SPEECH ACT OF DISAPPROVAL IN PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE

Madumarova Mukhayyo Djuraevna[1]

[1]A Teacher of "The Uzbek Language and Literature" Department, "Management in Production" Faculty, Ferghana Polytechnic Institute, Uzbekistan, Ferghana

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to analysis of speech acts of disapproval in the pedagogical discourse. The author of the article considers that in the pedagogical discourse, disapproval is the expression of a negative evaluation by a superior (i.e. teacher) in order to change the behaviour, performance, appearance, etc. of persons below (i.e. students). A distinctive feature of the pedagogical discourse is the desire for partnership, cooperation and demonstration of respect for students' personality, which explains the priority in choosing certain ways of disapproval.

KEY WORDS: *pedagogical discourse; reproach; remark; reprimand; condemnation; warning; threat; criticism; negative evaluation; speech act; disapproval.*

DISCUSSION

Most cultures have the notion that being polite in communication is an important aspect of creating good communication in order to show respect for others. However, when establishing communication and relationships with others, a mistake sometimes happens. The speaker may make a remark to others that he or she does not like or approve of his or her actions. Whenever the speaker makes a remark, he or she is not only making a statement, but also performing an action. In this respect, the utterance carries a high risk of interrupting the conversation.

The present study considers speech acts of disapproval as an expression of negative evaluation. According to L.R. Bezuglaya, speech acts of disapproval express a negative evaluation, which the speaker gives to the actions of another person, or what is happening around [3]. The general meaning of disapproval is subdivided into reproach, censure, condemn, accuse, etc. [8].

The pragmatic variety of functioning of speech acts of disapproval depends on the type of discourse - parameters of communicative situation. Thus, pedagogical discourse refers to the institutional discourse, which is carried out in certain communicative conditions, dictated by the format of professional pedagogical activity - the lesson. The purpose of expressing speech acts of disapproval in pedagogical discourse is not to provoke negative emotions, like in conversational discourse, but to change behavior, so the speech should be constructed so as not to offend the opponent (the student in particular) and contribute to the correction of noticed shortcomings.

The concept of pedagogical discourse emerged in the 1970s and was described as a situational and socially conditioned speech activity. Due to the fact that pedagogical discourse processes take place in the educational environment of educational classes and the main goal of communicators has didactic orientation, such discourse is also called "didactic".

The problems of pedagogical/teaching-pedagogical discourse were studied by linguists V. Karasik, A. Gabidullina, T. Yezhova, M. Oleshkov, Y. Shcherbinina, etc. [5,6,7,8]. According to T. Yezhova's concept "pedagogical discourse is a dynamic system of value and meaningful communication of subjects of educational process which objectively exists and functions in educational environment. [5]. The components of this system are discourse participants, pedagogical goals, values and a semantic component which ensures that the subjects of the learning process gain experience in designing and evaluating pedagogical and social

phenomena". A.Gabidullina, using the term "educational-pedagogical discourse", defines this concept as a holistic social and communicative event in the sphere of organized learning activity, the essence of which is the interaction between a teacher and a student and which occurs within a specific educational and pedagogical situation with the help of texts and other sign complexes [6]. V.Karasik believes that pedagogical discourse is more structured due to the high level of regulation, status of participants, and ritualization. V.Karasik points to such a peculiarity of it as the presence of the discourse author (teacher) who is aware of the need to "generate" a text, is able to implement it in the form of his own didactic genre text, exercising planned influence on the addressee in a particular communication situation [8].

The general strategy of pedagogical discourse is an imperative strategy aimed at guiding all student activity in the classroom It is implemented through specific tactics, the most important of which are the tactics of concentration, stimulation of physical and mental activity, establishing and maintaining verbal contact, and controlling student activity.

