

GREAT BRITAIN

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC
ONLINE CONFERENCE

INTERDISCIPLINE INNOVATION
AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
CONFERENCE

 2023 YEAR

GREAT BRITAIN, LONDON



ISOC
INTERNATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC
ONLINE
CONFERENCES



**INTERDISCIPLINE INNOVATION AND
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CONFERENCE**
International scientific-online conference

Part 15

December 15th

COLLECTIONS OF SCIENTIFIC WORKS

LONDON 2023



INTERDISCIPLINE INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CONFERENCE:
a collection of scientific works of the International scientific online
conference (15th December, 2023) – Great Britain, London: "CESS", 2023.
Part 15 – 502p.

Chief editor:

Candra Zonyfar - PhD Universitas Buana Perjuangan Karawang,
Indonesia Sunmoon University, South Korea.

Editorial board:

Martha Merrill - PhD Kent State University, USA

David Pearce - ScD Washington, D.C., USA

Emma Sabzalieva - PhD Toronto, Canada

Languages of publication: русский, english, қазақша, о'zbek, limba
română, кыргыз тили, Հայերեն....

The collection consists of scientific researches of scientists, graduate
students and students who took part in the International Scientific online
conference.

"INTERDISCIPLINE INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
CONFERENCE". Which took place in London on December 15th, 2023.

Conference proceedings are recommended for scientists and teachers
in higher education establishments. They can be used in education,
including the process of post - graduate teaching, preparation for obtain
bachelors' and masters' degrees. The review of all articles was
accomplished by experts, materials are according to authors copyright. The
authors are responsible for content, researches results and errors.

© "CESS", 2023
© Authors, 2023



Qo'shiyev Mirjalol Saidvali o'g'li <i>VOYAGA YETMAGANLARGA NISBATAN QO'LLANILADIGAN BOSHQA JINOIY-HUQUQIY TA'SIR CHORALARNI QO'LLASHNING NAZARIY VA AMALIY JIHATLARI</i>	356
Сайдахмедова Умида Мухаммадамин қизи <i>МЕЛОДИЧЕСКАЯ ФИГУРАЦИЯ</i>	360
Халилова Г.Р <i>ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ СФЕРЫ УСЛУГ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЦИФРОВОЙ ЭКОНОМИКИ</i>	362
Jo'raqulova Sabina Shermat qizi Muqaddas Sobirova Botirovna <i>BIONANOTEKNOLOGIYADAN FOYDALANIB,SUYAK TO'QIMASINI TIKLASH</i>	368
Hamidova Rushana <i>PSIXOLOGIYA FANINING FAN TARAQQIYOTIDA TUTGAN O`RNI</i>	372
Yuldosheva Iroda Murotaliyevna <i>PSIXOLOGIYA FANINING TARAQQIYOTI</i>	376
Xolto'rayeva Shahnoza <i>BOSHLANG'ICH SINIF O'QITUVCHILARIDA MATEMATIKA O'QITISH METODIKASI FANININI O'QITISHNING UMUMIY XUSUSIYATLARI</i>	381
Hamidova Rushana <i>PSIXOLOGIYA FANINING FAN TARAQQIYOTIDA TUTGAN O`RNI</i>	386
Ro'ziboyeva Nozanin Ravshanova O'g'ilshod <i>DIQQATNING PSIXIK JARAYONLARGA AHAMIYATI</i>	390
Abdujabborova Ruxshona Shuhrat qizi <i>PSIXOLOGIYA FANINING PREDMETI, RIVOJLANISH TARIXI VA VAZIFALARI</i>	394
Imomov Asliddin Abdurazaqovich Xomidov Asror Gapparovich <i>YOSH FUTBOLCHILARNING TEXNIK-TAKTIK HARAKAT KO'NIKALARINI SHAKILLANTIRISH</i>	399
Sultanova Ozoda Rajabovna <i>TALABA YOSHLARNI O'QITISHDA ZAMONAVIY TEXNOLOGIYALARNI QO'LLASH</i>	402
Sultanova Ozoda Rajabovna <i>OLIY O'QUV YURLARIDA TA'LIM SAMARADORLIGINI OSHIRISHDA AXBOROT TEXNOLOGIYALARINING O`RNI</i>	404
Saidova Mukhayyo Umedilloevna Nadir Khanovna Nozima Alisherovna <i>REFUSAL STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH, UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LINGUOCULTURES</i>	407
Niyatova Maftuna Abdurasulova Diyora Jalilovna Niyatqulova Maftuna <i>SPEECH CULTURE OR COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE:CONTENT ASPECT</i>	411



