

Ministry Of Education And Science Of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

Bachelor's thesis

**AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN MODERN ENGLISH
DISCOURSE**

Oleksandra Sabadokha,
4th year student of the Education Program
‘English Studies and Translation
and Two Western European Languages’
Field of science: 03 “Humanities”
Specialty: 035 “Philology”

Supervised by:
Olena Kaptiurova

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 10 від 27.05.2024

Зав. кафедри _____ д. філол. н., проф. Алла БЄЛОВА

KYIV – 2024

ABSTRACT

This work delves into the linguistic phenomena of agreement and disagreement in Modern English, highlighting their role in effective communication. The research examines the various grammatical and lexical means through which agreement and disagreement are expressed, contributing to a deeper and better understanding of language usage and interpersonal interactions. The practical aspect of the work is centered on classic books and movies, which serve as the prism, through which the concepts of agreement and disagreement will be explored.

In the context of Modern English discourse, this study aims to offer an investigation of the language phenomena such as agreement and disagreement, clarifying their crucial role in fostering efficient communication. This work enhances the understanding of language dynamics and interpersonal interactions by examining the variety of grammatical, lexical and nonverbal mechanisms utilized in expressing agreement and disagreement.

The focus of this research is on the books and films, which act as frameworks for an in-depth review of agreement and disagreement in a range of sociocultural situations. These works act as an integral part in clarifying the complex relationship between language and social dynamics, providing the comprehension into the intricacies of interpersonal communication.

Furthermore, this study establishes an in-depth method, merging information from descriptive, sociolinguistic, corpus-based, and discourse analysis to ensure an accurate and complex inquiry into the intricate dynamics of agreement and disagreement in Modern English discourse.

KEY WORDS

Agreement, disagreement, communication, linguistic means, grammatical means, books, films

АНОТАЦІЯ

Ця робота розглядає такі лінгвістичні поняття як згода і незгода в контексті сучасного англійського дискурсу та наголошує на їх важливості під час ефективного спілкування. В ній також представлені засоби, що виражають згоду та незгоду, та які сприяють кращому розумінню мови та міжособистісної комунікації. В роботі поняття згоди і незгоди досліджуються через запропоновані фільми та книжки.

З огляду на сучасний англійський дискурс, робота має на меті дослідити мовні явища згоди та незгоди та з'ясувати яку вони відіграють роль у комунікації. Розглядаючи різноманітні граматичні, лексичні та невербальні механізми, які використовуються для вираження згоди і незгоди, ця робота поглиблює розуміння мови, її динаміки та вплив на міжособистісне спілкування.

Дане дослідження фокусується на обраних творах літератури та фільмах, що слугують підґрунтям для аналізу понять згоди і незгоди в різних соціокультурних умовах. Допоміжні матеріали в роботі дозволяють зрозуміти зв'язок між мовою та соціокультурним контекстом та забезпечують розуміння використання згоди і незгоди в міжособистісній комунікації.

Отже, ця робота поєднує описовий, соціолінгвістичний, корпусний та дискурсивний аналіз, задля комплексного дослідження динаміки згоди і незгоди в сучасному англійському дискурсі.

КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА

Згода, незгода, комунікація, мовні засоби, граматичні засоби, книги, фільми

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
1. AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	8
1.1. Examination of linguistic patterns of “agreement” and “disagreement”	8
1.2. Strategies of agreement and disagreement for fostering effective communication	14
Conclusions to chapter 1.....	21
2. UNDERSTANDING EXPRESSIONS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN LITERARY AND CINEMATIC CONTEXTS	23
2.1. Grammatical, lexical and nonverbal means of expressing agreement and disagreement.....	23
2.2. Linguo-stylistic analysis of agreement and disagreement based on dialogues from chosen movies.....	34
Conclusions to chapter 2.....	46
GENERAL CONCLUSION	48
REFERENCES	51
SUMMARY	55

INTRODUCTION

Language is the basis of human communication; it is an intricate arrangement of terms, idioms, and expressions that enables the exchange of concepts, emotions, and thoughts. The concepts of agreement and disagreement stand out as critical elements since they are fundamental to our daily interactions. Beyond being merely linguistic constructions, agreement and disagreement define the boundaries of understanding, compromising, and expressing in every kind of interaction, from informal to formal. They comprise the universal language of human discourse.

Comprehending the intricacies of modern English communication requires a thorough understanding of agreement and disagreement. These concepts, despite their seeming simplicity, are complex and diverse, demanding a careful examination of their usage, meanings, and roles in our daily lives. This research examines the concepts of agreement and disagreement in modern English and the many ways in which they are expressed, with a focus on films, using some academic works.

This topic is **relevant** to understanding the dynamics of communication in various kinds of sociolinguistic contexts. Studying such linguistic strategies as agreement and disagreement is essential to effective communication, as they can provide new perspectives on the development of language and social discourse.

The **objective** of this research is to provide an in-depth analysis of the Modern English meanings of agreement and disagreement.

The **theoretical value** of the work lies in the study of agreement and disagreement that are inherent to English discourse. Enhancing knowledge on statement and disagreement, utilising different techniques to delve into the dynamics of these concepts in proposed films and books, is the **practical significance** of the work. Paying attention to the complexities of how these terms are expressed in literature and movies can help one's language comprehension while also providing a deeper knowledge of the social and cultural contexts shown in cinematography and books.

The **object** of the research: investigation the variety of forms of agreement and disagreement in Modern English as they are portrayed in books and movies. This study aims to investigate the common themes, linguistic structures, and situational variations that emphasize the ways in which characters convey agreement or disagreement in literature/cinematography.

The subject: grammatical, lexical and linguo-stylistic features of agreement and disagreement in proposed books and movies.

The **purpose** of the research is to conduct the features of the concepts of agreement and disagreement, particularly as portrayed in films and literature.

To achieve the aforementioned target, this work will focus on the following main **tasks:**

1. Within the chosen film corpus and books, locate and classify examples of agreement and disagreement.
2. Examine the discourse markers, linguistic forms, and syntactic structures that chosen phrases from films and books employ.
3. Analyze the situational elements and sociocultural settings that affect how the characters convey agreement or disagreement.
4. Examine how agreement and disagreement serve practical purposes in different movie genres.

This research will use a multimodal methodology that combines qualitative and quantitative techniques to achieve the objectives mentioned. The **investigation methods** will be *corpus analysis* (the process of compiling a list of dialogues from various genres of movies to identify agreement and disagreement), *discourse analysis* (the examination of linguistic components such as discourse markers, speech acts, and the pragmatic techniques used by characters to express agreement and disagreement), *sociolinguistic analysis* (an analysis of how social and cultural contexts affect the way agreement and disagreement are expressed in films) and *descriptive analysis* (this method examines how these expressions are represented across various film genres to identify differences in language usage and communication objectives).

The research paper consists of introduction, two chapters, conclusions, reference list and summary, the total number of pages is 57.

1. AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. Examination of linguistic patterns of “agreement” and “disagreement”

In the realm of linguistics and communication, the concepts of "agreement" and "disagreement" are fundamental and pervasive. The word "agreement" is derived from the Old French word "agreer," which means "to receive favorably" or "to make a bargain." A reduction of the expression *a gré* literally "to (one's) relish" or a similar abbreviation in medieval Latin. The French expression derived from *a (to)*, from Latin *ad (toward)* and Old French *gre (what pleased)*, from Latin *grantum (welcoming)* [15]. "Disagreement" is formed by adding the prefix "dis-", which means "not" or "opposite", to "agreement," creating the opposite meaning.

Whether it be through words, actions, or gestures, agreeing is a way for people to build rapport and harmony in addition to indicating a common understanding of what is being spoken. Agreement acts as a link between people, enabling them to communicate, come to decisions, and move through different social and professional settings.

There are great amount of definitions, but the following one seems to be the most pertinent to the area of the research - the Cambridge Dictionary [10], the idea of agreement is described practically identical, but with the help of different words. Commonly, in combination with agreement such words can be used: absence of agreement, balanced agreement, breach of agreement and broad agreement.

1. Agreement is the situation in which people have the same opinion, or in which they approve of or accept something. Agreement can be a decision or arrangement, often formal and written, between two or more groups or people.
2. Agreement is the condition of having the same opinion, or a decision or arrangement between two or more people or groups to do something or to obey the same rules.
3. Agreement is a decision or agreement that has been made and accepted by two or more people, groups, organisations, etc.

4. Agreement is a notion when two or more either identical or extremely similar statements or ideas agree.

The online dictionary Vocabulary states, that if people's opinions are in accord, or match one another, then they are in agreement. Agreement is a harmony of people's opinions, actions, or characters [47].

Agreement is the state of sharing the same opinion or feeling or an arrangement, a promise or a contract made with somebody [45].

Using all these definitions, the generalized one can be done, which will be the following: agreement is a situation in which people share the same opinion, approve, or accept something. It can also refer to a formal, written decision or arrangement between two or more parties, indicating their shared understanding and adherence to specific rules or actions. In essence, agreement signifies the alignment of statements, ideas, or sets of numbers, indicating their similarity or harmony.

In general, in colloquial speech, agreement typically refers to the act of voicing agreement or conformity with the ideas, viewpoints, or claims made by other participants in a discussion. It shows a favorable reaction to someone else's perspective. In the Britannica Dictionary in the sentence "I agree with what you say" or "I couldn't agree more," for instance, the speaker expresses agreement with the interlocutor's opinion [43].

As noted by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson in their work on politeness theory, agreement entails the linguistic act of expressing alignment, accord, or concurrence with the propositions, opinions, or statements put forward by interlocutors. It signifies a positive response to another's viewpoint, reflecting harmony and shared perspective. The concept of agreement often involves politeness strategies, such as employing mitigating expressions to convey solidarity while affirming a shared standpoint [9, p. 101].

