DIALOGUE AS THE PRIMARY FORM OF VERBAL COMMUNICATION.

Pardayeva Sojida Axmatovna

Teacher of Foreign Languages Department of

Tashkent Institute of Finance

Annotation. The problems of patterns, the knowledge of which contributes to the organization of conflict-free communication, as well as the creation of such a communicative situation when both participants in dialogical communication, regardless of their communicative intentions, are interested in verbal cooperation in order to achieve their communicative goals are discussed in the article. Therefore, in studying the use of language, the role of speaker and hearer, the role of the context, the amount of relative quality of language, which is used, and the relative distance between the speaker and the hearer is important.

Key words: dialogue, communication, dialogical communication, communicative goal, conflict-free communication, speaker, hearer, language, pragmalinguistics, linguopragmatics.

Traditional understanding of dialogue is to examine the messages of communicators in terms of speech acts, coordinate management of meaning, and accomplishment of goals. In terms of levels of communication, the most individualistic is intrapersonal communication, whereas mass media is collectivistic.

In order for dialogue to take place, three conditions must be met. First, participants must suspend assumptions. Bohm said that discussions and negotiations are not dialogue because each represents a process whereby someone tries to "win" or convince others to assume the views of another. In dialogue, there is no attempt to win or prevail in a discussion. The main goal of dialogue is to suspend opinions and examine the opinions of others. All participants must learn to listen to what is on someone's mind and suspend judgment without coming to a conclusion. Hence,

active listening such as listening with feeling and listening to interpret are encouraged. Dialogue requires an "empty place" to give all participants the necessary space to talk.

The problem of dialogue and its communicative units is studied in many branches of Linguistics, including Pragmatics and Speech-act theory. The author cites different definitions of the notion «dialogue» in Linguistics. The problem of the number of participants in dialogue is studied. Dialogue is viewed as a form of active communicative interaction between two or more people, the result of which is the emergence of a specific discourse. One of the participants may be of integrated, polymodal nature, that is be represented by a group. Discourse is defined as text together with extra - pragmatic, cultural and other factors; text taken in respect of events occurring. The article aims at summing up the main modern Linguistics aspects as for features, functions, structure and types of dialogues. Classificational characteristics of dialogical discourses are systematized. Division of dialogical discourses on communicative and pragmatic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, thematic, modal and communicative features is suggested. Dialogical discourse characteristics prove its role of a dominant form of verbal communication and one of the most significant forms of language functioning.

Buber espoused an ethical approach to communication such that true dialogue between communicators reflects ethics. He espoused an ethical responsibility to value people rather than external objects. Hence, meanings are in people, not in words from the old cliché. His philosophy was grounded firmly in Western Judaic religion and psychology. For Buber, it was important to understand the distinction between two different types of human existence "what one's reality is" as opposed to "the image of what one wishes to be." Buber distinguished three types of dialogue: genuine, technical, and disguise. In genuine dialogue, whether it is spoken or silent, each of the participants really has in mind the other or others in their present and particular being and turns to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation between them. Conversely, technical dialogue is prompted by the need of

objective understanding. Finally, there is monologue disguised as dialogue, in which two men, meeting in space, speak each with himself in strangely tortuous and circuitous ways and yet imagine they have escaped the torment of being thrown back on their own resources.

Any dialogue between two people involves six perspectives:

1. How you view yourself.

2. How you view the other person.

3. How you believe other person views you.

4. How people view themselves.

 5. How the other person views you.

6. How the other person believes you view him or her.

Anderson and Cissna discussed the famous Martin Buber – Carl Rogers dialogue at the University of Michigan that occurred in 1957. Rogers was a clinical psychologist famous for his humanistic theory of the "actualizing tendency." It can be defined as the built-in motivation present in every life form to develop its potentials to the fullest extent possible. Rogers asked Buber whether a person could have a dialogue with one's self. Buber answered "No" because dialogue requires two persons entering into a genuine relationship with each other. He referred to imagining dialogue within oneself as an intrapsychic dialectic in terms of envisioning self and other within a single person. For Buber, internal dialogue lacks the otherness and surprise necessary for real dialogue. He described dialogue as a game of chess because the self can only contemplate what the interaction partner will do.

All communication involves speaker(s), listener(s) and contexts. Speakers initiate communication and convey meaning. Listeners attempt to understand communication. The environment is both a situation for communication and a context ("co-text") that is a source of meaning. Thus, the immediate environment is a "participant" in communication.

Dialogue differs from conversation, discussion, debate and argument. Dialogue is concerned with understanding ideas and opinions of others. Attentive listening, sensitivity, turn taking, the desire to communicate experiences and ideas, sharing understanding and planning actions are typical in dialogue interactions.

Dialogue is both task- and other-oriented. Dialogue is an occasion for learning and development within a social group. Dialogue is a multilayered, complex process. Dialogue elicits questions, values, emotions, ideas and beliefs in a joint quest for meaning. In dialogue, language, relationships, thinking and contexts are interactive and interconnected.

Dialogue is an opportunity for expressing, refining and expanding communicative literacy through the process of social interaction. During the process, the other members of the group socially mediate learning and development by individual participants.

The term, dialogue stems from the Greek, dialogues, in which dia means through and logos means words. Dialogue literally means, "Through words." Dialogue is a dynamic, interactive, meaning-centered activity that fosters communication, openness and mutual understanding among people. Indeed the concept of logos encompasses far more than words, speech or meaning. The concept of logos has profound significance in the history of metaphysics, theology and philosophy. Logos represents the unifying, essential force in the world, creating order from chaos and linking humans to god and the cosmos. For the ancient Greeks, logos is identified with fire, for Christians, with The Word and for philosophers, with thought. The term, logic, the study of thought, also derives from logos. Dialogue involves direct communication of two or more individuals and usually is a face-to-face encounter. However, telephone conference calls, electronic chat and webcasts now allow "virtual" dialogues.