REFUSAL STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH, UZBEK AND RUSSIAN
LINGUOCULTURES

Saidova Mukhayyo Umedilloevna

Associate professor of Bukhara State University, PhD

Nadirkhanovna Nozima Alisherovna

Master degree student, Bukhara State University

Annotation: *Communication between people is organized and formalized in a certain way. This process is influenced by a number of factors: the participants themselves, their background knowledge, physical and psychological state, goals, objects and situations of communication, social norms and cultural traditions and values, and much more. Depending on the communication environment and social role, one can speak (write) about the same thing in different ways, so everyone has their own unique set of communicative practices that are used in specific situations and under specific conditions.*

Key words: *human communication, rejections and refusals, culture, imposition, politeness and impoliteness,*

Scholars around the world have devoted their research on different areas of pragmatics with the main goal of better understanding how languages are used. We meet different forms of social behavior in different cultures around the globe that individuals categorize as mutually shared appreciation and consideration for others. Researchers in the field of Intercultural Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication have collected considerable data that illustrate how communicative behavior varies across cultures. They suggest that across societies and communities, people speak differently, and these differences in ways of speaking are profound and systematic, they reflect different cultural values, or at least different hierarchies of values. As a result, people often use different language tools and strategies, guided by their values, when performing the same speech act in a similar situation. The problem of intercultural communication is that one does not only have to understand the sentence in its semantic meaning but also have communicative competence in order to comprehend what the speaker meant; in other words to have pragmatic competence to understand and perform different speech acts in intercultural contexts. 'Speaking a language means more than uttering a number of grammatically decent sentences', one must be aware of the pragmatic meaning of the interlocutors' utterances. People speak different languages and therefore use them in a different way. Refusal is a speech act that exists in all languages and is used in everyday life. It occurs as a negative response to other acts such as requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions. Searle and Vander ken (1985) define the speech act of refusal as follows: 'The negative counterparts to acceptances and consents are rejections and refusals. Just as one can accept offers, applications, and invitations, so each of these can be refused or rejected'. The speech act of refusing is a non-preferred response and consequently it is a face-threatening act both to the Speaker and to the Hearer. In order not to risk threatening the face, speakers use



various strategies to avoid offending the interlocutor but do it in a different way and with varying degrees of effort. As with other speech acts, refusal is culture-specific due to differences in such categories as face, threat, imposition, politeness and impoliteness. Comparing American English, Hebrew and Japanese Anna Wierzbicka (2003) points out significant differences on how refusal is performed in these languages. She notes that it is not common in English to express refusal by saying 'No' as one does in Hebrew, or to say 'No' in response to a request for information (e.g., in shops, hotels, and restaurants): 'Do you have such and such?'. In English, when someone indicates that they want something from us we are free to say 'No' but not to say just 'No' it is necessary to say something more. In Japanese culture, the norm seems to be to avoid saying 'No' altogether (in particular, to refuse an offer or a request, to express disagreement and so on). One would prefer to remain silent than utter such words as 'no' or 'I disagree'. The avoidance of such open and bald negative expressions is rooted in the fear that it might disrupt the harmony and order of the group. Summing up these differences she suggests cultural scripts for refusal in each culture:

Anglo-American culture

I say: No. I don't want you to feel something bad because of this.

I will say something more about it because of this.

Japanese culture

I can't say: No.

I will say something else because of this.

The conducted analysis has revealed both some similarities and differences in the way the British and Russians make a refusal. It has shown that while refusing, both Russian and English speakers may say No, give an apology, express regret and explain the reason for the refusal. Nevertheless it has revealed a lot of differences.

1. The analyses show that when refusing Russian speakers, on the whole, are much more laconic and direct in comparison to English speakers. They can say a straight 'No' followed by gratitude or explanation and don't often mitigate their refusal as the British do. The most typical Russian refusal consists of 2—3 moves while English speakers can go through 3—4 and sometimes even 5—6 moves.

(1) Situation 1 (refusal to the offer to carry a heavy bag):

Uzbek: Yo'q rahmat. O'g'ir emas,rahmat.

Russian: Нет, спасибо (No, thank you).

English: Thank you, but it's ok, don't worry. I don't have far to go.

(2) Situation 2 (refusal to the offer to water flowers):

Uzbek: Yo'q rahmat. Shart emas

Russian: Не надо. Спасибо / Нет необходимости. Спасибо. (No need, thank you).

English: That's a kind offer, thank you, but I don't think they'll need watering. / Thank you, but it's all right. I'm not going to be away long.