Tannen suggests that agreement often serves as a means to establish rapport and strengthen interpersonal relationships, helping people connect with one another creating a more positive and cooperative atmosphere in conversations and influencing the dynamics of interactions and relationships. It seems that, for example, someone

says, "I assume renewable energy is the key to a sustainable future." "I agree" response from someone demonstrates that they both agree on how important renewable energy is. This strengthens the first point made in the conversation and also helps the other person feel like he or she is talking to an individual who accepts this statement [42, p. 206].

According to Nyoman Putra Antara generally agreement is formed when a few parties reach a consensus on something. The coincidence of viewpoints or state of being in agreement with one another also defines as agreement. To be more precise a more detailed definition of the term ought to be taken into consideration: a) harmony of people's beliefs, behaviours, or personalities; b) coherence of facts; c) the declaration of the promise exchanged, either verbally or in writing; d) the verbal act of agreeing; e) the arrangement; f) in grammar, the relation between two words [6, p. 3-5].

As far as the concept of disagreement is concerned, it is a type of conflict, either between people or ideas. If the opinion contradicts the facts, there's a disagreement. When ideas conflict, there's disagreement. Statements, opinions, and claims can also disagree. Disagreement — a conflict of people's opinions or actions or characters; a difference between conflicting facts or claims or opinions; the speech act of disagreeing or arguing or disputing [47].

The Cambridge Dictionary states that disagreement is an argument or a situation in which people do not have the same opinion or it is a situation in which people have different opinions, or an inability to agree. Furthermore, there are words often used in combination with disagreement: area of disagreement, considerable disagreement, deep, fundamental or genuine disagreement [10].

The Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language [44] defines disagreement as follows: 1) lack of mutual understanding, peaceful relations, harmony between someone; strife, discord; 2) difference in views, opinions and worldview; 3) negative response to something, denial of something, disagreement with something; refusal; 4) misfortune, trouble, difficulties in something. In the context of violation of role expectations, disagreement is seen as a difference of views, opinions, worldviews

of a subordinate and a superior and, as a result, a speaker with a lower status denying something said by a speaker with a higher status or disagreeing with him/her.

Disagreement as an uncountable noun means objecting to something such as a proposal while being a variable noun it states that disagreement is a dispute about something, people or argue about what should be done.

Put differently, disagreement pertains to the articulation of disapproval, resistance, or inconsistency with the claims or perspectives of others. It can take many forms, ranging from courteous disapproval to direct contradiction. While "I can't agree with that assessment at all" indicates a stronger sort of disagreement, "I respectfully disagree with your interpretation of the data" indicates a more respectful disagreement [30, p. 270-287].

Moreover, disagreement refers to the expression of disapproval, contradiction, or inconsistency with the claims or perspectives put forth by others. It might take the form of subtly expressed objections or overt refutations and indicate a difference in viewpoint or opinion. Deborah Tannen highlights that societal factors, such as gender, can have an impact on the ways in which people disagree. She investigates how interpersonal dynamics, cultural background, and communication style might impact disputes. According to Tannen's research, disagreements can result in misunderstandings and confrontations because they frequently entail not only opposing viewpoints but also variations in communication styles and how people communicate and perceive their perspectives [40, p. 138].

As defined by Herbert H. Clark, disagreement is the idea that expresses one's disapproval of a claim or point of view. It indicates that opposing viewpoints are present. Clark states that skilled communicators frequently use strategies to lessen the impact of their disagreement, enabling a civil and fruitful discussion of viewpoints. Saying "I disagree, but I understand your reasoning" in response to someone who says, "I think this policy will address the issue," for instance, respects the other person's point of view while fostering a civil and cooperative discussion [11, p. 32-33].

Shamala Paramasivam suggests that disagreement is a type of conflict, either between people or ideas. Speaking of conflicts, any dispute arises out of disagreement. Disagreement can be built on the grounds of claims, assertions and beliefs.

Disagreement is:

1. A divergence in beliefs, behaviors, or attitudes;
2. A distinction between opposing facts, assertions, or viewpoints;
3. A speech act of disagreeing, debating, or contesting [34, p. 91-166].

Sornig describes a speech act of dispute within the context of Speech Act Theory as a reaction act to an act that comes before it. In other words, it necessitates an earlier utterance from an interlocutor. Overall, the definition of disagreement that follows is proposed after accounting for all opinions and research. 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 while disagreement is regarded as its negative, undesirable counterpart. [37, p. 347-373]

According to Ian Walkinshaw disagreement can be defined as oppositional, face-attacking behavior that elicit in the addressee varied degrees of irritation, rage, disdain, or disgust [48]. Muntigl and Turnbull clarify why such a disagreement happens:

- a) The assertion has no bearing on the current conversation;
- b) The speaker disputes the addressee's assertion, insisting on the need for evidence because he does not believe he can do so [31, p. 225-256].

Ian Walkinshaw further explains that disagreeing can also indicate or represent closeness and/or tolerance using the research of Georgakopoulou [17, p. 1881-1900] as an example. Solidarity connections provide interlocutors with a shared set of interactional standards that enable them to distinguish between forms of disagreement that are acceptable within the relationship and those that cross interpersonal boundaries. Therefore, compared to participants whose relationship is oppositional, their arguments may be constructed, conveyed, and perceived differently.

Sifianou claims that disagreements ought to be interpreted as a sign of face issues rather than a particular lack of civility. Although she admits the connection between

both of them, she asserts that face is more comprehensive and can explain the intricacy of conflicts more effectively [36, p. 1554-1564].

Drawing attention to the fact that the notion of "disagreement" has been mistakenly associated with disputes and animosity in relationships, Georgakopoulou [18, p. 1623-1625] suggests that a new analytical vocabulary be created that is devoid of any negative connotations. This would allow for the differentiation of the conceptual meanings of disagreement and the creation of distinct terms for each meaning.

In order to fully explore the topic of the concepts of these definitions, it is vital to clarify the distinction between speech acts that express agreement and disagreement. According to Sornig four major differences exist between them.

1. Agreement components normally occupy an entire agreement turn, whereas disagreements are often prefaced with a hesitation, verbal pause etc.
2. Agreements are normally accomplished with explicitly stated agreement components, while disagreements may be accomplished with a variety of forms, ranging from stated (explicit) disagreements to unstated (implicit or implied) disagreements.
3. Agreements are performed with as little gap as possible between the completion of the first turn and the beginning of the second, whereas disagreements are frequently delayed within a turn or over a series of turns.
4. Disagreements may be unstated and may be marked only by the absence of forthcoming agreements or by gaps, requests for clarification, and so on [36, p. 347-373].

In conclusion, by merging all the terms that have been offered throughout the work, it is possible to define these concepts clearly and succinctly. The linguistic act of expressing concurrence or alignment with a proposition, statement, or opinion put forth by others is known as agreement. Conversely, disagreement entails expressing dissent, contradiction, or discord with these claims. These notions serve as fundamental building blocks of effective communication.

1.2. Strategies of agreement and disagreement for fostering effective communication

In many social and professional circumstances, communication and negotiation are greatly aided by agreement and disagreement [38, p. 2-3]. In terms of pragmatics they are crucial instruments for establishing opinions, maintaining one's authority, settling disputes, and preserving societal harmony. Furthermore, they have multiple functions in social relationships. Cooperation, contact, and trust are all enhanced by agreement. On the other hand, disagreement is essential for expressing different viewpoints, encouraging critical thought, and preventing groupthink. It can spark constructive debates that allow for discussion of different points of view and the improvement of notions and ideas [32, p. 139-141].

When people are in agreement, they may convey alignment and consensus, which facilitates better communication and establishes **effective communication** [20, p. 1-3]. It eliminates uncertainty and misinterpretations by confirming that information is received and comprehended. A common strategy for developing a connection and confidence is agreement.

By expressing agreement, one can validate shared beliefs and interests and reinforce social ties, which will lead to the **building of relationships** [7, p. 2].

Agreement with **social norms and customs** contributes to the upkeep of societal harmony and order. It upholds social norms and collaboration. To elaborate, it can be emphasized that conformity to social standards encourages people to have common understanding, which in turn builds a stable and cohesive community. It serves for encouraging productive teamwork and communication. Furthermore, stressing the ways in which agreement to standards fosters a feeling of community and a common identity can emphasize the importance of consensus in maintaining social order and promoting peaceful relationships within a society.

Expressing agreement with the audience's point of view can be a potent strategy in **persuasive communication** [12, p. 87]. It increases credibility and gets in front of more open-minded people. By recognizing the audience's common ground, the

communicator builds rapport and increases the audience's receptivity to the message. Furthermore, the strategic use of agreement not only validates the viewpoint of the audience but also acts as a springboard for the introduction of fresh concepts or deftly directs the discussion in the direction of the intended result, strengthening the persuasive effect overall.

Agreement functions as a mechanism to **foster understanding and connection**. It establishes rapport, trust, and shared values among interlocutors. Robin Lakoff's exploration of language and gender underscores the role of agreement in maintaining social bonds, as women, in particular, may utilize agreement as a means of affirming relationships and solidarity [26, p. 45-79].

Agreement often serves as **positive reinforcement**. When someone says, "I think climate change is a pressing issue," an agreement response might be, "I completely agree; it's a significant concern." Agreement can indicate **shared values or beliefs**. Deborah Tannen noted that in conversations, agreement helps to create a sense of solidarity [41, p. 3-9]. For instance, "I'm a big fan of that author too; their writing is captivating."

In order to discuss diverse ideas and have **multiple perspectives** in dialogue, disagreement is fundamental [33, p. 47-64]. By questioning preconceived notions and concepts, it promotes critical thinking and a more thorough grasp of complicated topics.