The imperative strategy at the initial stage of the lesson is implemented through the tactics of establishing verbal contact and enhancing mental activity. At the other stages (i.e. the explanatory or summarizing time) the task of the teacher is to stimulate pupils and students to be physically and mentally active, to make them work:

Who will go to the blackboard? indirect stimulus to action expressed by a questioning statement *Well/ go/ Zumrad, please// Let's remember the orthogram of vowels after the comma*// - a demand-ask addressed to a specific pupil and a call for joint action, addressed to the whole class.

The tactics of maintaining language contact within the framework of the communicative-regulative strategy are most often used in the course of the entire lesson through different kinds of remarks-evaluations by the teacher's *Behaviour in the lesson ugly// Guys// only Umid answers// Are yo // You're shouting //* Often these are negative assessments of pupils' work in class *Guys/It's already too much/they're all idlers// Well/ look/ they're sitting alone/ doing a hundred things at once/ we don't write anything/ we don't do anything/ everybody gets a bad mark//* These emotionally charged reprimands contain a strongly negative assessment of pupils' actions and even a threat.

The teacher's speech is composed of stereotypical teacher statements. The most frequent are prompts forms of prompting depend largely on the age of students, on the types and stages of lessons, on the personality of the teacher (authoritarian, democratic), on the psychological type

of class, on the type of speech culture of the teacher. So, for example, in upper grades prompting at the beginning of the lesson may be expressed by imperative form of the imperative inclination, But this is softened by etiquette such as: *Please open your exercise book and write down the topic//* Often collective action forms are used which soften the degree of inequality and authoritarianism of the teacher. *We write down// We stress the spelling// We solve equations// We start putting things in square//* Also, the teacher uses indirect inducements by asking pupils *When do we put a semicolon?//* There are always lots of these questions in the lesson and the teacher uses them to stimulate the pupils into a mental procedure. The teacher also uses implicit forms of prompting *How do we check?/ Do we check the prefix "pre" in any way?/ No// We need to remember what it means // So/ What does it mean?//*

The teacher constantly gives feedback to pupils in class using the evaluative genre of 'pedagogical feedback'. These can be stereotypical pedagogical remarks or extended reprimands Such remarks are directed at both physical actions and pupils' intellect *Anton, what happened to you? // Sit and sleep// Wake up,work//* - the teacher rebukes the pupil for being passive and at the same time encourages him/her to be active *Quietly, Aziz/ You are not clever/ Look carefully at the textbook//* - a rebuke to the pupil for being careless.

The speech acts of rebuke can be grammatically realized through modal verbs.

The lexico-syntactic model of rebuke expression is as follows:
Subject + could/might/should + Perfect Infinitive [10; 11].

In example 1, the teacher rebukes the pupil for not having read the school uniform rules.
1) Teacher: *We have a strict black-shoe policy here, Munira. Your parents should have read it in the introductory rule book, page 142.*

The modal verb "should" in combination with the infinitive in the perfect form expresses a rebuke about something that should have been done (reading the school rules) but has not been done.

The prevalence of the speech acts of reproach in comparison with other speech acts with the disapproval semantics is due to the fact that the speech acts of reproach is characterized by the situation of positive and constructive cooperation in problem solving and by the equivalence of the positions of speaker and listener [12], which is characteristic for the pedagogical discourse, where the teacher strives for informal communication.

In example 2, during the exam, the pupil watches what the other pupil is doing.
2) Teacher: *Eyes forward, Anna.*

The imperative construction is expressed without a verb, using the preposition forward. The

teacher uses a short sentence to correct a behaviour in which she disapproves of a pupil's peeping during a test.

In contrast to a correctional remark, a reprimand most often involves an extended expression of disapproval.

In example 3 the teacher disapproves of an article that the student has written for the school newspaper.

3) Teacher: *I can't run this story, Salim. It's against every rule here, and your dad is on the board.*

The inconsistency of the article with the school rules is expressed by the phrase it "*is against every rule here*", where the negation is expressed by the preposition against, which has a negative semantics - "disagreeing with a plan or activity" [17]. The combination of the preposition against and the intensifier every strengthens the categorical nature of the utterance. A phrase with the modal verb *can't* indicates the impossibility of publishing an article [18].

