MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL AGGRESSION AS A TYPE OF EMOTIONAL RESPONSE

Aziz Sh. Mukhamadiyev
Navoi State Pedagogical Institute
Navoi, Uzbekistan
E-mail: azizmuhammadievsh@gmail.com

ABOUT ARTICLE

Abstract: In this article is discussed usage of verbal and non-verbal aggression and its type of emotional response in the context. Also, this study describes nonverbal aggression as a type of emotional reaction that manifests as physical and other (non-verbal) activities meant to injure the target, either physically or morally. An exclusive set of *lexemes-identifiers* that are used to semantically categorize violent nonverbal acts define nonverbal aggressiveness as a form of emotional response. It is important to draw attention to the names of weapons and items / means used for punishment among the *lexemes-identifiers*, the semantics of which include the meaning *"means of implementing violent non-verbal behaviors."* These punishments imply either aggressively restrained or unrestrained emotions on the part of the subject by their very nature. So, it is illustrated examples to compare advantages and disadvantage of their implementation.

INTRODUCTION

We view verbal aggressiveness as a type of emotional reaction that manifests as verbal actions, the primary goal of which is to morally injure the target, or as the verbal expression of unpleasant emotions / feelings, as well as attitudes against the target of aggression. The verbal embodiment of the researched type of emotional response is distinguished by a specific collection of lexemes that reflect the meaning of the process, much as nonverbal aggressiveness.

This study describes nonverbal aggression as a type of emotional reaction that manifests as physical and other (non-verbal) activities meant to injure the target, either physically or morally. An

exclusive set of *lexemes-identifiers* that are used to semantically categorize violent nonverbal acts define nonverbal aggressiveness as a form of emotional response.

It is important to draw attention to the names of weapons and items / means used for punishment among the *lexemes-identifiers*, the semantics of which include the meaning *"means of implementing violent non-verbal behaviors."* These punishments imply either aggressively restrained or unrestrained emotions on the part of the subject by their very nature.

However, in contrast to nonverbal aggression, where we were able to isolate distinct groups of identifiers of aggressive nonverbal actions (names of weapons and objects, means used for the purpose of punishment), verbal aggression enables us to focus on the word as the primary tool for implementing this type of aggressive response.

We were able to identify the most prevalent lexical generators of anger, insults, criticism, quarrels/swearing, verbal attacks, and rudeness through the study of dictionary entries that was done to find indicators of the process of aggressive verbal acts. Let's go on to a more thorough analysis of these token groups.

Accordingly, "a sense of great outrage" is the definition of anger[2, 45]. We have identified lexemes that name verbal actions whose meaning includes **anger** (berate, blaster, bollock, chew sb. out, hide, css, drop dead, dry up, flare out at, haul smb. over the coals, hector, hurl abuse / insults / accusations at smb., jump down smb's throat, rate, rave, unbraid), lexemes (hostile, sharp). We may also learn about certain semantic characteristics of the offered group by looking at dictionary definitions for the corpus of lexemes indicating aggressive verbal behaviors coupled by the feeling of rage.

Therefore, additional meanings can be discerned in the semantics of the words used to identify this group of actions, such as the aggressor's displeasure with the target's actions (berate, bullock, chew the target out, and haul the target over the coals), the speaker's accompanying negative emotions (irritation - cuss, drop dead, the speaker's desire to be left alone (drop dead, dry up, the threat (flare out at, lash out).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Let's now take a look at yet another source of abusive verbal behavior. We also found the insult generator, which is indicated by lexemes reflecting offensive verbal actions (abuse, insult, pitch into; to defy, insult, offend, call, groan, scold, humiliate, insult, hurt), as well as lexemes characterizing them (abusive, catty, coarse, mordant; bold, insulting, insulting). The definition of an insult, according to [4, 91-92] is "an offensive behavior, insulting words," with the intent to "hard to offend, humiliate."

Therefore, the use of these group identifiers by the aggressor is intended to degrade the target of violence, leaving the victim with a sense of resentment over the harm done. The fact that a lot of

these group's lexemes contain the "rude" component demonstrates that the insult generator is closely connected to impolite manifestations (insult, abusive, coarse).

