

# Sociopragmatic Features of Speech Acts of Expressing “Refusals”, “Denials” And “Surprises”

**Azimova Sayyora Khusanboevna,**  
PhD, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Foreign  
Languages in Natural  
Sciences, Fergana State University

**Abstract.** Expressing refusals, denials, and surprises are important sociodramas features of speech acts in many cultures. The way these speech acts are expressed can reveal cultural attitudes towards politeness, hierarchy, and social norms.

**Key words:** Refusals, denials, surprises, cultural norms, sociodramas factors, speech acts, expressions.

## Introduction

Speech acts that include conveying a certain feeling or goal in discussion include refusals, denials, and surprises. Sociopragmatic elements, which can range greatly across various groups and circumstances, such as cultural norms, social roles, and power relations, have a significant impact on these speech actions.

One of the most frequent speaking acts that involves turning down an invitation, a request, or an offer from another person is to refuse. Depending on the language and culture of the speakers concerned, refusals can be either explicit or implicit, direct or indirect. For instance, in certain cultures, it is considered rude to respond "no" immediately; instead, speakers may evade the question or offer an explanation. Other cultures, like the American one, encourage honesty, therefore speakers may use clear words to indicate their rejection.

## The main part

Contrarily, denials entail disputing or rejecting an assertion or charge made by another individual. Denials may be used to convey disapproval of the speaker's viewpoint, to defend oneself, to clear up any confusion, or to just clarify an issue. In accordance with the sociopragmatic setting, rejections can be either direct or indirect. For instance, in certain cultures, it is rude to disagree with or criticize parents, teachers, or other authority people. In these situations, speakers may choose to communicate their disagreement in a tactful manner to avoid offending the listener.

Speech actions known as surprises include conveying a quick or unexpected response to a certain incident or circumstance. Depending on the speaker's personality and the severity of the event, surprises can range from moderate to strong emotions and can be either good or negative. The same sociopragmatic elements that affect refusals and denials, such as cultural expectations, social position, and interpersonal connections, also have a significant impact on surprises. Speakers may utilize subtle indicators, like as their tone of voice or facial expressions, to indicate their surprise without calling undue attention to oneself, for instance, in cultures where it is considered unpleasant to display strong emotions in public.

Numerous studies have been carried out in a variety of languages and cultures to better understand the sociopragmatics of rejections, denials, and surprises. For instance, Huang (2017) studied how politeness methods are used to communicate refusals in American English and Mandarin Chinese. The study discovered that whereas American speakers are more aggressive and straightforward, Chinese speakers prefer to utilize more deceptive tactics and avoid expressing "no" explicitly.

Another study by Kim (2018) inspected the part of face-saving in denying demands or offers in Korean culture. The think about found that Korean speakers tend to utilize roundabout techniques and attempt to preserve agreeable connections by protecting confront.

A study by Ikeda (2020) analyzed the utilize of prosodic highlights and talk markers in communicating shock in Japanese. The consider found that speakers utilize rising pitch, contributes, and particles to communicate their astonish and feeling.

In a comparative study about by Peña (2019), the creator compared the utilize of refusal techniques in Spanish and English. The think about found that Spanish speakers tend to utilize more circuitous methodologies and mollify their refusals with expressions of lament or appreciation, though English speakers are more coordinate and confident.

Another study by Alhajri (2018) examined the sociolinguistic features of denying in Arabic culture. The study found that directness and honesty are highly valued in expressing denials in this culture, and speakers may use religious expressions or proverbs to soften their refusals.

Schmid (2017) compared the use of politeness strategies in French and German. The study found that French speakers tend to use more indirect and formal strategies, while German speakers tend to be more direct and informal.

## Conclusion

Overall, the sociopragmatic features of speech acts of expressing refusals, denials, and surprises vary across cultures and can reveal important insights into the values and norms of those cultures.