In example 4, the principal summoned a student to express his dissatisfaction with the film he had made about the students.

4) Teacher: *Peddling this kind of trash makes you reprehensible. Do you know what "reprehensible" means?*

Student: *Yes, sir.*

In this example there are two evaluation words with negative semantics: *trash* and *reprehensible*. The director calls the film "trash" - "something that is of low quality". For condemnations it is important that actions are bad and that the negative evaluation is given by the author based on his/her own subjective perceptions of bad and good [5]. The presence of the speaker's subjective assessment distinguishes censure from condemnation. In addition, it is the actions that are censured, not the person himself or herself. In this example, the principal refers to the pupil making his/her *reprehensible*, referring the negative quality to the pupil's personality, where *reprehensible* means "very bad".

Thus, in the pedagogical discourse, disapproval is the expression of a negative evaluation by a superior (i.e. teacher) in order to change the behaviour, performance, appearance, etc. of persons below (i.e. students). A distinctive feature of the pedagogical discourse is the desire for partnership, cooperation and demonstration of respect for students' personality, which explains the priority in choosing certain ways of disapproval. Thus, the results of the study showed that the pragmatics of acts of speech of disapproval is multifunctional, with the pragmatic meanings of reproach and remark-correction characterizing the mentality and culture of teachers.

REFERENCES

1. *Bachurka M.S. (2017) Pragmatic specificity of evaluative speech acts, strategies and tactics in Russian and English languages pedagogical discourses. Yekaterinburg. P.24.*
2. *Bachurka M.S. (2017) Reprehension: pragmalinguistic analysis // Philological Sciences. Issues of theory and practice. Tambov: Gramota. №5 (71). P.p. 59–61.*
3. *Bezuglaya L.R. (2007) Verbalization of implicit meanings in German-language dialogic discourse. Kharkov. P.332.*
4. *Chernyavskaya V. (2000) Discourse as an object of linguistic research // Text and discourse. The problems of economic discourse: collection of scientific papers. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg State University of Economics and Finance. P.p. 11-22.*
5. *Yezhova T.V. (2009) Designing pedagogical discourse in higher professional teacher's future education. Orenburg. P.29.*
6. *Gabidullina A.R. (2009) Educational and pedagogical discourse. Gorlovka: Publishing house of GSPIJ. P.292.*
7. *Karasik V.I. Characteristics of pedagogical discourse // Linguistic personality: aspects of linguistics and linguodidactics. - Volgograd. P.67*
8. *Karasik V. I. (2000) On the Types of Discourse // Linguistic Personality: Institutional and Personal Discourse. Volgograd. P.p. 5-20.*
9. *Karasik V.I. (2000) Structure of institutional discourse // Problems of speech communication. - Saratov: Publishing house of Saratov University. P.p. 25-33.*
10. *Kvashina V.V. (2013) Estimation as a linguistic category in modern linguistics // Philological Sciences. Historical and Socio-Educational Thought. №5 (21). P.p. 250–255.*
11. *Kholmatova, D.A., Rakhmatova O.K., Kosimova D.R. Ethnographic terminology and its linguistic analysis (based on Russian and Uzbek languages) // Herald of science and education. 2019. No. 19-3 (73). URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/etnograficheskay a-terminologiya-i-ee-lingvisticheskiy-analiz-na-materialah-russkogo-i-uzbekskogo-yazykov*
12. *Mironova M.V. (2012) Constructions of disapproval and censure in monological unities // Bulletin of Yaroslavl State University. Humanities Series.. №4/1 (22/1). P.p. 136–139.*
13. *Parpiyeva M.M., Madumarova M.D., Mavlonov U. (2018) Development of motivation of students to study language // Achievements of science and education. №8 (30). URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/razvitie-motivatsii-u-studentov-k-izucheniyu-yazyka*
14. *Vodak R. (2006) Medical discourse: doctor-patient communication // Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Kate Brown ed. 2nd ed. - Oxford: Elsevier. P.p. 681-687.*