Because of the connection between the generator and rudeness mentioned above, we are compelled to investigate if it is possible to combine indicators of verbal acts accompanied by the emotion of rudeness. The investigation of the lexical units of aggressive semantics demonstrated that these identifiers can nevertheless be assigned to a distinct group despite having a negligible presence in the language. As a result, we discovered that the rudeness generator is composed of terms that describe rude verbal activities (abusive, caustic, harsh) as well as words that denote rude verbal actions (abuse, bog off, brush smb off, cuss; impolite, rude, scold). We can better define the acts they designate by elucidating the semantics of the lexical elements that represent this group. Therefore, being impolite with words can be used to drive a point home (bog off), or to show that you don't want to hear what the other person has to say (brush smb. off). Additionally, the rudeness that comes with verbal manifestations suggests that the attacker has "*lack of culture, indelicacy, and insensitivity*" [4, 112].

The presence of groups of lexemes identifying verbal acts in both languages, according to further examination of lexical units of aggressive semantics, is shown by the critic generator. To clarify the potential of attributing the lexemes building this generator to the process of verbal acts, we believe it is important to first turn to the definition of the term critique before moving on to clarify the components of the specified generator. According to the TSRYA dictionary entry, which reveals the semantics of this generator: "discussion, analysis of what-n. in order to evaluate, identify shortcomings; a negative judgment about something, an indication of shortcomings" [9, 154] criticism is actually only expressed verbally.

The "criticism" generator thus defines words for critical verbal actions (e.g., bait, kick someone while they're down, pick something apart, savage, scarify, tear something to shreds or pieces; scold, scold, scold, disassemble, scold), as well as a verbal action characteristic that reflects the component of criticizing. At the same time, we observe that the tokens that we have allotted are utilized to identify the objects or to point out their flaws. Additionally, there are semantic components included in the English lexemes constituting the critic generator that shed light on the nature of critical verbal activities. As a result, the aggressor may use verbal criticism to point out flaws in an effort to incite resentment by treating the target disrespectfully (bait). We discovered a shared element in the meaning of harshly during the study of English lexemes (pick smb. / smth. to pieces, savage, scarify, tear smb. / smth. to shreds / pieces), indicating a high level of intensity in the activity it characterizes.

Naturally, criticism frequently results in an argument between speakers, or a "mutual altercation" [5, 91-92]. We therefore believe it is necessary to move to the identification of aggressive semantic lexemes that characterize interpersonal conflict. But first, we'll explain whether it's possible

to attribute such lexemes to verbal acts. To start, let's look at what an "altercation" is defined as: "a disagreement accompanied by abuse, condemning, and insulting words" [6, 178]. Thus, it becomes clear that the argument is actually a linguistic one. This fact makes it necessary for us to allocate a "quarrel/swearing" generator, which, in accordance with the definitions of lexical units of aggressive semantics, includes identifiers such as brawl, feud, fight out, lock horns with smb., pick a quarrel, row, contradict, dog, and dust-up; nonsense (this kind of verbal actions are called). In this situation, the behaviors suggested by the group's identifiers can be followed by cruelty (feud, fight out), anger-related feelings (row), discontent, and rudeness. Additionally, it is hard to deny that a dispute is a communicative interaction between two or more speakers and that it is, of course, a conflict of interlocutors.

From our perspective, a disagreement is directly related to verbal attacks since it might result in communicants doing aggressive behaviors to achieve a variety of undesirable ends. We discovered that the language contains examples of these verbal manifestations as well, which allowed us to identify a verbal attack generator represented by the tokens go for, lady into, round on, tilt at, and turn upon. These tokens can also be used to signal unexpected actions (round on, turn on), which can be done both vocally and in writing (tilt at).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The process of aggressive verbal actions, however, can also be denoted by lexical terms that signify annoyance (cuss, drop dead), threat (accost, hector), harm (defamation), cruelty (biting, mordant, vituperative), hatred (bitter), lack of friendliness (clipped, hostile), and malice (We can find lexemes that express the repetitive nature of verbal acts (to repeat, to pull), which also results in mutual hostility of the object, by turning to the study of the language of aggressive semantics.

We were therefore able to detect such generators as anger, insult, criticism, quarrel/swearing, verbal attacks, rudeness, impatience, threat, injury, cruelty, hatred, lack of friendliness, and malice through the examination of the corpus of vocabulary units carrying aggressive verbal acts. In comparison to the number of tokens used to identify hostile nonverbal acts, the number of identifiers for such activities turns out to be rather little. In light of this, it can be said that aggression, a form of emotional response, mostly manifests itself through nonverbal behaviors that are highly diverse in nature.

