

## SOME LINGUO-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF TOURISM DISCOURSE

Sobirjon Solijon o'g'li Kodirov

Lecturer, the Department of Interfaculty Foreign Languages,  
Andijan State University, Uzbekistan  
qodirov20022@mail.ru

### Annotation.

In the study of tourism discourse, it is important to determine its typological status. There are different points of view on this matter. In particular, it is suggested that this type of speech is a subtype of institutional advertising speech. According to another point of view, it is an independent type of speech that has the ability to interact with other types of speech (domestic, scientific, advertising, etc.).

**Keywords:** discourse type, situation, linguo -pragmatic characteristics, communication, oral speech, teaching principles.

### INTRODUCTION

The first of the above positions is highly controversial, since it narrows the very concept of tourism discourse. In our opinion, advertising is only one of the genre varieties of tourist discourse, therefore, it cannot represent all the diversity of its characteristics.

A more balanced point of view, according to which tourist discourse is an independent type of discourse, is characterized by a special thematic focus, orientation to a strictly defined addressee, uniqueness of purpose, specificity of a set of language tools, and its own genre paradigm [2]. However, some clarifications are required here as well. In order to clearly present the typological status of tourism discourse, it is necessary to consider (a) the sphere of communication in which it functions, (b) the goals of communication, (b) the type of communicants (addressee and addressee).

The sphere of communication of this type of discourse is the tourism business as one of the sectors of the world economy. The situations in which the tourism discourse functions are quite numerous and varied. In the most general form, they can be differentiated as follows: (a) managing various departments of the tourism business and organizing its diversification; (b) product marketing and promotion; (c) finance; (d) information support and advertising; (e) insurance and legal support.

In accordance with the specifics of the situations in which the tourism discourse functions, the purpose of communication is to ensure the effectiveness of the activities of organizations representing the tourism industry: establishing contacts between organizations offering a tourism product, on the one hand, and target audiences, on the other, interaction with the media, creation of the image of the organization, development of public relations, promotion of the tourist product and tourism in general. Being a kind of institutional business discourse, at the same time, tourism discourse is not homogeneous in its linguo -pragmatic characteristics - it is a multifaceted phenomenon. Taking the point of view of T. A. Shiryaeva about the three areas of functioning of business discourse (professional, academic and public) [5], we single out at least three subspecies of tourist discourse, each of which is characterized by the specifics of the lexical composition, genre and stylistic features, specific communicative strategies and tactics: professional (serves the business process in the tourism industry), academic (operates in the field of training tourism specialists, and also carries out a scientific analysis of existing practical activities in this area of the economy) and public (aimed mainly at

disseminating information about the tourism industry and customer acquisition). Each of these subspecies has both its own specifics and common characteristics.

It should be noted that the scientist L. Tarnayeva revealed new aspects in the discourse of tourism with her scientific views. In his scientific work on teaching future translators to translate the cultural-specific meanings of institutional speech, gave he a scientifically clear definition of discourse.

Communicative strategies can be identified as common features inherent in professional, academic and public tourism discourse. In a generalized form, communicative strategies of business discourse can be reduced to two main groups: argumentative and manipulative [6].

Argumentative strategies are based on logical and rhetorical characteristics that implement the influence of the addresser on the opinions and rational assessments of the recipient, as well as indirect regulation of his rational behavior [3]. Manipulative strategies are a type of linguistic influence used to introduce goals, desires, intentions, relationships or attitudes into the psyche of the addressee that do not coincide with those that the addressee has at the moment [8, p. 99]. It should be taken into account that manipulative strategies involve the use of hidden language capabilities in order to impose a certain idea of reality on the addressee, form the necessary attitude towards it, and evoke the necessary emotional reaction [ 3 ].

It is important to note here that in each of the subtypes of tourism discourse we have identified (professional, academic and public), the ratio of the above communicative strategies will vary depending on the situation, the goals of communication and the type of communicators. If in professional and academic tourism discourse the goals of communication dictate mainly the use of argumentative strategies, then in public tourism discourse, manipulative strategies come to the fore.