It is also worth bearing in mind that a constructive means of addressing disputes and **conflict resolution** is made possible by disagreement [25, p. 4-5]. Reaching solutions that are agreeable to all parties is facilitated by compromise and negotiation. Disagreement honors the freedom of expression and the individual's liberty.

It promotes candid communication and recognizes the **diversity of opinions**.

Disagreement is essential for **encouraging diverse perspectives and critical thinking** [8, p. 291-335].

John Heritage's contributions to conversation analysis illuminate how disagreement prompts exploratory talk and allows for the examination of alternative

viewpoints [22, p. 663-672]. It serves as a catalyst for intellectual growth and innovation.

Disagreement can be a tool for **constructive debates** [21, p. 300-320]. Grice's "Conversational Implicature" theory emphasizes the importance of clear communication. When one person argues for a tax cut and another disagrees, it can lead to an informative discussion about economic policy.

Penelope Brown discussed how disagreement can help maintain **individual autonomy**. Saying "I can't do that" when asked to take on extra work can protect one's boundaries. She has also explored how people **mitigate disagreement** to maintain social harmony. In family conversations, for example, when a teenager disagrees with their parents' curfew rules, they might say, "I understand your concern, but what if we tried a compromise on the curfew?" [39, p. 529-545].

For intellectual and personal development, both agreement and disagreement are needed [28, p. 6-18]. Agreement serves as a sense of confirmation and solidifies understanding, which frequently boosts confidence. On the contrary, disagreement stimulates people's intellectual curiosity by pushing them to learn more about a subject, address opposing ideas, and ultimately increase their knowledge. In addition to fostering personal development, this dynamic interplay between agreement and disagreement enhances the intellectual environment as a whole by fostering a wide variety of viewpoints and insights [14, p. 439-458].

Agreement and disagreement are vital tools in conflict resolution. Agreement can signal compromise and common ground, while disagreement highlights areas of contention. The art of concession, as examined by researchers such as Emanuel A. Schegloff, underscores the importance of nuanced expressions of agreement and disagreement in navigating conflicts [35, p. 13-28].

In summary, agreement and disagreement are fundamental linguistic tools that facilitate effective communication, encourage the exchange of diverse perspectives, and play a vital role in resolving conflicts, building relationships, and promoting personal and societal growth. They are essential for the dynamic and adaptive nature of human language and interaction.

The understanding of agreement and disagreement is examined within the context of Grice's Cooperative Principle, Speech Act Theory, Conversational Analysis, Politeness Theory, Gender and Language, Pragmatic Markers and Discourse Markers.

British philosopher Herbert Paul Grice argued that language serves not only as a tool for conveying information, but also as a means to articulate thoughts and ideas. Speakers can express their personal opinions through agreement and disagreement, which is essential for self-expression and human autonomy. This was presented by H.P. Grice as the Cooperative Principle, a crucial idea in pragmatics. Four maxims — the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner — are said to be the foundation of effective communication.

Disagreement and agreement are frequently employed to uphold or violate these maxims. In response to the question "Is it cold outside?" with the statement "It's chilly," one is adhering to the **Maxim of Quantity** and giving the appropriate quantity of information.

One of the maxim exist, such the **Maxim of Manner**. Indirect disagreement may result from someone purposefully leaving anything unclear in their agreement. Saying something like, "You have an interesting point there," in a sarcastic manner, can convey disagreement without being direct.

Furthermore, disagreement can be linked to transgressions of Gricean maxims, including the **Maxim of Quality**. When someone states, "Your argument is... interesting," pausing and emphasizing the word, they are subtly disagreeing by implying that there isn't much to the argument [19, p. 41-58].

J.L. Austin and John Searle both point out the essential role of language in problem-solving and negotiation. When handled well, disagreements may lead to productive discussions and debates. It enables individuals to investigate various concepts, challenge presumptions, and come up with solutions as a group. Speech Act Theory investigates how language is used to carry out acts in addition to providing information. When something is said contrary to one's wishes, as "I'd prefer you didn't do that," they are engaging in speaking. Disagreement is a way to voice one's

preferences in this situation. Speech act theory is concerned with the functions of language that go beyond straightforward communication. Conflict can manifest itself in a variety of illocutionary acts.

Disagreements can be expressed as "commissives" when expressing rejection or dissent or as "assertives" when presenting opposing arguments. Speech acts purpose is the main emphasis of illocutionary acts. One instance would be a disagreement made by use of the illocutionary act of "assertion" when someone expresses a different viewpoint, such as "I don't think that's accurate."

Agreement in Speech Act Theory is categorised as a type of illocutionary act, where speakers perform an action by expressing their accord with a proposition. This can include agreeing with a statement "Yes, I agree," consenting to a request "Great, I'll do that," or confirming a proposal "Sounds like a good idea" [16, p. 983-1025].

According to Harvey Sacks, ethnomethodology is the study of how individuals interpret their social environment. Conversation analysis is a methodological approach that emphasizes examining communication by studying the organization and structure of conversations. Systematic examination of verbal and nonverbal cues, such as gestures, pauses, and conversational turn-taking, helps in understanding how people communicate with each other. It is a field that combines linguistics, sociology, psychology, and communication studies to study people's interactions in social contexts.

Adjacency pairs, or call-and-response sequences of consecutive utterances spoken by two different people, are among the most often defined conversational structures. Offer/Refusal:

- Sales clerk: Do you need someone to carry your packages out?
- Customer: No thanks. I've got it.

In the above-mentioned adjacency pair, the sales clerk uses the question "Do you need someone to carry your packages out?" His intention is to offer assistance to the customer. The customer's response clearly demonstrates that no help is required. The customer is actually stating that he or she can handle the task on his or her own.

Consequently, this adjacency pair demonstrates the disagreement between the proposal of the sales clerk and the customer's response [29, p. 180-186].

The Politeness Theory, created by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, describes how agreement and disagreement are related to preserving face, or social identity. People can manage potentially face-threatening circumstances and preserve social peace by using politeness strategies. Positive and negative politeness strategies are distinguished by politeness theory.

Consensus to preserve social harmony is a component of positive politeness. When responding, "I totally understand; it happens to all of us," to someone who says, "I had a tough day" one is using positive politeness to concur and provide support. Brown and Levinson outline four main types of politeness strategies: bald on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record (indirect) as well as simply not using the face-threatening act.

Although there are ways that bald on-record politeness can be used to try to limit face-threatening acts indirectly, such as offering advice in a non-manipulative manner, bald on-record strategy does not strive to lessen the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is typically used in settings where the speaker and listener have a close relationship, like in the case of family or close friends, because it frequently shocks or embarrasses the addressee.

Negative politeness strategies focus on avoiding imposing oneself on the hearer and are geared at the hearer's unfavorable face. The chance that the hearer will feel threatened in the face is decreased when the speaker tries to avoid imposing. Unlike positive politeness and bald on record strategies, these strategies assume that the speaker will be imposing on the audience and have a higher possibility for difficulty or humiliation.

The goal of positive politeness strategies is to reduce any danger to the hearer's good image. These strategies are most frequently employed in scenarios where the interlocutors is fairly acquainted with one another or if a person's positive face needs, or self-worth, must be satisfied. They aim to make the hearer feel good about themselves, their hobbies, or their belongings. By using indirect language, the off-

record strategy eliminates the speaker's potential for imposition. When speaking off-record, the speaker's intention is communicated by expressing something vague or different from what they truly intend, leaving it up to the listener's interpretation.

Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's theory on politeness extends to requests, where agreement or disagreement can be expressed indirectly. If someone asks, "Could you pass me the salt?" a polite agreement might be, "Of course, here you go," whereas a polite disagreement could be, "I'm sorry, I can't reach it." In the realm of politeness theory, disagreement can be masked politely. If the question "Can you work overtime this weekend?" is posed to someone and there is a need to disagree, a polite strategy might be used by saying, "I'd love to, but I already have plans."

Deborah Tannen has conducted research on how gender affects the usage of agreement and disagreement are used. According to Tannen's research, men may use disagreement as a means of arguing or asserting their independence, but women frequently use agreement to foster rapport and express support [42, p. 206].

Diana M Lewis states that pragmatic markers can signal agreement or disagreement explicitly. The pragmatic marker "indeed" can signal agreement. If someone says, "This is a challenging task," responding with "Indeed, it is" signifies agreement. Pragmatic markers are linguistic devices that signal the speaker's attitude towards the information conveyed. She has examined markers like "clearly," which can be used to signal strong agreement, or "actually," which might indicate mild disagreement [27, p. 351].

Deborah Tannen's research on discourse markers and gender differences in language use reveals how women often use markers like "I know what you mean" to express agreement and maintain rapport in conversation while men might employ markers like "I don't think so" to express disagreement. These markers can serve to align or differentiate speakers' perspectives.

In conclusion, agreement and disagreement are vital parts of verbal interaction since they are basic instruments for expressing uniqueness, encouraging meaningful conversation, creating social connections, and upholding social and cultural standards. They are essential to human connection and make successful communication possible.

Conclusions to chapter 1

This part explores the concepts of "agreement" and "disagreement" in communication studies and linguistics. The alignment of beliefs, behaviors, or personas that promotes compassion and rapport-building is known as agreement. A thorough grasp of agreement is provided by examining numerous dictionary definitions and linguistic stances, emphasizing the importance of agreement in interpersonal communication and manners.

Conversely, disagreement is defined as an opposition of beliefs, behaviors, or characters, encompassing anything from tacit rejections to outright inconsistencies. Various forms of disagreement are emphasized and their effects on communication are examined, taking into account aspects like gender, societal dynamics, and communication styles.

Chapter 1 provides a thorough examination of how agreement and disagreement play a crucial role in social and professional interactions. Disagreement is seen as essential for sharing different opinions, encouraging critical thinking, and preventing group conformity, while agreement is seen as a method for shaping beliefs, maintaining power, and building relationships. The purpose of this chapter is to deepen our understanding of agreement and disagreement by exploring linguistic theories. Grice's Cooperative Principle is introduced, showing how maxims like quantity, quality, relation, and style are used in language to represent individual ideas and objectives. Disagreements and agreements are used to examine Speech Act Theory, in particular the illocutionary acts of assertives and commissives.

