PRAGMATIC INTERPRETATION OF EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE AND EXPRESSION OF DIALOGIC DISCOURSE IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS

Shakhnoza Bobojonova Yoldosh kizi*

*Teacher,
Department of Uzbek and foreign languages,
Tashkent Medical Academy,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: shakhnoza.bobojonova@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article presents problems of discourse pragmatics, psychological-pragmatic factors of the use of language units in the speaker-addressee relationship, and the interaction of language and the human factor. The analysis of the discursive situation as a whole, that is, within the framework of educational processes related to the structure of the sentence, is expressed in the article on the basis of examples.

KEYWORDS: *Language Units, Addressee, Pragmatic Feature, Communicative Pragmatics, Discourse Pragmatics, Dialogical Discourse, Literary Language Units.*

INTRODUCTION

For a long time, until the middle of the 20th century, the fields of syntax and semantics were studied separately in linguistics, and there was a very clear difference between them: lexicology dealt with the semantic side of the language, and grammar (morphology and syntax) dealt with the formal-grammatical aspect. In modern linguistics, semantics and syntax have merged: on the one hand, interest in syntax has increased in lexical semantics, primarily in the works of representatives of the Moscow semantic school (Y.D. Apresyan, I.A. Melchuk, etc.); on the other hand, syntactic units began to be actively studied semantically (N.D.Arutyunova, E.V.Paducheva, O.N.Seliverstova, etc.) [1].

This situation is also reflected in Uzbek linguistics. A.Nurmonov emphasizes that since the 60s of the last century, the study of the relationship between the sign and the entity has increased, he mentions that such directions of linguistics as phonosemantics, morphosemantics, lexical semantics, syntactic semantics, which study the different level units of the language from a semantic point of view, have appeared. "The results of semantic studies have shown that the function of linguistic units in the speech process cannot be fully studied without taking into account the context, speech situation, speaking and listening persons") [2].

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

It is known that N. Chomsky's ideas expanded the scope of research on the human ability to acquire language, as well as language use.

In the new era associated with generative linguistics, the interest in the ideas of behaviorism disappeared, the decisive transition from the structural paradigm to the generative paradigm was called the "Chomsky revolution" or the "second cognitive revolution". Its characteristic feature was learning the language through established formal models. These models reflect the main parameters that describe the language. Linguistic ability can be learned through a certain system of rules based on the concept of a brain that is programmed to produce an infinite number of sentences from a limited number of words. Thus, N. Chomsky proposed the ideas of "mental grammar" and "universal grammar". According to him, when studying grammar, one learns not the order of words, but the order of parts of speech. The proposal aims at a common scheme for all language grammars [3].

In particular, issues such as the problems of text-discourse pragmatics, psychological-pragmatic factors of using language units in the speaker-addressee relationship, the interaction of language and the human factor, caused the need to study communicative pragmatics. This requires researching the discursive situation as a whole, that is, within the framework of all processes related to the structure of the sentence.

"Syntactic units within a sentence depend on each other and the language system in a syntagmatic chain, and are connected within certain paradigmatic relations" [4].

A specific syntactic device in the context acquires different semantic signs, contextual meanings, which requires a theoretical generalization of the relationship of form and content on the basis of the dichotomy of language and speech. This issue creates the need to determine the possible methods of syntactic units.

Theorists and practitioners look for observable speech phenomena that are persistent, stable, and complex types that are repeated by speakers of the language in the same way or with slight differences [5].

Sometimes there is a need to use a syntactic device with completely different semantics for a certain expression. In this case, the meaning expressed in a special way is accepted within the framework of the language norm. The same tool can be in its material-logical sense, as well as in a figurative sense, like a directly expressed unit. This case shows that language units express reality in a unique way, and in such cases, the compatibility between language units acquires a pragmatic character.

Therefore, not only the lexical units carrying the main meaning, but also the correct perception of the syntactic devices are important for the correct acceptance of the expression by the addressee. Each element in the structure of communication, regardless of whether it is big or small, main or auxiliary, has a certain importance in the emergence of a certain meaning and linguistic task, so that its insufficient evaluation by the addressee or misunderstanding leads to a misinterpretation of the thought intended by the speaker.

Linguistic units do not always come in their commonly used speech patterns, but sometimes acquire a special textual character, which aspect serves to convey a new pragmatic meaning. Grammatical form reflects the essence of meaning in one way or another. The basis of the modern cognitive approach to language lies in the idea of restoring appropriate cognitive

structures in the forms of language units. The reconstruction is based on the underlying meanings of the linguistic form: what the linguistic form prompts reflects the cognition behind it.

You need to find a model that represents how the content is "actually" built. This approach requires attention to the processes occurring in the human brain. [6]. "In content syntax, the content of the sentence is considered to consist of two elements - objective and subjective content. Objective content is the proposition reflected in the sentence (it is also called dictum), and subjective content is the attitude of the speaker to this reality (it is called modus)" [7, p. 4; 8, pp. 262-264].

Dialogic Discourse is multifaceted in terms of purpose and content, form and conditions. For example, from discourse between casual communicants in a teahouse, to a scientific lecture in an auditorium, to a special-purpose conversation on television/radio, communication-intervention at the border is a variety of discourses. Dialogic discourse differs from other types of discourse by its culturological nature and legality, the influence of communicants on each other.

