

9-20-2019

EXPRESSING SPEECH ACT OF DISAGREEMENT AT DIFFERENT LANGUAGE LEVELS

Shokhista Nusratullaeva Teacher of English Faculty II
UzSWLU

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#), [Linguistics Commons](#), [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nusratullaeva, Shokhista Teacher of English Faculty II (2019) "EXPRESSING SPEECH ACT OF DISAGREEMENT AT DIFFERENT LANGUAGE LEVELS," *Philology Matters*: Vol. 2019 : Iss. 3 , Article 48.
DOI: 10.36078/987654362
Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm/vol2019/iss3/48>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Philology Matters* by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.



Shokhista Nusratullaeva

Teacher of English Faculty II, UzSWLU

EXPRESSING SPEECH ACT OF DISAGREEMENT AT DIFFERENT LANGUAGE LEVELS

АННОТАЦИЯ

The problem of revealing and systematizing the features of expressing disagreement repeatedly is still at the center of linguistic research. The current article investigates the speech act of disagreement in the framework of Speech Act Theory and its realization with the help of linguistic means (lexical, grammatical, phraseological and stylistic). Speech act of disagreement is act which combines all types of negative reaction: refutation, objection, judgment, disapproval, and dissatisfaction. It is an informative, imperative or evaluative statement and has a certain realization through various means of expression. Using these means in a particular communication depends on the intentions of the speaker, on the nature of the replica stimulus, and on the peculiarities of speech situations.

Key words: the theory of speech act, disagreement, argument, context, dialogue, interlocutor, lexical means, grammatical means.

Шоҳиста Нусратуллаева

Инглиз тили 2-факультети ўқитувчиси, ЎзДЖТУ

ТУРЛИ ТИЛ САТҲЛАРИДА НОРОЗИЛИК НУТҚИЙ АКТИНИ ИФОДАЛАШ

ABSTRACT

Бугунги кунда норозиликнинг нутқий актда ифодаланиш хусусиятларини аниқлаш ва тизимлаштириш лингвистик тадқиқотлар марказида мавжуд бўлган асосий муаммолардан биридир. Норозилик нутқий акти ўзида рад этиш, эътироз, муҳокама, таққловчи, маъқулламаслик каби барча салбий реакцияларни мужассамлаштиради. Шу билан бирга норозилик нутқий акти мураккаб ва кўп аспекти ҳодиса бўлиб, семантик, грамматик ва прагматик аспектига ҳисобга олган ҳолда тадқиқ қилиниши зарур. Иккинчи томондан, тадқиқ қилинаётган норозилик нутқий акти воқеа-ҳодисага ёки суҳбатдошнинг хатти-ҳаракати ёки фикрига салбий муносабатни билдиради ва хабар, баҳолаш ёки императив фикр билдиришни ўзида ифодалайди ҳамда нутқда ифода воситалари ёрдамида мужассамланади. Улардан аниқ бир вазиятда фойдаланиш қатор сабаблар – сўзловчининг нияти, рағбатлантирувчи лўқма, нутқий вазият хусусиятига боғлиқдир. Ушбу мақолада норозилик нутқий акти нутқий акт назарияси доирасида тадқиқ қилинади ва унинг лингвистик воситалар (лексик, грамматик, фразеологик ва услубий воситалар) орқали ифодаланиши таҳлил этилади.

Калит сўзлар: нутқий акт назарияси, норозилик, аргумент, контекст, суҳбатдош, лексик воситалар, грамматик воситалар.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomena of agreement and disagreement have been captivating researchers in linguistics for several decades. The growing popularity of disagreement as a research subject among linguists can be attributed to the following factors: disagreement is one of the most commonly occurring speech events in everyday interactions; it has a complex nature; and it raises the widely-researched issues of im/politeness and in/appropriateness.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the process of investigation the notion of disagreement is used differently by various researchers such as *opposition* (Kakavá 2002), *argument* (Emihovich 1986; Maynard 1985; Muntigl & Turnbull 1998; Schiffrin 1984, 1985), *debate* (Johnson & Johnson 1985), *conflict* (Honda 2002), *dispute* (Corsaro & Rizzo 1990; Goodwin et al. 2002; Kotthoff 1993; Sprott 1992), *confrontation* (Brown 1990; Hutchby 1992), *oppositional talk* (Bardovi-Harlig & Salsbury 2004; Corsaro & Maynard 1996), and *conflict talk* (Grimshaw 1990; Honda 2002; Leung 2005).