Dialogue works to create and sustain the collective thought of the group. Habermas (reference) describes dialogue as the ideal speech situation, perfection in communication. Through dialogue, we are able to make sense of experience and

order our thoughts with the help of others. The imagery Bohm uses to describe dialogue alludes to power of logos: "a stream of meaning flowing among us and between us . . . out of which may emerge some understanding. It's something new. It's something creative. And this shared meaning is the glue or cement that holds people and societies together." This description suggests the value of dialogue for developing insight, synergistic relationships and a civil society where members live in harmony and show concern for the welfare of others. At its best, dialogue results in distributed knowledge, full participation and enhanced humanity.

When groups of people decide to engage in dialogue, whether in social or professional groups, a vast kaleidoscope of knowledge, experience, ideas and possibilities come out. Such dialogue is energizing, delightful and insightful. Although good dialogue is hard work and can be frustrating at times, as a result, close relationships grow in the group dialogue process.

Properties of dialogue according to Pinell dialogue has certain, defining properties:

1)   Sequential organization. Like text, dialogue has a beginning middle and end. Dialogue also includes a "core act" or event that organizes, focuses and directs the flow of ideas. Dialogue occurs over time.

2)   Asymmetry is a contributing factor. Different from debate where comparable ability, knowledge and experience are necessary, dialogue adjusts to different levels of experience, knowledge, education, interests and communicative abilities among participants. These differences are positive, contributing to lively dialogue and supportive interactions.

3)   Context specific/Collaborative negotiation of meaning. Participants interact productively, exchange ideas, work on problems, allow differences of opinion, revise thinking, project hypotheses, share understanding and engage in planning new experiences.

4)   Coherence. Practicing dialogue regularly increases coherence, making ideas and views sensible to others. In practicing dialogue, the ability to express ideas

coherently improves as participants strive to make their thoughts meaningful to others. According to Bohm, coherence is an antidote to fragmentation.

5)   Surfacing differences is a pivotal stage in the process of dialogue. When tensions arise, participants who accommodate differences into the dialogue are able to progress to a new level of openness. When this state is achieved, a group is able to think together and deal with the challenges that are the focus of the dialogue.

The Greeks may not have invented dialogue, but they introduced the idea that individuals are not intelligent on their own, that it's only by reasoning together that they are able to uncover the truth for themselves. The Greeks understood that if two or more people are unsure about a question, they can accomplish something together they can't do on their own. By questioning and probing each other, carefully dissecting and analyzing ideas, finding the inconsistencies, never attacking or insulting but always searching for what they can accept between them, they can gradually attain deeper understanding and insight.

That's what dialogue is: a form of discussion aimed at fostering mutual insight and common purpose. The process involves listening with empathy, searching for common ground, exploring new ideas and perspectives, and bringing unexamined assumptions into the open.

While dialogue is often confused with other forms of discourse, it belongs in a distinctive category of its own. Unlike debate, it does not involve arguing for a point of view, defending a set of assumptions, or reviewing the positions of others. Unlike negotiation or consensus building, it's not a method of reaching agreement or arriving at decisions. In addition, unlike discussion, it can only emerge when participants trust and respect each other, suspend their judgments, and listen deeply to all points of view. The process of dialogue is more important than ever today for a number of reasons. For one thing, the confrontation between different cultural traditions and worldviews requires some process by which people can communicate across differences. For another, the fragmentation of society into a myriad of subcultures based on profession, status, race, ethnicity, political loyalty, etc., make

it necessary that people find a pathway to common ground. A third reason is that traditional authority structures are falling away.

Dialogue is the most effective response to these developments because, on the one hand, it allows people to span their differences and forge shared frames of reference and, on the other, it gives those formerly excluded from decision-making an opportunity to participate in the process of finding common ground and establishing priorities for action. Nevertheless, dialogue is not always easy or straightforward. It can run aground in a thousand subtle ways. Effective dialogue requires that all the participants have equal standing, that they listen with respect and empathy, and that ideas and assumptions explored openly and without judgment.

Effective dialogue typically follows some basic ground rules:

- The focus is on common interests, not divisive ones

- The dialogue and decision-making processes are separated

- Assumptions that can lead to distortions of certain points of view are clarified and brought into the open

- People are encouraged to reveal their own insights and assumptions before speculating on those of others

- Concrete examples are used to raise general issues

- The process focuses on conflicts between value systems, not people

- When appropriate, participants are encouraged to express emotions accompanying strongly held values

- Participants err on the side of including people who disagree

- They encourage relationships in order to humanize transactions

REFERENCES

1.   Ashurova D.U., Galiyeva M.R. Text Linguistics. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 250.

2.   Ashurova D.U, Galiyeva M.R. Stylistics of literary text. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 91.

3.   Gardner H. Using multiple intelligences to improve negotiation theory and practice // Negotiation Journal. October, 2000. – C. 18.

4.   Graham J.L., Mintu A.T., Rodgers W. Explorations of negotiation behaviours in ten foreign cultures using a model developed in the United States // Management Science. Vol.40, № 1. - January, 1994.

5. Bell R. Sociolinguistics. – M.: International relations, 1980.

6. Koltunova M.V. Language and business communication. Norms. Rhetoric. Etiquette: Proc. allowance for universities. – M.: Ekon.lit., 2000.

7. Shamne H.JI. Actual problems of intercultural communication: Textbook. - Volgograd: VolGU Publishing House, 1999.