Participants of dialogic discourse are: speaker (communicator, informant) and listener (addressee). They will have a common goal of some specific practical significance. The goal of the speaker in the communication-intervention process is to convey information about something and influence people's psyche and morals, while the goal of the listener is to listen. Their common goal is to exchange ideas. In turn, the speech situation of communicants differs according to gender differences, according to their cultural level, according to social status, according to age, according to education, according to their specialty, according to their social and spiritual world, and according to their pragmatic characteristics, and the speech situation in dialogic discourse is also different: on the street, on the phone, at home, on the bus It creates different forms of dialogic discourse, taking into account many social factors, such as in (machine) and written speech (letter).

Discourse has emerged as one of the leading concepts in new research directions such as philosophy of language, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and pragmalinguistics based on anthropocentric principles.

Speaking of the structural layering of the syntactic device, how are they formed and manifested in the sentence model? the question arises. "An objective argument represented by a syntactic device, a story is a dictum. Some authors, using the terminology of logic, call it the term proposition. Modus expresses the relationship of the event expressed through the syntactic device to the existence and the speaker's relationship to the event he is expressing" [7, p.8].

The two aspects of language - oral and written - are always in relation to each other. Spoken language is the source of written literary language. Colloquial language is manifested in the form of dialogic discourse, and this discourse is structured on the basis of present response. But it should not be forgotten that spoken language does not mean only dialogue. Of course, they are interrelated phenomena, therefore, written and spoken literary language contain both forms of speech. According to L. V. Shcherba [9], colloquial speech occurs in the form of dialogic discourse. This ensures the naturalness of the dialogue. Language reveals its true existence only in dialogue. If we compare its oral and written forms, we can see that monologue is the basis of literary language. L.V. Shcherba examines the signs of the literary language and divides them into two groups in the form of different forms of the literary language and different forms of the

business language and says that "Each form and each method is related to its syntactic feature to perform a certain task required by vital necessity" [10]. One of the characteristic features of dialogic discourse is the division of dialogic units into replicas, each of which has a separate syntactic structure [11]. A dialogic reply differs from a monologue in its size, focus on the interlocutor, and the presence of a topic boundary. Intonation has its place along with the means of forming dialogic discourse units and showing it as a communication unit: expressiveness, expressiveness, elliptical forms.

CONCLUSION

Syntactic construction of dialogic discourse can be divided into simple and compound sentences based on the characteristics of replicas. When we observe the compound sentences found in dialogues, its complex nature as a linguistic unit, its place on the linguistic level in this complexity, the grammatical form and connecting means of the simple sentences, and the diversity of its meaningful relations are noticeable.

REFERENCES

1. Starodumova E. A. Syntax of the modern Russian language. Vladivostok, Ed. Far Eastern University. 2005. - p. 33.

2. Nurmonov A. Selected works. 3 volumes. Publisher: Akademnashr, Tashkent. – p. 76. 2012.

3. Kornienko M.A. Linguistic philosophy of Noam Chomsky: from the Cartesian tradition to generative grammar // Tomsk State University Bulletin Philosophy. Sociology. Political science. 2018. No. 43. – pp. 88-100.

4. Pocheptsov G.G. Constructive analysis of sentence structure. – Kyiv."High school", 1971. – p. 114.

5. Alpatov V.M. Language is a system of rules and language is activity // Historical psychology and sociology of history 2/2018 202–220.

6. Kurbanova M., Sayfullaeva R., Boqieva G., Mengliev B. Structural syntax of the Uzbek language. Study guide. – Tashkent. 2004. – p. 54.

7. Shcherba L.V. East Luga dialect. Petersburg. 1915. – p. 4.

8. Khursanov, N. I. (2022). Semantic Groups of Behavioral Verbs in Uzbek and English // "Philological Research: Problem and Solution" Materials of the International Scientific Conference. Year: 2022, Volume: 1, Issue, 1. First page: (262). Last page: (264). Online ISBN: 978-620-062760-5. DOI: 10.53885/edinres.2021.32.10.065.

9. Hazratkulov A. Some features of dialogic speech syntax. – Karshi. 1978. – p. 35.

10. Kubryakova E. S. In search of the essence of language: Cognitive research. – Moscow: Znak, 2012. – p. 208.

11. Makarov M. L. Fundamentals of the theory of discourse. – Moscow: Gnosis, 2003. – p. 280.

12. Khursanov, N. I. (2021). Creating a Corpus of Texts. *Journal of Education and Innovative Research*, (4), 1. – Tashkent. – pp. 247-253.

13. Niyozova G., &Raupova L. (2021) The Pragmatics Of Intercultural Communication In English Teaching In University // The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations. Volume 3, Issue 02, Pages 210-215.

14. Davletnazarova, L. B. (2021). Principles of Language Testing and Assessment with its Appliance in Evaluation of Exam Tasks. In Modern Education: Current Issues, Achievements and Innovations (pp. 26-28).

15. Raupova, L. R., & Kholmurodova, M. I. (2020). Dialogical discourse as an environment in which a poly-predictive unit is implemented. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 03 (83), 451-457.   Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-03-83-85   Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.03.83.85 Scopus ASCC: 1203.

16. Khursanov, N. I. (2022). Sociopragmatic Features of Verbal Components in Dramatic Works. ACTA NUUz. Year: 2022, Volume: 1, № 01 (2022). First page: (298). Last page: (300).

17. Davletnazarova, L. B. (2021). The Notion of Critical Period Hypothesis and its Role in Learning Foreign Languages. International Journal art of the Word, 4(2).