

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Alimova Madinabonu Islomjon qizi

Student of Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Gmail: bonumadina008@gmail.com

Annotation:

Conversation analysis is a method of studying social interactions, especially through the use of language in conversation. By understanding the different types of conversation analytics, the customer journey can be guided by the voice of the customer. Conversation analysis is a branch of linguistics that deals with the systematic analysis of verbal and nonverbal behaviors in conversation to understand how people interact with each other. Dialogue analysis in discourse analysis examines the structure and organization of oral and written communication.

There are different types of conversation analysis, including microanalysis, macroanalysis, and ethnographic methodological analysis. Microanalysis is a detailed examination of specific characteristics of a conversation, such as taking turns, editing, and topic management. Macroanalysis examines broader conversational patterns, such as the structure of stories or the use of specific speech acts.

Key words: Conversation analysis, social interaction, conversation microanalysis and macroanalysis, speech acts, adjacent pairs, turn-taking

One area of conversation analysis is taking turns in conversation activities. Taking turns refers to the process by which speakers take turns in a conversation, and it is a fundamental aspect of conversation analysis. This area of study looks at the rules, practices, and strategies used by speakers to initiate, maintain, and end a conversation. Speech turn analysis helps explain how speakers coordinate their speaking roles and how they manage the flow of conversation.

Another area of conversation analysis is conversation analysis in pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of how people use language in context, and conversational analysis in pragmatics aims to understand how meaning is created through



conversation. This area of study examines how speakers use language to convey meaning, including the use of conversational implication, indirect speech behavior, and supposition.

When it comes to conversation analysis, it is important to understand the difference between conversation analysis and discourse analysis. Conversation analysis is a specific type of discourse analysis that focuses on the structure and organization of spoken interactions. Discourse analysis, on the other hand, is a broader field that examines the use of language in a variety of contexts, including written text, speech, and media.

Adjacent Pairs

One of the most common constructs identified by conversation analysis is the adjacency pair, which is a pattern of calling and responding to sequential utterances spoken by two different people. Here are some examples:

Summon/Reply

Can I get help here? I'll be there. Offer/Reject

Saleswoman: Do you need someone to deliver your packages? Customer: No, thanks. Understood. Praise/Accept

That's a nice tie you're wearing. THANK. It was a birthday present from my wife. Observations on conversation analysis

"[C]onversational analysis (CA) [is] an approach in the social sciences to describe, analyze, and understand conversation as a fundamental and constitutive feature of human social life. CA is a well-developed tradition with a distinct set of analytical methods and procedures as well as a large number of established results..." At its core, conversation analysis is a set of combines methods for working with audio and video recordings of conversations and social interactions. These methods were developed in some of the earliest research on conversation analysis and have remained consistent. significantly over the past 40 years. The continued use of them has brought about a great amount of interweaving and mutual reinforcement.



In conversation analysis, utterances are considered not only as a means to convey ideas, but also as a tool used by speakers to achieve social goals. Examples of social goals include complaints, requests, or greetings. There are specific niches in conversations where multiple utterances might fit, but each utterance will perform the same action. For example, to greet a friend, one might say, "Hi, how are you?" or "Hi, how are you?" Different words were used, but the same social act - a greeting - was performed.

Conversational analysis (CA) is an approach to the study of social interaction and language. Despite its name, CA's scope is not limited to conversation as a genre of speech (gossip, gossip) but includes any human activity that involves exchange speeches and other meaningful acts. CA is committed to scrutinizing social interaction during sequential and forward-looking development. The interaction takes place as a sequence of initiation and response actions. This sequence is an intrinsic source of evidence for the meaning of social behavior because it reveals the insights the participants themselves give about what others are doing. CA's sequential frame of analysis also shapes the basic questions that guide CA research: what is a participant doing by speaking or moving in a certain way at a given moment? What evidence is there for this in the conduct that precedes, co-occurs with, and follows that stretch of behavior? Such an analysis requires the close and repeated inspection of audio and video recordings of naturally occurring interaction, supported by transcripts and other forms of annotation. Distributional regularities are complemented by a demonstration of participants' orientation to deviant behavior, which brings to the surface the underlying norms of social interaction.

