

## Language of Face-to-Face Conversation

*Ochilov Timur*

*Teacher of the Samarkand state institute of foreign languages*

**Abstract:** this article deals with the language and conversation as well as the difference between spoken and written form of speech. In addition, author gives several possible notions from prominent linguists who contributed to find solution of the issue.

**Keywords:** *spoken, written, gestures, phonetic level, semantic level, nominal group.*

Language serves as a dazzling mirror reflecting people's moral and spiritual lives. It is a natural phenomenon of society that captures the enduring spirit, inner world, and national idiosyncrasies of thought, traditions, and customs of people throughout thousands of years—in other words, the essence of people on the inside and outside. It follows that anything that is unique to one people may not be present in the lives of people in another country. In these situations, the process of understanding the essence of a particular world requires the use of both the way of articulating the essence of this nation as well as its appropriate equivalents in other languages.

Understanding the distinctions and distinctive qualities between spoken and written language is essential to comprehending spoken language at its core. This part discusses aspects of the subject that are essential to the current task, English conversation. Since conversational English is “the most commonly used kind of English, and consequently a variety which will be more familiar to the vast majority of English-speaking people than any other”, it serves as the foundation for my inquiry [1]. It is the sole natural source of backchannels and the sort of English that native English speakers use on a daily basis. Backchannels can be found in written language, however they are typically found as fictitious examples added to theater productions, dialogue contained in poetry poems, or illustrations in publications on metalinguistics.

“The least marked kind of situationally influenced language” is English conversation [1]. The majority of other forms of English have some sort of context restriction when they are employed. Formal letters are often composed in an office, but newsrooms cover nightly news and offer a variety of commonly used forms. Conversation is more flexible in its application and offers a wider range of potential structures based on users, context, and application adaptability. Here are some essential qualities that are quite important when it comes to discussion.

First, the participants' excessive dependence on the extra-linguistic context of the discussion for most of their information is largely to blame for the language's explicitness, which is one of the key components of the exchange [2]. Since speakers often converse face-to-face, they may rely on immediate situational context and shared information. Participants utilize ambiguous language and anaphoric and deictic terms such as one, over there, and this, which leads to the current situation. Another aspect made possible by the context is the incompleteness of many statements. As a result, only those who are actively involved may begin speaking and leave the framework incomplete since their shared knowledge facilitates understanding. The “unfinished part” might be supported by nonverbal cues such body language, object pointing, or facial emotions. Using techniques like muttering, whistling, snoring, and similar ones, one can achieve vocal realization.

Second, “randomness of subject-matter, and a general lack of planning” [3] is another attribute of conversation. Too much planning goes into the next issue because of the impromptu nature of the speech and its pace. If one does not prepare ahead of time, it is nearly impossible to foretell how the discussion will go, how the subject will evolve, and who will bring it to an end. Everyone has

the ability to shift the subject at any point throughout a conversation, which helps to ensure that it ends smoothly. Changing one's English dialect for another does not always indicate improper language use because it might help one obtain the intended meaning for a certain circumstance. As a result, using extremely formal language for amusement or to paraphrase a ruling might happen without feeling out of place.

Thirdly, the final basic characteristic that is typical of discourse is known as “normal non-fluency”. This is characterized by the high percentage of “errors” in casual, spontaneous speech, such as hesitations, slips of the tongue, and overlapping speech. Hesitation often indicates a state of thought, and backchannel signals or other forms of overlapped speech might happen while someone is giving feedback. The strain to think while speaking can result in slips of the tongue, and the only time to retract a statement is while it is still being spoken. On the contrary, “perfect fluency in this variety tends to produce the wrong effect, for psychological and other reasons – one gets labelled a ‘smooth talker’, for instance – which rather suggests that hesitation phenomena are of primary significance in determining the acceptability or otherwise of conversation. Considered in its own situation (that is, with gestures, facial expressions, and so on all included), conversation does not seem ‘disjointed’ at all” [4].

Relatively little has to be said on the phonetic level of casual speech. The usage of a variety of wide-ranging sounds is the sole trait that occurs on a regular basis. Sounds such as *tut tut*, various whistles, sounds of amazement, artificial clearing of the throat, coughing for the purpose of irony, or laughing and sounds like *mhm* for the purpose of back channeling are used in English conversation. It is possible to include here onomatopoeic sounds, such as *whoosh*, *brrr*, *boing* as well.

In terms of the phonological differences between other speech types and informal conversation, it is feasible to identify the latter's use of elision and assimilation, while the former uses clarity and vigorous enunciation when appropriate. However, the utilization of non-segmental language elements is primarily responsible for the phonological uniqueness of conversation [5]. Only in casual discussion can prosodic and paralinguistic elements like screaming, yelling, and sobbing tend to occur; the participants' “face wants” are the only real restriction. The phonological level's propensity to maintain tone units relatively short and unfinished and to employ a limited number of fundamental prosodic configurations very regularly is another noteworthy characteristic.