Another interesting characteristic of English refusal concerns the use of positive



politeness strategies. The data has shown that despite being indirect which is one of the main negative politeness strategies the British informants demonstrate, the tendency to use positive politeness strategies quite regularly:

- give communicative gifts to the hearer expressing positive emotion, evaluation and attitude: This is a kind offer... / That's very nice of you... / That's kind of you... (refusing an offer); I'd love to... / That would be great... (refusing an invitation);
- attend to the hearer and his interests: Is there someone else you can ask? / I'll ask the person next to me to help you (refusing a request); I hope you have a lovely evening though / I hope you have a nice time (refusing an invitation);
- say thank you and sorry regularly;
- use in-group identity markers (mate, buddy);
- are voluble.

We have analyzed communicative strategies of the English and Russian native speakers used to perform speech acts of refusal to offers, requests and invitations in different social contexts. The study has shown that in both languages refusal is a complex of acts (moves) which usually involves apology, regret and explanation. It involves indirect strategies as well as mitigating devices to avoid threatening the initiator's positive face. Nevertheless, the findings reveal significant differences concerning both quantitative and qualitative characteristics.

Based upon current research, it is apparent that the knowledge of communicative differences in refusal as well as in other speech acts is necessary for the acquisition and development of pragmatic competence of L2 English learners and successful intercultural communication.

Also, it should be noted that what we have presented here are only selected and preliminary results. More extensive testing and analysis is required for more detailed and conclusive results.

REFERENCES:

1. Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language*. New York, NY: Newbury House, 55—73.
2. Brown, P. and Levinson S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
4. Eslami, Z.R. (2010). Refusals: How to develop appropriate refusal strategies. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó-Juan (Eds.) *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 217—236). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
5. Houck, N. & Gass, S.M. (1996). Non-native refusal: A methodological perspective. In: Gass, S.M. & Neu, J. (eds.) *Speech acts across cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 45—64.



6. Larina, T. (2008). Directness, Imposition and Politeness in English and Russian. Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes: issue 33, August 2008. pp. 33—38. http://www.cambridgeesol.org/rs_notes/rs_nts33.pdf.
7. Yunusova, A. (2023). Thinking, reading and writing critically. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 29(29). https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/8979.
8. Axmetjanovna, Y. A. (2023). Analysis of the Language and Speech Portrait of a Literary Character. Miasto Przyszłości, 32, 277–279. Retrieved from <https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/1147>.
9. Yunusova, A. (2023). СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ТЕОРИИ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ЛИЧНОСТИ И СУЩНОСТИ ДИСКУРСА. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 40(40). https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/10591.
10. Yunusova, A. (2023). FUNCTIONAL AND PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF INVERSION. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 30(30). https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/9178.



SPEECH CULTURE OR COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE:CONTENT
ASPECT

Niyatova Maftuna

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, The faculty of Psychology The teacher at the department of Foreign language and literature

Abdurasulova Diyora Jalilovna

Niyatqulova Maftuna

the 4th year students of Philology

Abstract: *The article introduces the analysis of the notion “speech culture” in subjective, objective and gnoceological meaning. The culture of speech is a basis for development of general human culture, whereas the communicative competence is formed in the process of a professional training of a specialist and is a systematic development of knowledge, skills, abilities and personal qualities, which enable to successfully solve functional tasks in professional activity.*

Keywords: *culture of speech; competence; competence-based approach; communicative competence;*

“Russian language and culture of speech”. “Speech culture” as a scientific discipline started to form in Russian Philology from the 20s of the XX century.

Before that time the main cycle of humanitarian and linguistic knowledge of educational profile in Russia was connected with rhetoric.

We can suppose that introduction of another nomination was due to the change of social status of all sectors of society. In the post revolutionary period a new cultural-ideological civilization has been created. It had a new content of philological disciplines and currents in Russian speech investigation: foundation of alive word Institution, analysis of speech practice of A.V. Mirtov, V. Gofman, B. Kazantsev, V.V. Vinogradov, scientific discipline

“Speech culture”. Initially the concept “speech culture” had persinafactive undertone and anthropological orientation, it was considered to be the basis for the development of human general culture. The idea of the standard has become a central concept of the new linguistic discipline together with corresponding requirements to the usage of linguistic means.

During each historical epoch standard is a complicated phenomenon, so it exists in rather complicated conditions. V.I. Chernishov wrote about it:

“There is much unclear in the language of each epoch for the contemporaries: composing but not composed, dying but not extinct, appearing but not stabilized” [1: 453].

Contemporary investigators tell the same: “Linguistic standard in its dynamic aspect is a socially-historically conditioned result of speech activity” [2: 43]. Literary standard is characterized by stability, degree of usage of the linguistic phenomenon and correspondence to the authoritative sources of information (more often they represent works written by famous writers, oral speeches made by famous public speakers and