With its foundation in ethnomethodology, Conversational Analysis emphasizes adjacency pairs and their importance for comprehending conversational structures. In order to maintain social harmony and face in agreement and disagreement circumstances, people use both positive and negative politeness strategies, which are outlined in Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory.

Deborah Tannen's research on gender variations in language use in relation to agreement and disagreement is taken into consideration. The discourse and pragmatic

markers that express explicit agreement or disagreement, like "indeed" or "I know what you mean," are also introduced.

This part of the research concludes by highlighting the crucial role that agreement and disagreement play in human speech and stressing its significance for various viewpoints, successful communication, conflict resolution, and the advancement of both individuals and society as a whole. The theoretical investigation provides a thorough grasp of these essential ideas by drawing on linguistic theory and real-world experiences.

2. UNDERSTANDING EXPRESSIONS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN LITERARY AND CINEMATIC CONTEXTS

2.1. Grammatical, lexical and nonverbal means of expressing agreement and disagreement

The study of speech activity in terms of linguistic pragmatics is a relatively recent field in linguistics. The theory of speech influence has garnered increasing interest in recent decades. The shift from F. de Saussure's "internal" study of language as a system to the "external" linguistics of speech, which includes linguopragmatics, the theory of speech activity, communicative linguistics, and the theory of linguistic personality, is one of the factors contributing to the increased interest in the theory of speech genres [1, p. 342].

Florii Batsevych introduces genealogy as a branch of communicative linguistics that focuses on speech genres in one of his publications. "A common way of establishing speech in a specific circumstance, intended to convey a certain meaning" is what he defines as a speech genre. Speech genres are regarded as significant communication categories in genealogy [2, p. 247]. Within the parameters of a communicative act, people converse. The speech acts of agreement and disagreement serve as a primary means of communication that govern social connections.

The primary concepts in human communication between an addressee and an addresser are agreement and disagreement. Depending on the setting, the circumstances, and whether it is conveyed orally or in written form, the concept of agreement or disagreement might be perceived in various ways. A favorable response or reaction to the other person's viewpoint or statement of will is what is referred to as agreement in interpersonal interactions, during communication or during the process of making a speech act. A unfavorable response to the addressee's remarks or rejection of them are implied by disagreement.

There are direct and indirect ways for conveying agreement and disagreement. Direct agreement/disagreement is based on the literal meaning of the sentence. Its

illocutionary formula has a direct connection with the utterance place, or more specifically, with its propositional content. The speech act of agreement and disagreement is stated explicitly in direct statements. In interpersonal communication, direct agreement can be expressed through dialogic discourse, as in the case of this example.

"My house looks well, doesn't it?" he demanded.

"See how the whole front of it catches the light."

I agreed that it was splendid. "Yes." [50, p. 69]

In a communication act, the following is a representation of how to convey direct disagreement.

"Just my Christmas dough. For presents and all. I haven't done any shopping at all yet."

"Oh." I didn't want to take her Christmas dough.

"You want some?" she said.

"I don't want to take your Christmas dough." [52, p. 96]

A bifurcation between a statement expressed and implied content, or between its meaning and content, is indicative of an indirect speech act of agreement or disagreement. The speaker utilises one speech action, but at the same time uses another. The agreement/disagreement component of an indirect statement can be observed within the sentence. An implicit way of conveying agreement or disagreement itself characterizes an indirect speech act of agreement or disagreement.

Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the speaker delivers more information while applying indirect speech acts of agreement or disagreement for the reason that he or she relies on the addressee's knowledge and capacity to make sense of what has been stated. Nonetheless, the perception and comprehension of agreement/disagreement in direct and indirect speech acts are driven by the same mechanisms. The usage of indirect agreement is illustrated by the following examples.

"You haven't broken anything?"

'I'm all right. It hurt for a moment, that's all' [51, p. 134]

"You should've thought of that before becoming a fireman."

"Was I given a choice? My grandfather and father were firemen. In my sleep, I ran after them." [54, p. 66]

Indirect disagreement can be expressed in the following way.

"Wouldn't you like some coffee?" I urged him.

"I'm all right now, Mr.— "

"Carraway." [50, p. 128]

Agreement and disagreement can be expressed in a variety of ways.

1. Nouns

The noun "agreement" is one of the primary nouns used to convey agreement.

"They would know now, if they had not known before, that he was breaking the agreement he had made with them." [51, p. 354]

"He was talking intently across the table at her, and in his earnestness his hand had fallen upon and covered her own. Once in a while she looked up at him and nodded in agreement." [50, p. 109]

The following nouns, which are within the synonymous range of the word "agreement" and have varying degrees of meaning, can also be used to signify agreement. These are nouns such as agreeing, assent, compliance, concord, concurrence, consent, harmony, union, unison. The analysis highlighted that these words were not all meaning precisely the same thing. While the aforementioned terms are all proposed as synonyms for the word agreement, not all of them define agreement as a favorable answer or response to the other person's viewpoint or declaration of intent.

A few of them define agreement as written statement, reciprocal friendliness, unity, harmonious connections, and occasionally a partnership or cooperation, for example: concord, harmony, union, unison. Nonetheless, since each of these words has the agreement sense, they are all inside the synonymy range of the word agreement. The most apparent resemblance between noun meanings, that is, between words that convey agreement as approval to act or as a favorable response, is found in the nouns concurrence (consensus, concordance), agreeing (approval, consensus), assent (endorsement, consent in case of an official application), compliance (accord, pliability

to rules and laws) and consent (permission, arrangement). It should be emphasized that the author's text, rather than dialogic speech, contains the majority of the aforementioned nouns.

For example: A young woman who was perhaps his secretary, and who was sitting with her back to Winston, was listening to him and seemed to be eagerly agreeing with everything that he said. [51, p. 69]

And she consented to drive to Mansfield, both of them, to dinner, to bring Connie back to the lane-end after dark, and to fetch her from the lane-end the next morning, herself sleeping in Mansfield, only half an hour away, good going. [49, p. 179]

Other noun that convey agreement can also be encountered. For example: Only if by change you mean has my love of libraries widened and deepened, to which the answer is a yes that ricochets off the stacks and dusts talcum off the librarian's cheek. [54, p. 222]

The following words make up the synonym range for the noun disagreement: altercation, argument, clash, conflict, debate, difference, discord, dissent, misunderstanding. Discord (strife, divergence of opinions) and dissent (difference of opinion, objection) are the nouns that most closely resemble the word disagreement in meaning and that indicate disagreement as an unfavorable response to something or disagreement with something. The nouns altercation, argument, clash, conflict, difference, misunderstanding, in addition to the concept of disagreement, carry the expression of a dispute, fight or quarrel with different emotional colors (in particular, altercation is a short but loud quarrel). For example: So they had given the gift of themselves, each to the youth with whom she had the most subtle and intimate arguments. [49, p. 6]

Other noun can also convey the meaning of disagreement, for example: Winston made another convulsive movement. This time he did not say anything. O'Brien continued as though answering a spoken objection: “For certain purposes, of course, that is not true...” [51, p. 336]

2. Adverbs, adjectives and interjections

The following adverbs can be used to express agreement.

For example: "Do you feel quite sure of that, Dorian?"

"Quite sure." [53]

'But you trust me, don't you?' she said.

'Oh, absolutely!'

She heard the mockery in his tone. [49, p. 168]

The adjectives used in dialogic speech are for example: A massive and lethargic woman, who had been urging Daisy to play golf with her at the local club tomorrow, spoke in Miss Baedeker's defence: "Oh, she's all right now." [50, p. 83]

Furthermore, interjections can be used:

"Well!" I inspected them. "That's a very interesting idea."

"Yeah." He flipped his sleeves up under his coat.

"Yeah, Gatsby's very careful about women. He would never so much as look at a friend's wife." [50, p. 56]

"Do you work every night?" I asked her — it sounded sort of awful, after I'd said it.

"Yeah." She was walking all around the room. She picked up the menu off the desk and read it. [52, p. 52]

Disagreement can be expressed by means of: absolutely not, definitely not, certainly not. "He has certainly not been paying me compliments. Perhaps that is the reason that I don't believe anything he has told me." [53]

3. Verbs

One of the primary ways to convey agreement or disagreement is with a verb. Agreement can be expressed with different verbs: to accede, to acquiesce, to admit, to agree, to allow, to assent, to comply, to concede, to concur, to consent, to grant, to permit. Though their meanings are nearly same, there are still significant distinctions among them all. For example, the verbs to agree and to concur mean to share someone's opinion in general.

"Dorian hesitated for a moment. Then he threw his head back and laughed. "I always agree with Harry, Duchess." [53]

The verbs to accede, to assent mean to agree with an idea, plan, proposal, demand. For example: She murmured something that seemed to be assent. [51, p. 219]

Verbs such as to acquiesce, to admit, to concede, to grant, to comply, carry the meaning of agreement, but express a reluctant attitude to something, or even a certain disagreement with what is said. For example, to admit means to reluctantly agree that something is true and correct or that someone is right. For example: “Dear Basil! I have not laid eyes on him for a week. It is rather horrid of me, as he has sent me my portrait in the most wonderful frame, specially designed by himself, and, though I am a little jealous of the picture for being a whole month younger than I am, I must admit that I delight in it.” [53]

The verb to allow means to agree, assume, or recognize that what is said is correct, according to rules or laws. For example: He refuses to allow that such a situation could arise [45].