It should also be noted that a small number of identifiers of the Russian language were discovered during the study of the corpus of lexical units of aggressive semantics, as well as the frequent inability of their allocation within discrete groups of generators. The TSR definitions analysis revealed that it does not always reflect the characteristics accompanying the actions indicated by the lexemes [1, 44]. This is the cause of the insufficient lexical prevalence of the generators we mentioned, as well as their significant limitations when compared to the English language.

When we view nonverbal aggression as a form of emotional reaction, we are forced to focus on another crucial aspect of it: the outcomes of aggressive nonverbal behaviors. Note that from our perspective, aggression typically results in the object being in a negative emotional or physical state and has a negative attitude towards the person who is being aggressive. We conducted a lexico-semantic analysis of dictionary entries based on this viewpoint in order to discover lexemes-identifiers of the outcome of aggressive nonverbal behaviors. However, there are some differences in the content of various groups of semantic generators due to the choice of lexical units connected to aggressive emotional response and lexemes-identifiers of the outcome of aggressive actions in the Russian and English languages. The differences we mentioned include, on the one hand, the difficulty in identifying the identifiers of specific groups in the English language due to the lack of the corresponding vocabulary in the Uzbek language's aggressive semantics: a response to cruelty, lack of friendliness, hostility, hatred, and disrespect **(shafqatsizlik, do'stlikning yetishmasligi, dushmanlik, nafrat va hurmatsizlik)**. However, the meaning of the lexeme is not always made clear in dictionary definitions from Uzbek explanatory dictionaries, which restricts the ability to identify groups of identifiers for this emotional response or results in the allocation of incredibly small groups of identifiers.

Thus, using the corpus of lexical units with aggressive semantics, we were able to identify such generators as guilt/punishment, destruction, suffering, pain, cruelty, fear, sadness, insult, disgust, irritation, rudeness, lack of friendliness toward the object, anger, hatred, dislike/antipathy, lack of humanity, disrespect, and severity. The term punishment/guilt as a result of aggressive reactions contains a distinct collection of identifiers since illegal actions are frequently associated with aggressive actions, followed by punishment. This generator includes lexemes that indicate a trait that suggests guilt (guilty, larcenous; accused), as well as a trait that communicates the outcome of punishment as the location of the punishment's object (condemned, damned, done). A person's knowledge of guilt or regret over the offense they committed can also be discerned in the semantics of the supplied identifiers.

Additional research on the corpus of lexical units with aggressive semantics leads to the conclusion that language contains a large amount of destructive aggression. Keep in mind that actions taken to destroy an item typically result in a breach of its integrity. Therefore, special emphasis was paid to find the identifiers of destruction as a result during the lexico-semantic analysis of dictionary terms. A tiny collection of tokens that describe an object in a condition of devastation were also discovered at the same time: torn, tormented, and stabbed; doomed, kaput, rotting, ragged, and trashed. In addition to cause the thing to be destroyed, aggressive behavior can also cause the target of hostility to suffer from bodily suffering, including pain. We have determined the signs of anguish and pain brought on by aggressiveness based on this assertion. As a result, the "suffering" generator

is identified by lexemes that convey the characteristics of the state in which the object is located (bad, pallid, pasty, peaked, peaky, pinched, piteous; painful, incurable), as well as lexemes that denote the states in which a person experiences this feeling (suffering, torment). As shown by the definitions of the words suffering in English and Uzbek, which respectively mean "physical or moral pain" and "physical or mental pain" [6, 24] and "physical or moral pain" **(jismoniy yoki ma'naviy og'riq)** respectively, clarification of the semantics of the presented generator enables us to identify not only the meaning of physical but also moral suffering. Due to the fact that physical pain is always a component of sickness, it should be noted that the lexical indicators of suffering are mostly words that describe a person as unhealthy.

The following lexemes that communicate the names of painful sensations are used to identify the pain generator, which is directly related to the object's suffering: affliction, pang, suffering, agony, torture; painful, incurable. Because pain is a part of the suffering generator value, we may speak of a single group that is organized by the IDs for both pain and suffering in this scenario. We were able to identify a group of identifiers of activities as a response to cruelty: fight back, hit back, and strike back since it is evident that the aggressor's actions are frequently accompanied by cruelty and result in a same response. The identifiers that have been given represent the person's aggressive nonverbal behaviors. We were able to connect this collection of verbs to the outcome of aggressiveness as a form of emotional response since the actions of the aggressor generate the feelings indicated by these verbs-identifiers of cruelty.