There has been a great deal of variation in the literature in the way in which the term has been defined. For instance, Edstrom states (2004: 1505) that disagreement is the “communication of an opinion or belief contrary to the view expressed by the previous speaker”. Likewise, Sifianou (2012: 1554) considers the act of disagreement an “expression of a view”; however, it is not opposite to, but rather simply different from “that expressed by another speaker”. According to Rees-Miller (2000: 1088), who provides more in depth and more scientific explanation of what is meant by the term disagreement by stating that “speaker disagrees when s/he considers untrue some Proposition stated or presumed to be supposed by an Addressee and reacts with an utterance the propositional content or implicature of which is *Not Proposition*”. On the basis of this definition it can be pointed out that disagreement can be achieved indirectly, by implying opposition.

From the perspective of Speech Act Theory, Sornig defines speech act of disagreement as a reaction act to an act that precedes it; in other words, it requires a prior utterance from an interlocutor (Sornig 1977). Generally, taking into account all the views and studies conducted by researchers, the following definition of disagreement is proposed: “*Disagreement is a speech act expressing the speaker’s opinion or belief, whose illocutionary force is partly or fully inconsistent with that of the previous speaker’s utterance. In other words, agreement is generally perceived as the desirable, preferred option (Pomerantz 1984) while disagreement is regarded as its negative, undesirable counterpart*”.

In the framework of a conversation analysis, Pomerantz (1984) considers disagreement mostly as dispreferred, and she further differentiates strong from weak disagreement on sequential grounds. Hence, strong disagreements consist only of disagreement components (e.g., “I don’t think so”) whilst weak disagreements include other components like hesitation markers and fillers, token agreement components like “yes, but” and so on. Although encompassed within a different field, Pomerantz’ classification is similar to the one put forward by Kakava (1993), who also distinguishes between

three linguistic realizations of disagreement: strong forms, strong yet mitigated, and mitigated forms of disagreement. The difference between the second and third types lies in the explicitness of disagreement in the second type, as opposed to the third type, in which disagreement may be accompanied by digression or reformulations.

DATA ANALYSIS

Showing disagreement to others' opinions is an important speech act; thus it can be expressed both by verbal and nonverbal language. Its linguistic realization can be observed at all language levels: lexical, grammatical (morphological and syntactical), and phraseological levels.

Disagreement as a type of speech act in the dialogic speech can be expressed differently at all language levels. The answer-reaction can be verbal and non verbal, implicit and explicit depending on pragmatic meaning of disagreement and other sociolinguistic, pragmatic and cultural factors.

According to M.M. Filippova lexical means expressing disagreement include words containing negation itself: verbs (*fail, refuse, deny, doubt, detest*), nouns (*failure, lack*), negative adverbs (*hardly, scarcely*).

– *I'm afraid we mustn't base our policy on luxuries like sentiment.*

– *I **detest** this state of things.*

– *We didn't seek a quarrel.*

– *I know that sir, but surely we've gone far enough.*

– *No* (Galsworthy, 1932a, Act 1, p. 82).

The usage of a verb with negative connotation towards the prevalent situation “to detest” intensifies the categoricalness of the statement.

Number of lexical word combinations and models expressing disagreement in English is sufficiently widespread, for example, *you must be joking, I see the things rather differently myself, that's not necessarily so, it is not as simple as it seems, there is more to it than that, this in complete contradiction to, I am of different opinion, I cannot share this view, what I object to is, I'd say the exact opposite* and so on.