The verbs to consent and to permit express agreement as a permission to do something: "We will see if Duncan will consent to figure as co-respondent: then we must get Clifford to divorce Connie: and you must go on with your divorce, and you must both keep apart till you are free." [49, p. 214]

Disagreement can be expressed with the following verbs: to argue, to bicker, to clash, to contend, to contest, to debate, to differ (in opinion), to dispute, to dissent, to fall out, to object, to oppose, to quarrel, to wrangle. All of these verbs belong to the synonymous range of the verb to disagree, which is one of the most basic and common verbs used to express disagreement. Many of these verbs express disagreement as a disagreement with an opinion, a negative reaction or a response to the addressee's words. For example, to disagree and to differ (in opinion) means to disagree, to have different opinions; to contest means to state in a formal way that you do not accept or agree with something; to object means to feel or say that you oppose or disapprove of something.

“Yes; I don’t suppose you will object to that. Georges Petit is going to collect all my best pictures for a special exhibition in the Rue de Sèze, which will open the first week in October. The portrait will only be away a month. [53]

Some of the verbs express disagreement as a quarrel, conflict, or dispute. For example, to quarrel means to argue; to fall out — to swear; to bicker — to argue, especially over something insignificant. The verbs to argue and to wrangle also express disagreement as a conflict and dispute, but in an aggressive and angry manner. Verbs such as to clash, to dispute, to dissent, to oppose convey opposition or disagreement with certain facts, ideas, official decisions, or plans. For example: 'No! She said she was coming back, and she's got to come.' Mrs Bolton opposed him no more. She knew what she was dealing with. [49, p. 220]

Verbs that express agreement/disagreement in combination with the negative particle not or other verbs of negative meaning change their semantic feature and turn a positive attitude into a negative one, and vice versa. Thus, the meaning of disagreement turns into the meaning of agreement. It should be noted that this is what makes a seemingly positive assessment somewhat weaker.

4. Certain well-established expressions

Iryna Rudyk defines pragmatic idioms as "units of heterogeneous component composition, heterogeneous structural organization, and degree of stability, the specificity of which is due to their specialization in expressing communicative intent, speaker's intention, various kinds of personal meanings associated with the speaker, that is, basic, dominant, and additional, secondary, auxiliary pragmatic meanings" [4, p. 1-17].

Agreement can be expressed as a pragmatic idiom. For example: "Don't be ridiculous, Holden. Get back in that bed. I'm going to bed myself. The money will be there safe and sound in the morn—"

"No, no kidding. I gotta get going. I really do." [52, p. 104]

The example of disagreement is: "I'll have finished it by tomorrow." "And pigs might fly!" [45]. The phrase "when pigs fly" (alternatively, "pigs might fly") is an adynaton — a figure of speech so hyperbolic that it describes an impossibility.

5. Syntax

- Agreeing or disagreeing can also be expressed using the repetition structure

Agreement:

'So icy!' she said gasping.

'Good, isn't it! Did you wish?'

'Did you?'

'Yes, I wished. But I won't tell.' [49, p. 135]

Disagreement:

Isn't it rather terrible, when you've been intimate with her, to hate her so? Why is it?'

'I don't know. She sort of kept her will ready against me, always, always: her ghastly female will: her freedom! A woman's ghastly freedom that ends in the most beastly bullying! Oh, she always kept her freedom against me, like vitriol in my face.' [49, p. 209]

Quite often, instead of the repetition itself, agreement or disagreement is conveyed only by a short response from the addressee. For example: Oh dear, oh dear! Then I'll telephone to Sheffield for Dr Carrington, and Dr Lecky may as well run round straight away.' She was moving to the door, when he said in a hollow tone: 'No!' [49, p. 217]

- Sometimes agreement and disagreement are conveyed by a more informative and extended response to a question, suggestion, opinion, etc.

For example: Anyway, I gave her a buzz. First the maid answered. Then her father. Then she got on. "Sally?" I said.

"Yes—who is this?" she said. She was quite a little phony. I'd already told her father who it was. [52, p. 57]

- Agreement and disagreement can also be realized with the help of a rhetorical question, which expresses the speaker's disagreement with the addressee's actions or deeds and also conveys additional information about his/her attitude towards them.

For example: "What the hell do you mean you don't know when he's coming back? He never comes back till Sunday night, does he?"

"No, but for Chrissake, I can't just tell somebody they can sleep in his goddam bed if they want to." [52, p. 26]

6. Nonverbal cues

Nonverbal cues used to indicate agreement and disagreement are a frequently occurring phenomenon. These concepts can reinforce and enhance spoken words, as well as assist with expressing feelings that words alone might not be able to express. Additionally, nonverbal cues can offer context, which clarifies intents and interpretations. Nonverbal agreements and disagreements are conveyed by facial expressions and eye contact, body movements and gestures, touch and voice [23] [46].

- Facial expressions and eye contact

Agreement

1. Smile: 'It's very pleasant up here,' he said, with his queer smile, as if it hurt him to smile, showing his teeth. [49, p. 33]
2. Grin: Montag grinned the fierce grin of all men singed and driven back by flame. [54, p. 1]
3. Beam (twinkle): "I am." Mildred's mouth beamed. "And proud of it." [54, p. 31]
4. Wink: 'This idea is that we're Nordics. I am, and you are and you are and——' After an infinitesimal hesitation he included Daisy with a slight nod and she winked at me again. [50, p. 16]
5. Glance: And she glanced triumphantly at the already sleeping Clifford, as she stepped softly from the room. [49, p. 213]

Disagreement

1. Frown (scowl): He frowned and bit his lip. "Send him in," he muttered, after some moments' hesitation. [53]
2. Roll eyes: Though her mother, oh, holy saints!' He rolled his eyes to heaven. [49, p. 418]
3. Sneer: However, that was my fault, for he was one of those who used to sneer most bitterly at Gatsby on the courage of Gatsby's liquor and I should have known better than to call him. [50, p. 181]
4. Grimace: A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge-hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current, turning one even against one's will into a grimacing, screaming lunatic. [51, p. 19]

5. Glance: They walked the rest of the way in silence, hers thoughtful, his a kind of clenching and uncomfortable silence in which he shot her accusing glances. [54, p. 4]

- Body movements and gestures

Agreement

1. Nod: You can't afford to lose a minute. Not you." I nodded, because he was looking right at me and all, but I wasn't too sure what he was talking about. [52, p. 101]
2. Handshake: I stopped on the way, though, and picked up Ackley's hand, and gave him a big handshake. [52, p. 28]
3. Clap: I partly blame all those dopes that clap their heads off--they'd foul up anybody. [52, p. 46]
4. Applaud: She stepped back a few paces and her lips seemed to tremble. Basil Hallward leaped to his feet and began to applaud. [53]

Disagreement

1. Cross arms: Winston sat quietly, his hands crossed. [51, p. 292]
 2. Bite lips: He frowned and bit his lip. "Send him in," he muttered, after some moments' hesitation. [53]
 3. Turn away: After all, Michaelis had had the decency to turn away. This man was so assured in himself he didn't know what a clown other people found him, a half-bred fellow. [49, p. 254]
- Touch

Agreement

1. Pat: I reached up from where I was sitting on the floor and patted him on the goddam shoulder. [52, p. 26]
2. Hand on shoulder: I figured it was a good chance to catch up with her and all. I went up and sort of stood behind her and sort of put my hands on her shoulders. [52, p. 112]

Disagreement

1. Push: 'I'm going to push you!' she said. [49, p. 281]

2. Pull: 'All right, says Rosy and begins to get up and I pulled him down in his chair. "'Let the bastards come in here if they want you, Rosy, but don't you, so help me, move outside this room? [50, p. 76]

- Voice

Agreement

1. Murmur: 'Flowers stops out of doors all weathers,' he said. "They have no houses.' 'Not even a hut!' she murmured. [49, p. 329]

Disagreement

2 Snarl: ' LET HER TRY!' snarled Clifford, with all his emphasis. [49, p. 277]

2.2 Linguo-stylistic analysis of agreement and disagreement based on dialogues from chosen movies

In order to examine the usage of agreement and disagreement, I performed a linguistic and stylistic analysis of four films, each of which is a distinct genre (drama, detective, comedy, or romance). The primary goal of linguistic analysis of literary texts is to examine language tools at various levels within the system of the text from both a functional and artistic perspective, as well as from the perspective of how well it adheres to the author's unique style and concept. [5, p. 298]. Understanding the variations and commonalities in these ideas' expression across different film genres is also regarded as a goal.

The first movie to be examined is the drama "The Father" [57].

I've met someone?

You? (Surprised)

Yes. (agreement, verbal)

No, no, it's just that, I mean, huh (Smile) (disagreement, verbal and nonverbal)

00:08:50

The repeated "no" shows disagreement or the need to correct an earlier assumption, but the adverb "yes" expresses agreement with the query above. It's essential as well to note that adding the exclamation "huh" to a nonverbal smile conveys a hint of hesitation or slight dissent, suggesting that the situation may not be as important as the other person may have thought.

What are you doing here?

I live here.

You?

Yes (agreement, verbal)

Oh, that's the best yet

What is this nonsense? Huh? (disagreement, verbal) 00:14:35

The exclamation "huh" also conveys skepticism, and the questioning phrase "What is this nonsense?" with the noun "nonsense" serves as the primary indication of

disagreement. The straightforward affirmation denoted by the adverb "yes" expresses agreement with the question.

Anne. Where is she?

I'm here.

Oh, I see. (agreement, verbal) 00:20:20

"Oh, I see" is a statement that agrees with the scenario by utilizing the verb "see" to acknowledge or comprehend Anne's presence.

Are you hungry?

Yes. Why not? (agreement, verbal) 00:20:36

The straightforward affirmation provided by the adverb "yes" verifies that the speaker agrees with the question posed and that one is, in fact, hungry. "Why not?" is consistent with the original question on hunger because it suggests a readiness to eat or a lack of justification for not being hungry.