The fact that aggressive behaviors frequently elicit specific unfavorable emotions and sentiments in the object is undeniable in our opinion. Fear appears to be one of these negative emotional responses since it is closely tied to the expectation of the object of aggression of certain unfavorable outcomes of the subject of aggression's acts. Based on this clause, we draw the conclusion that a separate fear/anxiety generator, denoted by the tokens frenzied, frightened, horror-struck, uneasy, petrified, pusillanimous, shaken, terrified; afraid, bewildered, nervous, puzzled, must be assigned. It's crucial to remember that this collection of identifiers also includes words that express a trait implying that panic, fear, and anxiety are emotions that a person experiences as a result of aggressive influence on him, both verbally and nonverbally.

In addition to the emotion of dread, melancholy is a common emotional response in both languages. From our perspective, this object's state is a natural outcome of violent manifestations directed at the person, which required us to choose the appropriate generator for the effects of verbal and nonverbal hostility. We were able to identify of the state of the object of aggression as sad as a result of our analysis of the sadness component in the lexicon of aggressive semantics. The following words and phrases are used to symbolize the sadness generator: object, bad, bitter, broken-hearted, cheerless, crummy, disconsolate, doleful, downcast, empty, exasperated, gloomy, glum, grave,

grieved, heavy-hearted, hurt, miserable, oppressed, pained, pissed off, resentful, shocked, shattered, shaken, somber, sore.

The ability to recognize that one of the characteristics of the object of aggression may be the condition of the person as offended due to aggressive impact on him is made possible by further understanding the generators of the result of hostile emotional response.

As a result, we were able to identify the horror lexemes hit, prostrate, shook, snippy, dreadful; humiliated, damaged, outraged, offended, injured as identifiers of the insult by using the lexico-semantic analysis of dictionary entries.

A state of sadness brought on by something unpleasant for the person is reflected in the vast majority of words that characterize the person as offended (horror-struck, prostrate, shaken, shattered, terrible), which suggests a direct connection between the "insult" generator and the emotion of disgust as a result of aggressive influence.

Disgust, in turn, is also identified by a separate group of tokens that convey a characteristic that is the result of unpleasant actions. Our investigation revealed that the aversion generator only recognizes a narrow subset of tokens, including pain, sad, surprised, uncomfortable, and telltale, as well as disgusting, smelly, and nasty. However, in our opinion, the significance of this generator should not be understated because, generally speaking, aggressive reactions are repulsive to observers of these manifestations, as well as occasionally to the target and, occasionally, the victim of hostile acts. The irritation generator must also be included among the sources of the outcome of aggressiveness. Of course, one of the primary causes of the aggressive emotion of annoyance is violent manifestations of the topic (criticism, infliction of pain, harm, etc.). Cross, curmudgeonly, disgruntled, displeased, dratted, exasperated, gruff, irritated, moody, peevish, perturbed, pissed off, prickly, sore, spiky, stroppy, wretched, teed off, testy, tight, tiresome, touchy; rabid, derisive; The definition of this lexeme, "produced by anything. the state of annoyance, discontent," shows that irritation is unavoidably immediately related to a feeling of dissatisfaction or annoyance [8, 121]. It is evident that the feeling of irritation, which is primarily the outcome of aggressive influence, is frequently accompanied by unfavorable emotional responses like dissatisfaction and displeasure. Unquestionably, aggressive verbal and nonverbal behaviors (crimes, acts of sabotage, inflicting harm to the object, suffering, pain, etc.) result in a person's bad attitude toward the aggressor. In order to find lexemes-identifiers that carry a negative attitude towards the issue of aggressiveness, we further studied the corpus of lexical units representing the outcome of aggressive emotional reactions. We have recognized the following entities as such token generators:

Rudeness is defined as being bearish, dreadful, feral, filthy, nasty, terrible, ill-bred, impertinent, impudent, insolent, loutish, naughty, offensive, rude, rugged, saucy, scabrous, snobby, spoilt, or

uncouth; vulgar, rude, or bold. There are identifiers in this group that express a trait that suggests rudeness.