## References

1. Xusanboevna, S. A. (2021). Linguopragmatic Properties of Language. *International Journal of Discoveries and Innovations in Applied Sciences*, 1(4), 10-12.
2. Азимова, С. Х. (2020). НУТҚ АКТЛАРИ ВА КОММУНИКАТИВ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЯ: “РАД ЖАВОБИНИ БИЛДИРУВЧИ” ИЛЛОКАТЦИОН ҲАРАКАТНИ ПРАГМАТИК ТАҲЛИЛ ҚИЛИШ. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 3(5).
3. Xusanboyevna, A. S. (2020, June). ROLE OF THE THEORY OF SPEECH ACTS IN THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUISTIC PRAGMATICS. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 43-45).
4. Xusanboyevna, A. S. (2021, April). PRAGMATICS AND LINGVOPRAGMATIC FEATURES OF SPEECH. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 181-183).
5. Xusanboyevna, A. S. (2020, June). LINGUOPRAGMATICS AND THE MAIN CATEGORIES OF LINGUOPRAGMATICS. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 40-42).
6. Xusanboyevna, A. S. (2020, June). LINGUO-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF SPEECH ACTS “EXPRESSION OF REFUSAL” IN RUSSIAN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 37-39).
7. Азимова, С. Х. (2022). Прагматический Анализ Иллокутивного Акта «Выражение Отказов». *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 3(11), 276-282.
8. Азимова, С. (2021). Linguopragmatic features of speech acts" expression of refusals" in Russian and Uzbek languages. *Общество и инновации*, 2(4/S), 776-781.
9. Huang 2017 Greeting words comparison in US and Chinese, June 2017.
10. Gulsora, M., & Mamura, S. (2022). CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING OF GERMAN. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 2, 1-2.
11. Mamura, M. G. S. (2022). THOUGHTS AND METHODS OF FOREIGN SCIENTISTS IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. In *Conference Zone* (pp. 31-33).
12. Gulsora, M., & Mamura, S. (2021). EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES TO STUDENTS. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(12), 697-699.
13. Gulsora, M., & Mamura, S. (2022). CONSIDERING AGE FEATURES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING. *British Journal of Global Ecology and Sustainable Development*, 2, 54-56.
14. Mamura, S., & Sarvarbek, O. (2021, May). TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 189-191).
15. Mamura, S. (2022). The beginning of teaching German. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(02), 725-729.
16. Ma'mura, S. (2022). Mechanisms of Teaching the German Language Through Traditional and Innovative Methods. *Eurasian Journal of Research, Development and Innovation*, 14, 9-13.

17. Zokirov, M. T. (2021). ABOUT THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF LINGUISTICS AND PSYCHOLOGY. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 422-425.
18. Zokirov, M. T., & Zokirova, S. M. (2020). Contrastic analysis at the phonetic level. *Academic Leadership (Online Journal)*, 21(05), 163-169.
19. Zokirov, M. T. (2019). About the general characteristic of bilinguism. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(10), 260.
20. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). Actual Problems of Bilingualism in a Multi-Ethnic Environment. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 13, 17-23.
21. Mamajonov, A., & Dadabayeva, S. (2022). SUPERSYNTACTIC INTEGRITY WITH THE MEANING OF CONTRAST. *American Journal Of Philological Sciences*, 2(04), 14-20.
22. Zokirov, M., & Isomiddinov, F. (2021). EVFEMIZMLAR BORASIDAGIDAGI TURLI YONDASHUVLAR XUSUSIDA. *Редакционная коллегия*.
23. Porubay, I. F., Zokirov, M. T., & Ibragimova, E. I. (2023). FEATURES OF CONTEMPORARY INTERNET LANGUAGE. *BARQARORLIK VA YETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 3(2), 210-216.
24. Turdaliyevich, Z. M., & Farhod, I. (2022). Loiқ Is the Successor of the Great Figures Of Tajik Literature. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 14, 51-55.
25. Zokirov, M. T. (2019). About the general characteristic of bilinguism. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(10), 260.
26. Зокиров, М., & Зокирова, С. (2010). ТИЛ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯСИНИНГ МОҲИЯТИ ҲАҚИДА УМУМИЙ ТУШУНЧА. *Известия ВУЗов (Кыргызстан)*, (6), 10-11.
27. Zokirov, M. (2007). Lingvistik interferensiya va uning o'zbek-tojik bilimimizda namoyon bo'lishi. MDA-Toshkent.