– (1)*Harry, I want Pat to live with us, with me and Richard. I love him and he loves me and Pat greatly.*

– *Rubbish! How can he love my child if he even doesn't know him, his habits, his likes and dislikes*

– (2)*Mum, I think that my boyfriend Jimmy is a good guy. He is very active and clever and ... we decided to marry.*

– *Nonsense! You are too young to marry.*

In these examples disagreement is expressed with lexical units – evaluative lexis “Rubbish” and “Nonsense”.

The following examples reveal the usage of emotionally colored words such as *Are you a fool? Are you crazy? Are you mad? Are you joking?* The choice of these lexical units intensifies the negative attitude of the interlocutor. In the context “You are crazy” expresses disagreement of the listener with the interlocutor; it loses its core meaning

– (1)*Nigel, I decided to return Pat to Gina. It will be better for him.*

– *You must be joking! You are crazy. You shouldn't do it because we are going to*

win the process and the judge is on our side.

– (2) *I'd like Pat to live with Gina. I think that it will be better for him.*

– *Are you a fool? Harry, you are crazy. You are going to just hand him over to your ex-wife when we could beat her. (Parsons T. Man and boy / T. Parsons. – London, Harper Collins Publishers. - 2002. – 344 c.)*

– (3) *Harry, I'm sorry, I'm so sorry!*

– *Don't be stupid, it wasn't your fault! If anything, it was mine . . .*

(Rowling 2007: 223)

Disagreement can be expressed at grammatical level of language mostly with negation. Grammatical means of expressing agreement can be divided into morphological and syntactical. Grammatical means expressing disagreement is united sentence models and structures, with the help of which a speaker in the process of communication expresses his disagreement towards a certain situation. *I do not; do not agree with; cannot; is not* are widespread grammatical forms expressing disagreement.

Usage of following grammatical structures to express a speech act of *disagreement* can be observed in the following examples:

– (1) *Jane, I'd like to visit our Granny today?*

– *Oh, I do not think that Monday is a suitable day for a visit. I don't see any sense in it. (20, c. 13)*

(2) *I think that Mr. Dick will be kicked from this job. He is very careless and inexperienced.*

I do not agree with you. He knows his job and works hard to gain some good results.

(3) *I do not believe that Jack will try to help us. He is so busy with chasing that stupid girl.*

I can't share your view because Jack is a real friend and moreover he is in love with Julia.

– (4) *Patrick is a great guy. He is very sensitive and kind.*

– *I don't agree with you. He is very selfish and cunning. I can't understand why you don't notice it.*

– (5) *You are the best mother in the world*

No, I am not. You want me to be. And I want to be, I really do. But just wanting something doesn't make it true.

– (6) *I think that Jill is an up-to-date girl. That is why she has a lot of boy-friends.*

I don't think so. Her dresses are modest and her appearance isn't attractive.

In all examples disagreement is expressed with the help of the negative particle “not”. In English the negative particle “not” is the main unit used to express disagreement.

Morphological means of expressing disagreement is one of the vivid ways of disagreeing. It includes affixation (prefixation and suffixation): un-, dis-, de-, -in, -um, -im, -il, -ir; negative participle, negative pronouns and negative conjunction.

– (1) *Just sign this statement and you will be released*

– *Never! I'll do nothing of the kind!*

- (2) *Her train gets in at 3 a.m. Would you like to meet her at the station?*
- *No fear!*
- (3) *You don't know the value of money, he said, avoiding her eye.*
- *No! And I hope I never shall!" and, biting her lip with inexpressible mortification, poor June was silent.*

In the given cases the interlocutors' disagreement is expressed with negative morphological units "nothing" "never" and "no".

At syntactic level disagreement is expressed mostly implicitly with certain sentence structure and different types of sentences as declarative, interrogative (especially rhetorical), imperative, and exclamatory. Implicit disagreement is mainly revealed through rhetorical questions or counter question, which is considered to be an indirect speech act.