He told her he'd been a dancer. A tap dancer.

Yeah (Smile) (agreement, verbal and nonverbal) 00:37:32

"Yeah" is an interjection used to express agreement or affirmation. The nonverbal smile conveys acceptance and shows amusement at the statement.

I think you have to come up with a different solution. He's totally lost it.

Stop talking like that. (Angry) (disagreement, verbal and nonverbal) 00:57:28

The order to "stop talking like that," denoted by the word "angry," conveys a firm and unwavering disagreement with the preceding recommendation.

Sorry. Um, it won't happen again. (agreement, verbal) 01:03:40

The speaker recognizes the preceding assertion and pledges to follow the recommended conduct going forward. This was shown by the verb "sorry" and the following statement "it won't happen again."

Who put them there? I don't know.

Obviously my daughter, obviously (agreement, verbal) 01:04:05

"Obviously my daughter, obviously" conveys a firm belief that "them" was placed there by the speaker's daughter. The adverb "obviously" is used twice, highlighting the speaker's conviction in the claim.

You need to bear that in mind. Do you understand?

Yes, I'll bear that in mind. (agreement, verbal) 01:05:28

Adverb "yes" and the idiomatic phrase "bear that in mind" are repeated to show that the speaker understands and agrees with the command. The speaker promises to take into account the information supplied and recognizes its significance.

Job is done.

Bravo. (agreement, verbal) 01:06:45

The noun "bravo" is a direct way to commend and acknowledge someone for a job being done well.

There were a total of 12 instances of agreement and disagreement utilized in this instance (3 disagreements and 9 agreements). Additionally, these ideas were supported by nonverbal means of expressing emotions in two situations of agreement and one example of disagreement.

The aforementioned quotes from the dialogues in the drama film indicate that the style is primarily conversational and reflects the characters' regular conversations [41, p. 3-9]. Whether the conversation is one of agreement, disagreement, shock, or rage, it ultimately serves a purpose and develops the plot and the characters. Stylistically, a combination of nonverbal and verbal patterns, including body language, tone of voice, and facial expressions, provide the depth to the conversation. The interactions sound more realistic and personable to the audience because of the use of short and simple direct language.

"Gone girl," a detective story [56], was the second movie to be analyzed.

You want to drive him home?

I have honk that'd be wise.

Thanks. (agreement, verbal) 00:18:11

The exclamation "thanks" expresses thankfulness and shows that one is open to considering the offer.

Oh, you really don't like him, do you?

What's to like? (agreement, verbal) 00:36:30

It is implied by the rhetorical question "What's to like?" that there is nothing to like about the subject, thereby implying that it is not advised to like him.

You going to the marina? I could use some creamer.

I'm sorry. I can't. (disagreement, verbal) 01:16:00

"To be sorry" and "can't" are responses that convey an unwillingness or incapacity to comply with the request. It expresses disapproval of the suggestion and immediately contradicts the original question about visiting the marina.

All right. See you round.

You will. (agreement, verbal) 01:16:04

"You will" is used to reaffirm that another encounter is anticipated, which is consistent with the original assertion.

Told you that you came to the right guy.

Apparently. (agreement, verbal) 01:21:50

The adverb "apparently" conveys approval of the claim without making it clear that one agrees.

Don't show your face.

No problem. (agreement, verbal) 01:46:20

"No problem" is a negative particle and noun that agrees with the first sentence by implying that the speaker has no trouble following the instruction.

I should watch on my own.

Nonsense. (disagreement, verbal) 01:50:07

The noun "nonsense" suggests that the speaker thinks the statement is false or illogical, implying that it is neither necessary nor wise to watch alone.

More coffee?

Yeah, I'd love it (agreement, verbal) 01:59:15

The construction "would love" and the interjection "yeah" convey enthusiasm and a desire for more coffee, which is in line with the original query.

Six agreements and two disagreements totaling eight instances of verbal agreement and disagreement were employed in the detective.

The short, frequently cryptic speech in the detective film reflects the emphasis on mystery and intrigue that is relevant to this genre [3, p. 61-63]. The conversations frequently contain a lot of subtext, which encourages viewers to go past the obvious and discover concealed motives or conflicts. The succinctness of the dialogues heightens the tension and sense of urgency, drawing the viewer in as the story develops.

The romance film "The Holiday" [58] serves as the third case study for analysis.

I expect it's somewhere in my car.

Do you want to know what is it?

No. No, no, that's okay (disagreement, verbal) 00:07:05

"No. No, no, that's okay" firmly rejects the concept that one should know what is in the car and declines the invitation to find out. The interjection "no" is used often to highlight rejection or disagreement with the proposition.

Is this a bad time?

No. I'm just flipping out a little bit. (agreement, verbal) 00:16:00

By using the adverb "no," the response implies agreement with the question that it's not a bad moment, but it also admits and concurs with the statement that the speaker is feeling overwhelmed or anxious.

People actually do that?

Apparently. Yeah. I mean, it seems (agreement, verbal) 00:41:10

The adverb "apparently" and the interjection "yeah" convey recognition or acceptance of the reality, and the phrase "it seems" adds more support to the idea of agreement by indicating that the speaker believes this to be a feasible or credible event.

Am I pretty much talking you out of this?

Strangely, not at all. (disagreement, verbal) 00:47:29

The idiom "not at all" and the adverb "strangely" both run counter to the idea that the speaker is being talked out of something. It expresses dissatisfaction with the assumption and suggests that, contrary to expectations, the speaker is not being convinced or dissuaded against something.

Maybe we can see one together sometime.

All right. Cool. (agreement, verbal) 01:15:00

The adverb “all right” and the adjective “cool” convey agreement and excitement for the idea of going somewhere together at some point. This suggests openness to the idea and enthusiasm for it, which is consistent with the original proposal.

Amanda, are you by any chance at all into hot chocolate?

I'm totally into it. (agreement, verbal) 01:20:03

The idiom "be totally into something" in this response denotes agreement with the question regarding hot chocolate. It satisfies the first question by confirming that the speaker enjoys hot chocolate.

You know, if you wanted to sleep over, that would be all right.

Sorry. That's so sweet of you to invite me, but maybe another time. (disagreement, verbal) 01:24:00

The verb “sorry” with the following excuse indicates mild disagreement with the suggestion to sleep over, offering appreciation for the gesture while declining the invitation for the current moment.

Do you want some company?

Love some. (agreement, verbal) 01:33:53

When the verb "love" is used with the determiner "some," it indicates that the offer is clearly accepted and shows enthusiasm for the provided firm.

Eight instances of verbal agreement and disagreement on were used in this movie (3 disagreements and 5 agreements).

The gentle and personal discussions that characterize the style of this movie reflect its emphasis on relationships and emotional ties. The language is comforting and soft, highlighting the characters' mutual understanding and empathy [13, p. 114-115]. The dialogue additionally has a sense of vulnerability as the characters struggle through their emotions and uncertainties, which deepens their exchanges. Warmth and honesty characterize the conversations, fostering an intimate atmosphere that speaks to the audience and emphasizes the themes of love and friendship.

The comedy "Dirty Rotten Scoundrels" [55] was the last movie to be examined.

If you're in trouble and I can help...

Thank you. But I cannot accept. (disagreement, verbal) 00:06:39

Exclamation "Thank you" and an apology proceed, expressing appreciation for the offer of assistance but finally declining or rejecting it. It demonstrates clear disagreement.

Five years? (agreement, nonverbal) 00:07:43

In this instance, nonverbal cues like head nods and eye blinks indicate agreement.

Excuse me. May I sit here, please?

If you like. (agreement, verbal) 00:09:14

Although "if you like" is not conveying agreement directly, it does imply acceptance or approval of the request, which is consistent with the original query.

You're married, aren't you?

You can tell? (agreement, verbal) 00:12:55

The question "You can tell" implies agreement with the speaker's marital status, albeit sarcastically, given that it is a question in response to another query.

I have to phone my wife and children.

They really got you on a leash.

Afraid so. (agreement, verbal) 00:14:46

The claims that the speaker is "on a leash" because of their responsibilities to call their wife and kids are acknowledged and supported by the adjective "afraid" and the adverb "so." It is consistent with the first statement in that it implies acceptance of the circumstances.

He's trickster. Will Madame sign the complaint?

Gladly. (agreement, verbal) 00:20:08

The adverb "gladly" indicates agreement with Madame's signing of the complaint and indicates that she is prepared and willing to move on with the action.

I'll teach you and pay you a percentage.

Great! (agreement, verbal) 00:28:00

"Great" is an adjective that conveys enthusiasm or positive reinforcement.

Would you like to meet him fight now?

I would love to. (agreement, verbal) 00:34:10

The grammatical construction "would love to" expresses fervent agreement with the suggestion to meet someone.

You understand?

Absolutely (agreement, verbal) 00:59:35

"Absolutely" is an adverb that confirms comprehension and agreement with the question.

Now tell me, do you feel this?

..... No. (disagreement, nonverbal) from 01:02:40 till 01:03:40

The lengthy pause and the adverb "No" suggest tension and acknowledged disapproval of the query.

Ten instances of agreement and disagreement, two disagreements and eight agreements, were used in the comedy. Notably, one instance of agreement and one instance of disagreement were conveyed nonverbally.

The intelligent conversations and cheerful interactions that characterize the comedy film style reflect the genre's emphasis on humor and lightheartedness. Quick repartee and witty wordplay are common features of the language, which heightens the humorous effect [24, p. 22]. Humorous phrases are delivered and structured in a humorous way by using verbal cues to indicate agreement or disagreement.

