, and at the same time rejects the offer.

A: Let's go to the cinema on Saturday!

B: How about Sunday instead?

f) Postponement – if the interlocutor does not like the offer, wish or request made to him, he can ask for the offer to be postponed, without directly refusing it, and hint that he will reconsider it without responding to the offer right away.

A: Let's go to the cinema on Sunday!

B: I'll text you to inform you later.

In conclusion, we can say that the phenomenon of artistic discourse is one of the most relevant issues of recent years and is distinguished from other linguistic phenomena by the large amount of material that needs to be researched and studied. At the same time, the communicative strategies used in artistic discourse also vary from one participant in communication to another and do not obey rigid, rigid rules. Our research may provide an explanation for a single communication or communicative discourse, but just as people and

their goals are not exactly the same, the communicative strategies they use in discourse are also fundamentally different from each other, and it is also a natural fact in the communication process that the same communication strategies used in different situations are perceived or understood differently and achieve different results.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. G. R. Kress, *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication* (2010)
2. G. R. Kress, *Literacy in the new media age. Literacy in the new media age* (2003) <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203164754>
3. T. V. Leeuwen, *Critical Analysis of Multimodal Discourse. Encyclopaedia of Applied Linguistics* (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0269>
4. N. Fairclough, I. Fairclough, *A procedural approach to ethical critique in CDA. Critical Discourse Studies*, 15, 169–185 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1427121>
5. N. Fairclough, I. Fairclough, in *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*, 186–198 (Taylor and Francis Inc., 2015) <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315519296-4> Inc.
6. R. Wodak, K. Savski, *Critical discourse-ethnographic approaches to language policy. Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, 1–31 (2018), E. S. Kubryakova, *Language and Knowledge: On the Way to Knowledge of Language: Parts of Speech from Cognitive Perspective. Role of Language in Learning the World* (2004)
7. R. Wodak, B. Forchtner, R. Wodak, in *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics*, 135–150 (Routledge, 2018) <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315183718-11>