



DIALOGUES AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF HUMAN COMMUNICATION AND WAYS OF ITS LANGUAGE DESIGN.

Abbasova Nargiza Kobilovna

Farg'ona Davlat universiteti, ingliz tili kafedrasi katta o'qituvchisi, PhD

Xakimova Zumradxon Qudratali qizi

Farg'ona Davlat universiteti, lingvistika (ingliz tili)

yo'nalishi bo'yicha 1-kurs magistranti

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8055161>

ABSTRACT

Dialogue is an integral part of human communication, in which two or more characters are represented as conversing. It is used by writers as a way of advancing their plot of their story, by getting their characters to reveal their plans of action or share their inner thoughts and emotions. This article discusses different types of dialogues illustrating with some examples.

Key words: dialogue conservation, dialogue dispute, dialogue equality, dialogue questioning, Dialogic speech is a type of speech in which direct exchange of statements between two or more persons. The conditions under which dialogical speech proceeds determine a number of its features: brevity of expression, wide use non-verbal means of communication (facial expressions, gestures), a large role of intonation, variety of incomplete proposals, free from strict norms book speech, the syntactic design of the statement, the predominance simple suggestions. According to the types of communicative attitude, it can be divided into two: a dialogue-conversation and dialogue-dispute.

Dialogue-conversation is distinguished with the widespread use of simple one-part sentences with a predominance of declarative and interrogative sentences over incentive and exclamatory. In this type there can be commonly find the predominant use of various interrogative, including alternative interrogative sentences; among complex proposals relatively often complex subordinate and especially explanatory sentences of the modal type are used; frequent use of incomplete sentences, ellipses (yes, no); the presence of individual statements, in structural and semantic terms close to the monologue. In a dialogue-conversation, the leading units of learning are stimulus replicas (initiative replicas) and response replicas (reactive replicas)

Dialogue-dispute is an exchange of opinions with the aim of making a decision or finding out the truth, explanatory argumentation and contradictory argumentation. It includes language tools that describe the argumentation in the dialogue-dispute cover all language levels. At the same time, the means of expressing argumentation include verbs, negative adverbs, pronouns, adversative conjunctions, a negative particle and phraseological units with a negative meaning. The remaining lexical, grammatical and prosodic means of expressing the argument acquire the appropriate meaning in the context, the affirmative exclamatory nature of the replicas prevails

According to the nature of the interaction of communicants, the dialogues are divided into: Dialogue-equality, dialogue cooperation and dialogue dependence. Both participants in the dialogue conduct a conversation that is not aimed at the achievement of some joint, specific result, for example, an interview dialogue.

Dialogue-equality is characterized by a cooperative strategy, linguistic form, which is expressed in question-answer replication. Dialog dependence is characterized by the subordination of one of the participants over the other, for example, a dialogue between an employer and a job seeker. The predominant nature of the replicas is affirmatively interrogative.

Dialogue cooperation is aimed at achieving a common goal of the communicants, therefore, it is marked by the predominance of cooperative strategies. For example: a telephone conversation between a client and an employee of the company for computer repair (both the client and the employee of the company strive to solve a problem together, the question-answer character of replicas is realized).

By the nature of the interaction of participants, it happens: dialogue - questioning, dialogue (polylogue) - discussion, dialogue - dissonance (disagreement), dialogue - clarification

1. Dialogue-questioning

Dialogs of this type are built according to the model:

- request for general or private information;
- answer to the question (short or extended).

For dialogue-questioning, questions of a general nature are typical:

Who it...? What's happened...? What the...? What is...? What is...? What is the science of..

These questions concern the scientist, the nature of the object (phenomenon), a scientific event, the result of an action, etc. In addition, private clarification questions about the time and the place of the event, the purpose of the action, the distinctive features of the object (phenomena): What is...? What is...? What is...? What are...? What are the signs inherent...? What does it consist of...?

Questions-assumptions are also possible, that is, questions without an interrogative word like: Is this concept polysemantic?

A short answer is usually focused on the logical center of the question and contains a topic and a rhyme, and a detailed answer contains more explanations and clarifications.