- hostile, belligerent, frigid, hospitable, ill-disposed, po-faced, poisonous, sour, and surly are traits that lack warmth towards the object as a result of aggressive influence. In their semantics, they include a trait that suggests a lack of friendliness toward the object for the specified identifiers.

- bitchy, cruel, cutting, hateful, ill-natured, mean, merciless, uncharitable; embittered are traits that indicate the presence of animosity in connection to the subject of aggressive activities.

- tokens with characteristics that imply hate for the object are included in the dislike/antipathy generator: prejudiced, misanthropic, and poxy [3 units].

– hate. This generator recognizes the tokens baleful, malignant, misanthropic, poisonous, and virulent [5 units], which communicate a characteristic that denotes the presence of enmity towards a certain person.

- a deficiency in humanity. We have identified the following lexemes as identifiers for this generator: bestial, callous, cold, cold-blooded, hard, hard-hearted, inhuman, mean-spirited [8 units]; soulless, indifferent, indifferent, heartless, ruthless, indifferent, indifferent [7 units]. These lexemes reflect the characteristic manifested in coldness, indifference to human suffering, feelings, lack of compassion and empathy.

- disrespect: contemptuous, despicable, disrespectful, impertinent, impudent, insolent, and opprobrious. Lexemes, which serve as identifiers of this emotional state, have a quality that suggests disdain for the subject.

- strictness as a quality that communicates the proper attitude to the person: stern, severe, strict, tough; hard, strict, severe.

As a result, the vocabulary of the English and Uzbek languages is distinguished by a wide variety of lexemes that signify the outcome of aggressive activities. In contrast to the Uzbek language, an English explanatory dictionary demonstrates the presence of a single semantic component that permits the generator to be represented by a wide number of identifiers, offering the highest possibility of combining into generators.

CONCLUSION

It should be highlighted that compared to lexemes that express the process of aggression as a form of emotional response, the number of generators of the outcome of aggressive behaviors is much smaller. Since the study found that aggressive emotional reactions can take two different forms—verbal and nonverbal—we must now find lexemes that reflect the outcomes of aggressive verbal actions in order to construct lexical units of aggressive semantics in the English language. The research of dictionary entries has revealed that there are very few lexemes that emphasize the meaning of the outcome of linguistic acts. Additionally, these words include answer back, argument, and bite

back, which are responses to the aggressor's harsh verbal manifestations and have semantics that are analogous to the acts of the subject.

However, nonverbal cues like rudeness, annoyance, contempt, etc. can also be a result of native English and Uzbek speakers' verbal behaviors. In addition, the target of verbal and nonverbal violence may choose to ignore it, which prevents the aggressor from getting the desired outcome. Furthermore, we think that the outcome of verbal and nonverbal aggression frequently manifests itself in the aggressor's acts, which are similar manifestations of the aggressor. In summarizing the findings of our study, we believe it's necessary to point out that the study of the identifiers of the outcome of violent emotional reactions in the Uzbek language was frequently based on the semantic clarification of their constituent parts. Such a necessity was compelled by the need to display these groups as fully as feasible as well as the fact that they lacked coherent meaning components. In other words, the definitions of the English identifiers turned out to be extremely thorough, not requiring a further investigation to identify identifiers, however the identification of the Russian identifiers offered more challenges.

REFERENCES:

[1]. Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford, 1962. 166 p.

[2]. Buss D.M., Shakelford T.K. Human aggression in evolutionary psychological perspective. Clinical Psychology Review, 17, 1997. 619 p.

[3]. Dijk T.A. van. Text and context: Explorations and the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. London, 1977. 261 p.

[4]. Freud S. Beyond the pleasure principle. N.Y.: Bantam Books. 1999. 326 p.

[5]. Hahn M. T., MacLean M.S. Counseling psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955. 286 p.

[6]. Lakoff G., Johnson M. METAPHORS We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.

[7]. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. London, 1983. 250 p.

[8]. Romaine S. Language in society: An introd. To sociolinguistics. Oxford univ. press, 1994. 12, 235 p.

[9]. Smith F.K. Communication and culture. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966. 316 p.

[10]. Waxer P.T. Non-verbal cues for anxiety: an examination of emotional leakage // Journal of abnormal psychology. 1977. Vol. 86. 314 p.

[11]. Weiner B. An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion // Psychological Review. 1985. 573 p.