The presence of a number of common characteristics in the argumentative and manipulative strategies of tourist discourse leads to the conclusion that it is not appropriate to draw a sharp line between the above-mentioned communicative strategies of this type of discourse. Nevertheless, we emphasize that in professional and academic tourism discourse predominantly argumentative strategies are used, while public tourism discourse is based mainly on manipulative strategies, at the same time, we note the presence of persuasive rhetoric in both varieties of communicative strategies, although its share in both cases will be different.[3]

The differences between the subtypes of tourist discourse are clearly demonstrated by their lexical organization. The lexical means marking the professional and academic touristic discourse are, first of all, highly specialized terms. For example, here are some of them: inbound tourism / inbound tourism; outbound tourism / outbound tourism; hard tourism / mass tourism; alternative tourism / environmental friendliness, both ecological and social; amenities / facilities / basic services provided to tourists; pleasure periphery / tourist destinations, including warm sea coasts in both developed and developing countries; edutainment / denotes situations that combine recreational and educational activities; Plog's Psychographic Typology / model for drawing up a psychological portrait of a tourist, based on the definition of personal characteristics, motivation, type of perception of the individual; Butler Sequence / sequence of stages of development that a tourist destination goes through from the moment the route is developed to the moment the first tourists arrive. [four]

In addition to highly specialized vocabulary in professional and academic tourism discourse, there is a layer of multifunctional terminology applicable not only in the field of tourism, but also in other professional areas, for example: breakeven point / payback point in the tourism industry; market segmentation / the process of dividing the tourism market into segments; focus group / target audience; branding / a set of activities aimed at obtaining a unique image for a travel company; risk

assessment / evaluation of risks to life and health of participants in outdoor entertainment and sports events.

In the public tourism discourse, in which emotional, ethical, aesthetic rhetoric prevails, such lexical units as attraction / the most attractive aspects of a particular tourist destination are marked with frequency; entertainment / entertainment; leisure / leisure; lifestyle / lifestyle of a person, behavioral habits, preferences, family relationships and leisure activities; tourism appeal / features that make this or that direction attractive to tourists; fair trade tourism / tourism based on fair standards of international labor, environmental and social regulation; ecotourism / responsible tourism / tourism, involving the protection of the environment and the improvement of the well-being of the local population in this tourist destination; pro-poor tourism / tourism aimed at improving the well-being of the local population of a particular tourist destination; heritage tourism / visits to cultural heritage sites; UNESCO heritage sites / UNESCO World Heritage Sites, etc.[5,6].

Concluding the consideration of the specifics of tourism discourse, we emphasize the following: (a) being a kind of institutional business discourse, tourism discourse has such attributive features as officiality, status, normativity, etiquette, business tone; (b) in its linguo-pragmatic characteristics, tourist discourse is not homogeneous — in accordance with the specifics of communicative situations, the goals of functioning, and the type of addressee, three subspecies can be distinguished in it: professional, academic, and public tourist discourse; (c) in professional and academic tourism discourse argumentative strategies prevail, in public discourse manipulative strategies come to the fore, however, this does not exclude the presence of some common characteristics, which can be noted as intellectual, rational, psychological arguments inherent in each of them to varying degrees. subtypes of tourist discourse; (c) differences in the tourist discourse used depending on the specifics of communicative situations are clearly manifested in the lexical composition of texts functioning in this type of institutional business discourse: in professional and academic -mi and emotive connotations.

## LITERATURE

1. Mikhailov N. N. English for the directions "Service" and "Tourism". M.: Academy, 2011. 198 p.
2. Filatova N.V. Tourist discourse among related discourses: hybridization or polyphony. Vestnik MGOU. Series "Linguistics". 2012. Issue . 3. P. 41–46.
3. Tarnaeva L.P. Teaching future translators of the translation of cultural-specific meanings of institutional discourse: author . dis . ... Dr. ped . Sciences. St. Petersburg: Russian State Pedagogical University, 2011. 42 p.
4. Birjakov, M. (2004). Introduction to tourism . Educational posobie . (37p.). SPb : Izdatelskiy dom Gerda.
5. Moshnyaga , EV (2009). Terminosistema mejdunarodnogo tourism how linguistic culture phenomenon . Vestnik Moscow gorodskogo pedagogical universityta . Ser. Philology. theoretical writing. Yazykovoe obrazovanie ", No. 1 (3), pp. 67-73.
6. Qodirov, S. S. (2021). Definition of the notion of tourism discourse. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science,11 (103), 1116-1118.
7. Panchenko, E.I. (2014). K Voprosu lingvisticheskogo statusa disкурса turistskogo. Linguistics. Lingvokulturologiya. T.7. pp. 66-72. Retrieved 29.04.16
8. Simpson, J.A., & Weiner, E.S.C. (2003). Oxford English Dictionary. Second Edition. Clarendon Press. (Vol. 1-20). (1791p.). Oxford.