2. Unison dialogue (= agreement)

Dialogs of this type are built according to the following models:

First model:

- affirmative statement of some person;
- statement by another person who agrees with the information first person;

Second model:

- affirmative statement of some person;
- a statement by another person that not only agrees with information of the first, but also illustrates it with concrete examples and evidence;
- affirmative statement of some person;

Third model:

• a statement by another person that not only agrees with information of the first, but also develops the expressed idea further, complementing and expanding it. Speech implementations are needed to build a unison dialogue communication needs such as:

1) agreement with the information received (I think so too; I completely agree with you and under.);

2) illustration of information (I can illustrate this example; This is easily proved by the fact that...; This can be shown on example (of what?) etc.);

3) logical conclusion in the argument (From this...; What else can you say about this? etc.) or c) asking the interlocutor to clarify someone's point vision a) attracting attention interlocutor (I ask you ...; Agree that ...; Do you think that + paraphrasing the interlocutor's thoughts; and under.); b) requesting information about opinion of the interlocutor (What is your opinion? It is interesting to hear your opinion and under); c) stimulating the interlocutor to express his position (I am listening to you carefully ...; what you are talking about is very interesting and under.); d) limiting the activity of the interlocutor (Sorry ...; Allow you abort...; Excuse me, can I ask a question? and under.); e) a request for correction of the method of information transmission (Slower / louder, Please; Please, not so fast... etc.).

4) own inclusion in the conversation:

a) request to be allowed to speak (Let me speak; Let me say a few words... and under.);

b) joining an already expressed point of view (I also I think; Here our opinions coincide and under.);

c) an expression of doubt the reliability of the information (This is doubtful ...; No complete certainty that...; I'm not entirely sure about this...and under);

d) expression disagreement with the interlocutor (It seems to us that ... is not right; I think otherwise; I have a different point of view and so on.);

e) expression objections (causes an objection ...; I would like to object; I have there is an objection and under.);

f) refutation of someone else's opinion or position with giving counterarguments (= illustrative examples; references to famous scientists; references to the common memory of the participants in the dialogue): Let's start with what we show...; And now let's turn to ..., As already mentioned ...; IN let's give an example to confirm what has been said...; This position can illustrate with a number of examples...; Some researchers think that...; according to the teaching...; As you know...; As you remember...; And under.);

g) an explanation of his position (As it seems to us ...; On our sight...; I think that ...; From our point of view ... and so on.); and) self-correction (I mean...; I would like to say...; I'm not quite sure expressed ... and under). are you reading? And what do you think? What do you about itthink? etc.)

5) summing up the private and general results of the discussion, summarizing the information expressed during the discussion, placing emphasis (So, in this way ...; Based on the above ...; It is necessary to draw a conclusion about ...; Summarizing what has been said, we will make conclusion... etc.)

Dialogic speech is always motivated. This means that we always speak for some reason, for some purpose, which is determined either by external or internal stimuli. This characteristic must be taken into account at the initial stage. It is necessary to arouse in the student a desire, a need to speak, and for this it is necessary to create conditions under which there would be a desire to say something, to express one's thoughts, feelings, and not just reproduce others' ones, as is often the case at school, when the student does not see such opportunity, but is replaced by the reproduction of what has been learned by heart. Such conditions, first of all, include the use of such incentives that would cause the student to need to "express himself". This is possible when creating a favorable psychological climate conducive to statements, a friendly attitude with the teacher and in the class team, interest in completing the proposed tasks, the desire to perform these tasks well.



References:

1. Ilyenko S.G. The communicative aspect of considering a proposal and the question of its recognized and unrecognized components // Russian Studies: Selected Works. SPb., 2003.
2. Budaragina E.I. Means of creating the image of the addressee in a literary text: Ph.D. dis. ... cand. philol. Sciences. M., 2006.
3. Vinokur T.G. The speaker and the listener. Variants of speech behavior. M., 2009.
4. Vinogradov V.V. Some tasks of studying the syntax of a simple sentence (based on the Russian language) // Problems of Linguistics. 1954. No. 1. S. 3-29.
5. Schweitzer A.D. Modern sociolinguistics: Theory, problems, methods. M., 2012.
6. <http://www.rb.ru/inform/48257.htm>