Table 1 — *Number of agreement and disagreement in each film*

<i>Drama</i>	<i>Detective story</i>	<i>Romance</i>	<i>Comedy</i>
The Father — 12 cases of agreement and disagreement	Gone Girl — 8 cases of agreement and disagreement	The Holiday — 8 cases of agreement and disagreement	Dirty Rotten Scoundrels — 10 cases of agreement and disagreement
<u>Agreement</u> (9): 7 verbal cases + 2 nonverbal cases	<u>Agreement</u> (6): 6 verbal cases	<u>Agreement</u> (5): 5 verbal cases	<u>Agreement</u> (8): 7 verbal cases + 1 nonverbal case

<u>Disagreement (3):</u> 2 verbal cases + 1 nonverbal case	<u>Disagreement (2):</u> 2 verbal cases	<u>Disagreement (3):</u> 3 verbal cases	<u>Disagreement (2):</u> 1 verbal case + 1 nonverbal case
--	--	--	---

Table 2 — *Comparison of usage of agreement and disagreement in each film*

<u>Title of the film</u>	<u>Frequency of verbal expressions</u>	<u>Nonverbal cues</u>	<u>Tone and context</u>
The Father	When compared to disagreement, this movie exhibits the highest frequency of agreement. Direct affirmations, such "yes," are frequently used in the conversation to show a willingness to agree with other characters' comments or inquiries. Disagreement is indicated by expressions such as "What is this nonsense?" and "Stop talking like that," which make it evident that one is against specific	Nonverbal cues like a smile and the interjection "huh" are used to show the intricacy of the relationships between the characters and give depth to their interactions by highlighting the complexity of the characters' emotions and perspectives.	Conveys a mood of melancholy reflection, with themes of ambiguity and bewilderment frequently entwined with disagreement and agreement.

	concepts or recommendations.		
Gone Girl	<p>Characters in "Gone Girl" frequently use verbal cues to hide their genuine intentions, which highlights the tension and dishonesty in the story. Expressions like "apparently" and "thanks," which convey characters' enthusiasm or acceptance of other people's offers or statements, are used throughout this film. "Sorry," "can't," and "nonsense" are used to express disagreement and indicate a resistance to following instructions or recommendations.</p>	No examples of nonverbal cues	<p>Depicts an uncomfortable and stressful environment in which the detective story's suspense and intrigue are increased by the use of agreement and disagreement.</p>
The Holiday	As characters work through	No examples of nonverbal cues	Presents a sentimental and

	<p>miscommunications and issues in their relationships, "The Holiday" delves into topics of communication and connection through spoken encounters. Examples of agreement include "apparently" and "yeah," which denote acceptance or acknowledgment of particular circumstances or claims. "No," "sorry," and firmly rejecting offers or invitations are clear signs of disagreement.</p>		<p>carefree atmosphere, emphasizing the complexities of character connections and interactions through topics of agreement and disagreement.</p>
<p>Dirty Rotten Scoundrels</p>	<p>In "Dirty Rotten Scoundrels," characters converse amusingly and playfully with one another as they maneuver through a variety of plots and</p>	<p>Long pause, head nod, and eye blink are examples of nonverbal cues that enhance character interactions with humour and complexities. They</p>	<p>Shows a lighthearted and humorous tone, using agreement and disagreement to heighten the irony and wit in the discourse.</p>

	<p>deceptions, adding to the film's humorous tone. The humor uses upbeat expressions like "great" and "absolutely" to convey characters' acceptance or comprehension of particular suggestions or queries. The expressions "no" and "cannot accept," which indicate a courteous rejection of an offer, are used to express disagreement.</p>	<p>also highlight the film's comic tone and highlight hidden issues and disputes.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Conclusions to chapter 2

The above-mentioned part of the bachelor's thesis is devoted to the study of the mechanisms of agreement and disagreement in linguistic pragmatics, with a special emphasis on communicative categories and speech genres. The analysis reveals the various ways in which agreement and disagreement occur in interpersonal interactions by examining a wide range of linguistic examples, including syntactic structures, linguistic expressions, and direct and indirect speech acts.

The beginning of the analysis presents the conceptual framework of linguistic pragmatics and how it relates to the comprehension of speech genres. Moreover, it focuses on how the theory of speech influence has become more widely accepted in recent years, demonstrating the transition from studying language internally to studying speech activities externally.

The thesis explores the methodologies behind agreement and disagreement, clarifying the differences within direct and indirect interaction. It highlights how agreement and disagreement can be expressed clearly in direct utterances and tacitly via indirect speech acts, that are contingent on the addressee's awareness and situational comprehension, utilizing illustrations from literary texts and dialogues.

Besides, the analysis examines at how agreement and disagreement are represented linguistically in a variety of language elements, including nouns, adverbs, adjectives, interjections, verbs, pragmatic idioms, and syntax. It considers the ways in which every linguistic element makes a contribution to the complex expression of agreement and disagreement, underlining minute distinctions between intonation and connotation.

Furthermore, the thesis broadens its look into filmmaking discourse by performing a linguistic and stylistic examination of four films that relate to various genres. Through analyzing conversations from comedy, drama, romance and detective story, the study reveals the various strategies used in film narratives to represent agreement and disagreement.

To sum up, the following part of the bachelor's thesis increases knowledge on how discourse affects social dynamics and interactions among people.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Regardless of the personal or professional setting, agreement and disagreement are essential parts of regular communication between individuals. The theoretical framework and function of terms like agreement and disagreement in the English language is presented in the Chapter 1. The representation of these concepts in literature and cinema is then highlighted in the Chapter 2. Despite the seeming simplicity of agreement and disagreement, a thorough examination of these ideas is crucial in the context of contemporary English owing to the fundamental roles they serve in communication.

For the purpose of the formulation of a new definition for these concepts, the first part includes definitions from dictionaries as well as scientific and linguistic explanations of the concepts of agreement and disagreement.

The act of verbally expressing consensus or concordance with a claim, assertion, or viewpoint made by someone else is known as agreement. Disagreement also means expressing disagreement, contradiction, or discord with the claims made. It is additionally significant to take into account that these ideas can be communicated both verbally and nonverbally.

In the first part of the work, it is additionally mentioned how agreement and disagreement are crucial in interacting and negotiating in many social and professional contexts.

They are important for effective and persuasive communication, building relationships, fostering understanding and connection, multiple perspectives and constructive debates. Establishing effective connections and communicating effectively is nearly unattainable without agreement and disagreement, albeit these are only some of their crucial roles.

Moreover, the comprehension of agreement and disagreement is examined within the context of diverse linguistic approaches, such as Grice's Cooperative Principle, Speech Act Theory, Conversational Analysis, Politeness Theory, Gender and Language, Pragmatic and Discourse Markers.

So, this part explores the concepts of “agreement” and “disagreement” in communication studies and linguistics, highlighting their crucial role in social and professional relationships.

With regard to the second part of the work, which is practical, it examines how the concepts of agreement and disagreement are expressed grammatically, lexically and non-verbally.

In the six selected literary works instances of agreement and disagreement are identified through the examination of dialogues and narrative passages. The manifestation of agreement and disagreement is shown through the division into nouns, adverbs, adjectives, interactions, verbs, well-established expressions, syntax and nonverbal cues. In general, in this part there are 54 examples of agreement and disagreement.

Instances of agreement are classified by the expressions of concurrence, endorsement, or alignment with another’s viewpoint or position. Similarly, instances of disagreement are viewed according to the expressions of opposition, contradiction, or refusal. These cases are further categorised into direct and indirect forms.

Linguistic forms, syntactic structures and nonverbal cues are examined for their roles in conveying agreement or disagreement along with their nuances and contextual variations within the literary discourse.

The study examines at a variety of language instances, including syntactic structures, linguistic expressions, and direct and indirect speech acts, in order to evaluate the numerous ways that agreement and disagreement take place within the passages of chosen books.

The subsequent linguistic and stylistic analysis is based on four films. During the chosen film corpus analysis, 38 cases of the use of consent and disagreement, both verbal and non-verbal, were identified and analyzed. Each instance is based on the context and content of the dialogues.

The situational elements, including the characters’ relationships, emotions and motivations are examined to determine how they influence the expression of agreement and disagreement.

The role of agreement and disagreement in character development, plot progression and audience engagement are explored in the context of each genre, considering how linguistic and stylistic aspects contribute to overall narrative style specific to drama, detective story, comedy and romance films.

The results showed that in the four selected films, the number of uses of agreement and disagreement is almost equal and similar from the point of view of linguistics. The difference is presented through the difference in context and moments when the concepts of agreement and disagreement manifest themselves along with non-verbal emotions, which affects and defines the style.

The analysis presents the link between speech comprehension and linguistic pragmatics. This thesis looks into the concepts of agreement and disagreement within English discourse, particularly in movies and literature. It is pertinent to comprehending the dynamics of communication in various sociolinguistic contexts. Communicating effectively involves an understanding of linguistic strategies like agreement and disagreement since these concepts reveal diverse viewpoints on the transformation of language and discourse in society.

REFERENCES

Theoretical sources

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2004). Основи комунікативної лінгвістики/Флорій Сергійович Бацевич. *К.: Академія*, с. 342.
2. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2006). Вступ до лінгвістичної генології/Флорій Сергійович Бацевич. *К.: Академія*, с. 247.
3. Майборода, Н. (2021). Лексико-семантичні особливості детективних романів Андрія Кокотюхи. *Філологічний часопис*, (2), с. 61-63.
4. Рудик, І. М. (2000). *Комунікативно-прагматичні типи висловлювань зі значенням згоди/незгоди в сучасній англійській мові* (Doctoral dissertation, Харків), с. 1-17.
5. Чистякова, О. С. (2016). Лінгвостилістичний аналіз художнього тексту. *Наукові записки Національного університету Острозька академія. Серія: Філологічна*, (60), с. 298.
6. Antara, N. P. (2024). Expressing Agreement and Disagreement, p. 3-5.
7. Bar-Tal, D. (2000). *Shared beliefs in a society: Social psychological analysis*. Sage, p. 2.
8. Bickmore, K., & Parker, C. (2014). Constructive conflict talk in classrooms: Divergent approaches to addressing divergent perspectives. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 42(3), p. 291-335.
9. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311). Cambridge University Press, p. 101.
10. Cambridge English Dictionary. Agreement. Disagreement.
11. Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge university press, p. 32-33.
12. Conger, J. A. (1998). The necessary art of persuasion. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, p. 87.
13. Dewi, N. M. A. J., Ediwan, I. N. T., & Suastra, I. M. (2020). Language style in romantic movies. *Humanis: Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 24(2), p. 114-115.