The CA Working Group continues to foster the growing community of conversation analytic scholars through a facilitation of scholarly exchange between faculty and graduate students within the Department. We are proud of our relations with other Sociology Working Groups and with the broader UCLA community. Our working group continues to attract language and social interaction scholars from a range of allied departments and centers at the University.

Our primary goal is to establish and strengthen ties between graduate students and faculty working in our field within the Department of Sociology. At present the CA faculty have a range of courses and data analysis seminars detailing the substance



and methodology of conversation analysis. The working group is distinctive in providing a forum in which students can try out ideas for potential publications, showcase their own data sets, and test run relatively developed papers for conferences and symposia. Correspondingly, the working group provides students and faculty with an opportunity to witness and provide critical feedback on works in progress by faculty and other scholars.

Conversation analysis is a systematic analysis of talk that is produced as a result of normal everyday interactions. This talk is referred to as 'talk-in-interaction'. Conversation analysis refers to the study of orders of talk-in-interaction that takes place with any individual and in any setting. These settings can be the most ordinary and the most routine everyday situations. According to this approach, social actions hold some sort of significance to those who initiate them. They are organized naturally and this can be detected by careful examination. Therefore, conversation analysis tries to understand the hidden rules, meanings, or structures that make up such an order in the conversation.

The purpose of conversation analysis is to determine how the participants in a natural conversation understand and respond to each other when it is their turn to speak. The focus is on how these action sequences are created. It does not study the structure of the language used, but rather focuses on how the language is used in the form of a claim, complaint, suggestion or accusation. Conversation analysis is a research method that analyzes social interactions. The purpose of this analysis is to identify the links that exist between the peculiarities found in the details of human action and the common characteristics that can be drawn from organizational problems and resources. share.

We can start by noting, like the authors of Sacks et al. (1974) do, that there are different ways to organize speech for conversation (and indeed to distribute the opportunity to engage in interaction more generally). For example, rounds can be pre-assigned so that each potential participant has the right to speak for two minutes, and the order of speakers is pre-determined (by age, gender, status, first letter, pm) height, weight, etc.). There are systems of speech exchange (as Sacks et al., 1974 call them) that work more or less this way, like argument. But there are reasons why such a system doesn't work for conversation. For example, if we imagine that in such a system, participants A, B, C, D all



have the opportunity to speak, and in that order, what would happen if B asked questions to A? Now B has to wait for C and D to speak before A can answer. But what if C and D also question A? Or what if D doesn't hear B's question and so on? Of course, while this kind of pre-specified system obviously doesn't work for conversation, there are plenty of other ways to organize taking turns (and in fact, it's organized for activities). actions other than conversation). We don't need to go through all the possibilities here. Based on these considerations and common sense, we can see that the speaking turn of the conversation must be held locally, by the participants themselves. As Sacks et al. (1974) said, in turn in conversation is "locally managed, side-managed, interactively controlled".

The model these authors describe has two components and a set of "rules" that govern their operation. The "turn construction component" defines the shape and range of possible turns by specifying a clearly delineated set of units from which turns can be generated. Specifically, in English, variable constituting units (TCUs) can be lexical items, phrases, clauses, and sentences. In the following case, Shelley's declarative formatting question is on line 01, "you were at the Halloween thing". is a TCU sentence while his "Halloween party" on line 03 is a TCU sentence. Debbie's turn on lines 02 and 04 is TCU vocabulary. While such a format again does not include any clear indication of the participant responsible for the failure, it nevertheless suggests that whoever initiates the repair is responsible for finding out solution. And finally, by demonstrating (the candidate's) understanding of what has been said, it thus shows that its speaker has knowledge of the matter (and has heard what has been said). is said).

References:

1. Drew, Paul and Heritage, John. (1993). *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. <https://authenticx.com/page/types-of-conversation-analysis/>
3. <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-conversation-analysis-ca-1689923>
4. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2131259_English_Russian_Science_Dictionary
5. <https://soc.ucla.edu>
6. <https://www.communicationtheory.org/conversation-analysis/>