- (1) *You'll be late for school if you don't go.*
- *I'm in plenty of time [Cronin, 1979: 68].*
- (2) *But you must have heard it.*
- *I heard nothing at all [Christie, 1976: 264].*
- (3) *If you're not tired of hearing it, welcome!*
- *Matter of fact, I'm rather enjoying it [Hailey, 2006: 52].*

The rhetorical question is asked not in order to elicit an answer but in order to state or deny something. A positive rhetorical yes-no question is like a strong negative assertion:

- (1) *Could you meet him at the station?*
- What do you take me for? A taxi driver?*

(2) *Jane is a great girl. She is very attractive and charming. And moreover she is very clever.*

- *Do you really think so? (Rowling 2010)*

The interlocutor may demonstrate his/her opposite stances to the indicated information by asking questions with no intention of getting answers as in:

- Miss X is getting too fat.*
- How fat is too fat?*

The usage of rhetorical and counter questions is the method of emotionally and psychologically influencing the interlocutor. It is a reply-reaction of the speaker to the previous given question.

Some positive imperative sentences are often employed to convey negative meaning:

- (1) *Please be more careful. (You are not very careful.)*
- (2) *Leave the tap alone. (Don't touch the tap.)*
- (3) *Keep off the grass. (Don't step on the grass)*

Exclamatory noun phrases modified by a restrictive relative clause (in most instances with zero relative) generally express disapproval:

- (1) *The clothes she wears! (I really don't like the clothes she wears.)*

(2) *You and your statistics! (I deplore the way you so frequently resort to statistics; I am not satisfied with...)*

(3) *That you could ever want to marry such a man!*

(4) *You're going to be in trouble. To say something like that!*

As the peculiarity of English speech etiquette is politeness and tactfulness, disagreement is mostly expressed indirectly. One of the means of expressing disagreement indirectly is phraselogical units. Range of such idioms is varied, allowing the participants of conversation use idioms to make the speech more expressive.

– *The only choice is to introduce my plan for longer working hours. It will increase our productivity levels, which will be good for all of us.*

– *I **beg to differ**. I think the staff will get very tired and that will reduce productivity.*

– *There's a **world of difference** between expecting people to work twelve hours ...*

– *Ten hours and fifteen minutes actually. We **don't see eye to eye** on this issue.*

– *Now you are just **splitting hairs**.*

– *Well, you are **at odds** with your staff*

– *Well I'm sorry this **note of discord** has crept into our discussion.*

Speech act of disagreement can be revealed at stylistic level as well, i.e. by means of stylistic devices such as metaphors, euphemisms and proverbs.

The use of proverbs can be considered one way of over-generalization. Speaker's overgeneralization makes Hearer decide if the general rule applies to them:

– (1) *That party both you and I went to was very boring.*

– *Boring people get bored.*

– (2) *He is not very intelligent*

– *The dog disparages the cat for being too hairy*

Implementation of a proverb expresses his/her disagreement, and what is more, the utterance sounds more offensive than a direct expression of disagreement as it contains certain insinuation of irony or criticism.

By using tautology Speaker encourages Hearer to seek for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance. Tautology may be understood as an act of disagreeing as in:

– *Boys are getting too naughty these days.*

– ***Boys are boys.***

– *Annie: Was the dessert any good?*

– *Mike: Annie, **cherry pie is cherry pie.***

An act of disagreeing can be performed through an understatement, overstatement, irony and sarcasm. Speaker inevitably says something less than or different from what he/she intends to convey. The disagreeing token thus seems to be soft and weak, as in an example by Pomerantz (1978):

– (1) *That is Pat. Isn't she a doll?*

– *Yeah isn't she pretty. (Meaning: not very beautiful)*

– (2) *She seems like a nice little lady*

– *Awfully nice little person.*

– (3) *Hey Cartner, so see you after school?*

– *Maybe in your dreams? (Nicholas Sparks, A walk to remember)*

In the last example disagreement is expressed by means of sarcasm. The interlocutor states the flat opposite of the truth; replying ironically by counter question, he shows his attitude towards the interlocutor and atmosphere of the conversation.