14. Dong, Y., Bartol, K. M., Zhang, Z. X., & Li, C. (2017). Enhancing employee creativity via individual skill development and team knowledge sharing: Influences of dual-focused transformational leadership. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 38(3), p. 439-458.
15. Etymonline. Online Etymology Dictionary. Agree (v.).
16. Fish, S. E. (1976). How to do things with Austin and Searle: Speech act theory and literary criticism. *MLN*, 91(5), p. 983-1025.
17. Georgakopoulou, A. (2001). Arguing about the future: On indirect disagreements in conversations. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(12), p. 1881-1900.
18. Georgakopoulou, A. (2012). 'A simple disagreement? A row? Or a massive fall out?': On the challenges of an analytical task. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), p. 1623-1625.
19. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill.
20. Hartnett, T. (2011). *Consensus-oriented decision-making: The CODM model for facilitating groups to widespread agreement*. new society publishers, p. 1-3.
21. Heritage, J. (2009). Conversation analysis as social theory. *The new Blackwell companion to social theory*, p. 300-320.
22. Heritage, J., & Stivers, T. (2012). Conversation analysis and sociology. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, p. 663-672.
23. Hunyadi, L. (2019). Agreeing/disagreeing in a dialogue: multimodal patterns of its expression. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 453347.
24. King, G. (2002). *Film comedy*. Wallflower Press, p. 22.
25. Kriesberg, L. (2007). *Constructive conflicts: From escalation to resolution*. Rowman & Littlefield, p. 4-5.
26. Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in society*, 2(1), p. 45-79.
27. Lewis, D. M. (2021). Pragmatic markers at the periphery and discourse prominence. *Pragmatic markers and peripheries*, p. 325, 351.

28. Metaxiotis, K., Ergazakis, K., & Psarras, J. (2005). Exploring the world of knowledge management: agreements and disagreements in the academic/practitioner community. *Journal of knowledge management*, 9(2), p. 6-18.
29. Moerman, M., & Sacks, H. (1988). On “understanding” in the analysis of natural conversation. *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*, p. 180-186.
30. Munch-Jurišić, D. M. (2014). Perpetrator Abhorrence: Disgust as a Stop Sign. *Metaphilosophy*, 45(2), p. 270-287.
31. Muntigl, P., & Turnbull, W. (1998). Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of pragmatics*, 29(3), p. 225-256.
32. Nemeth, C. (2018). No!: The power of disagreement in a world that wants to get along. Atlantic Books, p. 139-141.
33. Ong, B., Barnes, S., & Buus, N. (2022). Developing multiple perspectives by eliding agreement: A conversation analysis of Open Dialogue reflections. *Discourse Studies*, 24(1), p. 47-64.
34. Paramasivam, S. (2007). Managing disagreement while managing not to disagree: Polite disagreement in negotiation discourse. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 36(2), p. 91-116.
35. Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I (Vol. 1). Cambridge university press, p. 13-28.
36. Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(12), p. 1554-1564.
37. Sornig, K. (1977). Disagreement and contradiction as communicative acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1(4), p. 347-373.
38. Spangle, M. L., & Isenhardt, M. W. (2002). Negotiation: Communication for diverse settings. Sage Publications, p. 2-3.
39. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of pragmatics*, 34(5), p. 529-545.

40. Tannen, D. (1995). The power of talk: Who gets heard and why. *Harvard business review*, 73, p. 138.
41. Tannen, D. (2005). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Oxford University Press, p. 3-9.
42. Tannen, D. (2011). You just don't understand, p. 206.
43. The Britannica Dictionary. Agree.
44. The Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. Disagreement.
45. The Oxford Learner's Dictionary. Agree. Allow. Pigs might fly.
46. Tuyen, N. T. V., & Celiktutan, O. (2022, August). Agree or disagree? generating body gestures from affective contextual cues during dyadic interactions. In *2022 31st IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)* (pp. 1542-1547). IEEE.
47. Vocabulary.com Dictionary. Agreement. Disagreement.
48. Walkinshaw, I. (2015) *Agreement and Disagreement*. Griffith University, Australia.

Illustrative materials

Literature

49. D. H. Lawrence. (2024). *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. [eBook #73144]
50. F. Scott Fitzgerald. (2021). *The Great Gatsby*. [eBook #64317]
51. G. Orwell. 1894. Planet eBook.
52. J. D. Salinger. (2019). *The Catcher in the Rye*. Internet Archive.
53. O. Wilde. (2022). *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. [eBook #174]
54. R. Bradbury. (2013). *Fahrenheit 451*. Edublogs.

Films

55. *Dirty Rotten Scoundrels*. (1988).
56. *Gone girl*. (2014).
57. *The Father*. (2020).
58. *The Holiday*. (2006).

SUMMARY

Мова — це основа людського спілкування, складна комбінація термінів, ідіом і виразів, що дає змогу обмінюватися почуттями і думками. Крім лінгвістичних понять, згода і незгода визначають межі розуміння і самовираження в усіх видах взаємодій: від неформальної до формальної. Вивчення сучасного англійського дискурсу вимагає розуміння понять згоди та незгоди. Вони є складними та різноманітними й потребують ретельного вивчення.

В цій роботі данні поняття розглядаються на основі наукової літератури з огляду на способи їхнього вираження в кіно та книжках. Метою даного дослідження є аналіз англійських визначень згоди та незгоди. Практична значущість полягає у застосуванні мультимодальної методології для дослідження динаміки згоди та незгоди в фільмах і книгах.

Теоретична основа та функції таких понять, як згода та незгода в англійській мові, представлені в першому розділі; у другому розділі згода і незгода висвітлюється через приклади з літератури і кінематографу. Незважаючи на, здавалося б, простоту згоди та незгоди, їх ретельне вивчення має вирішальне значення в контексті сучасної англійської мови через значущу роль, яку вони відіграють у спілкуванні.

Задля формулювання нового визначення цих понять в першій частині розглядаються визначення зі словників, а також наукові та лінгвістичні пояснення згоди і незгоди.

Акт усного вираження згоди з твердженням або точкою зору іншої людини, відомий як згода. Незгода означає висловлення суперечності або неузгодженості з висловленими претензіями. Крім того, важливо враховувати, що ці ідеї можуть передаватися як вербально, так і невербально.

У першій частині роботи також згадується про те, що згода та незгода мають вирішальне значення при взаємодії та веденні переговорів у багатьох соціальних та професійних контекстах.

Вони важливі для ефективного та переконливого спілкування, побудови відносин, зміцнення взаєморозуміння та взаємозв'язку, розуміння різних точок зору та конструктивних дебатів. Встановлення ефективних зв'язків та ефективне спілкування практично недосяжні без згоди та незгоди. У цій частині згода і незгода розглядається в контексті різних лінгвістичних підходів.

Отже, в цій частині розглядаються поняття "згода" і "незгода" в лінгвістиці, підкреслюється їх вирішальна роль в соціальних і професійних відносинах.

Що стосується другої частини роботи, в ній розглядається, як поняття згоди і незгоди виражаються граматично, лексично і невербально в обраних фільмах та книжках.

У шести творах літератури приклади згоди і незгоди виявляються шляхом вивчення діалогів. Прояви згоди і незгоди показано за допомогою поділу на іменники, прислівники, прикметники, вигуки, дієслова, усталені вирази, синтаксис і невербальні засоби. В цій частині наведено 54 приклади згоди і незгоди.

Випадки згоди класифікуються за виразами схвалення з точкою зору або позицією іншої особи. Так само випадки незгоди розглядаються відповідно до виразів суперечності чи відмови. Ці випадки далі поділяються на прямі та непрямі.

Частини мови, синтаксичні структури та невербальні сигнали досліджуються на предмет їх ролі у передачі згоди чи незгоди.

Дослідження розглядає різні мовні аспекти, включаючи синтаксичні структури, мовні вирази та прямі та непрямі мовленнєві акти, щоб оцінити численні способи вираження згоди та незгоди в обраних книгах.

Подальший лінгвістичний та стилістичний аналіз базується на чотирьох фільмах. В ході аналізу обраних фільмів було виявлено та проаналізовано 38 випадків використання вираження згоди і незгоди, як вербального, так і невербального. Кожен випадок розглядається за допомогою контексту та зміста діалогів.

Роль згоди та незгоди у розвитку персонажів, розвитку сюжету та залученні аудиторії досліджується в контексті кожного жанру, враховуючи, як мовні та стилістичні аспекти впливають на загальний стиль розповіді, характерний для драматичних, детективних, комедійних та романтичних фільмів.

Результати показали, що в чотирьох відібраних фільмах кількість вживань слів "згода" і "незгода" майже однакова і схожа з точки зору лінгвістики. Різниця проявляється в відмінностях контексту і моментів, коли поняття згоди і незгоди проявляють себе поряд з невербальними емоціями, що впливає на стиль і визначає його.

Аналіз показує зв'язок між розумінням мови та лінгвістикою. У цій роботі розглядаються поняття згоди та незгоди в англomовному дискурсі, на прикладі кіно та літератури. Ефективне спілкування передбачає розуміння таких лінгвістичних стратегій, як згода та незгода, оскільки ці поняття є вирішальними під час взаємодії та комунікації.