Another important aspect of casual conversation is “the frequency of silence for purposes of contrastive pause, as opposed to its being required simply for breath-taking” [6]. Voiceless pauses are more common in this type of English than they are in any other, and they are also more noticeable. When a silent pause is used, the conversational cadence both inside and between phrases becomes unbalanced. The tempo of speech is only a personal choice, and there is no inclination to adjust conversational speed to any general norms.

It should be highlighted that whereas utterances and sentences in most other forms of English are simply defined, they are not in conversational English. The “length of utterances in this variety is much more variable than in any other variety of English,” according to Tannen D. Generally speaking, statements are brief at first, get longer as subjects are covered, get even longer as the argument progresses or tale starts, and get even shorter as the conclusion draws near [7]. The usage of one-word turns and backchannels contrasts with very lengthy utterances within different monologues, demonstrating a range of utterances in terms of their duration.

One such characteristic of the spoken variation of the English language is the abundance of loosely coordinated sentences. Because of the sometimes fast speech and interclausal pauses, it is difficult to distinguish sentence borders, which exacerbates the condition of structural ambiguity. These clauses can be interpreted as either single compound sentences or as a series of sentences since it

can be difficult to determine when one clause finishes and the other begins. Although they are mostly employed as answer utterances, small phrases are also utilized non-response utterances rather frequently. One can also find a large number of comment clauses, such as *you know*, *you see*, *I mean*.

One aspect of English communication that is seen to be distinctive is disjointedness. This is supported by the fact that there is no consistent rhythmic structure and that a sizable number of phrases and clauses are left unfinished. It is sometimes caused by false starts, or grammatical blends, often labelled as ‘syntactic anacoluthon’.

As for sentence types, the most frequent are declaratives, then interrogatives, imperatives and exclamatives.

Concerning the clause structure, vocatives are common especially in initial position. “Nominal groups tend to be infrequent as subject, the personal pronoun is more in evidence – especially the first person, which is an expected, but nonetheless a distinctive feature of conversation. One might also note in this connection the use of the informal *you*, in its impersonal function as against the more formal *one* or in place of the third person pronoun [8]. Both nominal and verbal structures are rather not complicated. Nominal structures consist usually of a sequence of determiner-adjective, and noun with little post-modification which grows with the level of conversation seriousness, adverbial intensifiers mostly occurring are *very* and *a bit*. Relative clauses usually do not contain an optional relative pronoun and place the preposition at the end.

Verbal groupings are primarily made up of a lexical verb and one auxiliary. Additionally, the full spectrum of tense forms can be used. After that, there is a propensity to employ phrasal verbs, colloquial ellipses, and contracted verbal forms. Conversely, passive forms are not used.

Conversation provides a wide range of devices to be used, from “repetitious structures, looseness of syntax, ‘weak’ words like *got* and *nice*, and so on – all of which would be condemned, and with good reason, in children’s school essays and elsewhere – are a standard and indeed a valuable part of informal conversation [9].

Lastly, the most noteworthy feature of informal conversation is its vocabulary. Word structures tend to be simple, specialised and formal terms avoided and if used, their meaning is softened by the use of structures such as *you know*, *sort of* and so forth. Since inexplicitness is accepted, it is possible to use non-specific prop words such as *you-know-what-I-mean* instead of lexical items. It is also possible to use clichés, slang, abbreviations, and euphemism.

The previously mentioned subject matter's randomization is the most important aspect of the semantic level. "Conversation occurs in a series of jumps, rather than in a series of coordinated blocks, particularly when someone is trying to find the beginning of a topic" [9, 29]. Since there is no pressure to follow a set format, conversations can have a variety of characteristics, including concurrent starts, free-form stringing, afterthoughts, and redundancy that permits omission. The semantic space of conversation—which accommodates devices referred to as “intimacy signals”, “silence fillers”, and “rapport makers”—is crucial to the current study since the bulk of these signals may be classified as backchannel signals.

## **LIST OF USED LITERATURE**

1. Егорова Т. П. Семиотическая функция имени // Ономастика. Материалы к серии Народы мира и культура. – Вып. XXV. – Ч. I. – М.: РАН, 1993. – С. 21.
2. Halliday M., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. London: Pearson Education Ltd., 2003. – 191 p.

3. Жураева И.А. Номинативные функции антропонимов (на материале английского, узбекского и русского языков) – Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 2012. – 26 с.
4. Atkinson J. M., Heritage J. Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 252 p.
5. Greenbaum S., Nelson G. An introduction to English grammar (Second ed.). London: Longman, 2003. – 155 p.
6. Уфимцева А.А. Роль лексики в познании человеком действительности в формировании языковой картины мира // Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. – М.: Наука, 1988. – С. 108 – 140.
7. Tannen D. Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – P. 321-322.
8. Chen Naigang. Lingnan Culture – Tongji, Tongji University Press, 2006. – 194 p.
9. Chen Ke. Chinese Linguistic Folk Culture. – Peking: Tianjin Press, – 2001. – 206 p.