By using a word in such an ironic way that it could convey a meaning opposite to its literally meaning. Typically, there is an intention to mock:

- (1) *A fine daughter you raised.* (Your daughter is not fine at all)
- (2) *You are telling me.* (I don't need you to tell me.)
- (3) *Much I care!* (I don't care at all.)
- (4) *I am damned if it is true.* (It is not true certainly)

In the following example the speaker disagrees ironically in implicit way. Ironic meaning is expressed with the help of metonymy and metaphor, comparing voice with type of cabbage:

- *You have that sexy, smoky quality in your voice.*
- *Honey, my voice is pure grits and collard greens".* (Koontz, 1997)

Metaphors are vivid examples of stylistic devices, by means of which disagreement can be expressed. Metaphors can be marked with hedges like real, regular, sort of, as it was, etc.

- (1) *Can we arrive as early as possible?*
- *I'm sorry but **my train is not a rocket***
- (2) *I will tell you what to do, what to say, where to hide!*
- ***I'm not your wife.*** (Blige, 2007)

Negative metaphors illustrate the speech situation and carry figurative meaning, but not literal meaning. In both examples the interlocutors disagree with the utterance using metaphors. For example, in example (1) a speaker claims that can't arrive early since they are travelling not in a rocket. He/she wants to imply that speed of train is not as fast as rocket's one, therefore he disagrees with metaphorical utterance.

In conclusion, disagreement as communicative illocutionary and social act is theoretically examined within the framework of the speech act theories. "*Disagreement is a speech act expressing the speaker's opinion or belief, whose illocutionary force is partly or fully inconsistent with that of the previous speaker's utterance. In other words, agreement is generally perceived as the desirable, preferred option (Pomerantz 1984) while disagreement is regarded as its negative, undesirable counterpart*". As a linguistic phenomena speech act of agreement and disagreement can be expressed at all language levels as lexical – by means of lexical units, word combinations; grammatical – morphological and syntactical means; phraseological – phrasal verbs, idioms, and proverbs (mostly in spoken discourse); phonetic level – by means of rising and falling intonation; and stylistic level – the usage of stylistic devices (metaphors, irony, euphemisms, and litotes). The choice of exact linguistic means expressing agreement and disagreement in the process of conversation depends on the situation, intention and mood of the interlocutor.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. 1962 *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Christie A. *Selected stories*. – M., 1976.
3. Christie A. *Why didn't they ask Evans?* – M., 1990.
4. Cronin A. *The Green Years*. – M., 1979.
5. Galsworthy J. *End of the charter*. – M., 1960.
6. Kakava, C. (2002). Opposition in modern Greek discourse: Cultural and contextual constraint. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(10), 1537-1568.
7. Mitchell M. *Gone with the wind*. / M. Mitchell. – London, Penguin Books. – 2002. – 688
8. Parsons T. *Man and boy* / T. Parsons. – London, Harper Collins Publishers. - 2002. – p.344
9. Pomerantz, Anita, 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 57–103.
10. Rowling J. K. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. London, 2007.
11. Rowling J. K. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. London, 2010.
12. Searle, John R. 1965 “What is a Speech Act?”, in Max Black (ed.), *Philosophy in America*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965; London: Allen and Unwin, 1965.
13. Searle, John R. 1969 *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Searle, John R. 1975 “A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts”, in K. Gunderson (ed.), *Language, Mind and Knowledge*. Minnesota
15. Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreement, face, and politeness, *Journal of Pragmatics*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1554-1564.
16. Sornig, K. 1977. ‘Disagreement and Contradiction as Communicative Acts’ in *Journal of Pragmatics*. 1, pp.347-374.