DEFINING THE ROLE OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Vakhobova Feruza Mansurovna
PhD student, Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and agricultural
Mechanization Engieers National Research University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan vaxobovaferuza@gmail.com

Annotation: In many recent studies teachers and other professional educators in EFL circles highlight the importance of teaching pragmatic competence as a vital part of language teaching curriculum. This probably was the result of generations of learners of English language who completed their studies in the foreign language with a relatively good general language proficiency but weaker skills to interpret the messages and intentions that are conveyed in conversations, correctly. This particular competence is referred to as pragmatic competence. This paper aims to overview pragmatic competence in an EFL classroom as well as providing theoretical background for the concept and closely related notions.

Key words: teaching, pragmatic competence, language teaching curriculum, global village, culture, lingua franca.

It is well known that nowadays the development of knowledge and technology has brought people closer together, resulting in the phenomenon of the world as a "global village"[1]. This condition forces people of different backgrounds and ethnicities to work and communicate with each other. It may be interesting to know that people of different cultures should interact with each other in the era of globalization. However, in order to be able to communicate seamlessly with people of different backgrounds, interlocutors must be aware of these cultural differences, as well as their pragmatic aspects. Kavar emphasizes that when communicating with people of different customs, interlocutors should be able to determine how to correctly say what can be divided into what cannot, as well as be aware of cultural taboos, since what is accepted in a particular culture may not be approved in other cultures. To begin with, it is necessary to clearly know the broad meaning of culture. There are two different meanings of culture. The first meaning is associated with

---

[1] Kawar, T. I. (2012). Cross Cultural Differences in Management. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3, 105-111. Retrieved on December12,2019 from
https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_6_Special_Issue_March_2012/13.pdf;

"civilization", which includes customs, crafts, art and education. Moreover, it is also related to how people act, think and feel, which is the result of considering the dominant values and norms emerging in society.

With such a huge variety of cultures, lingua franca is necessary to ensure the possibility of communication between interlocutors belonging to different cultures.[2] That is why it is not surprising that in the latest curricula, the main purpose of learning English is to enable students to acquire communicative competence – linguistic and pragmatic skills – or, in other words International scientific journal in other words, use English in communication. In addition, the fact that English is considered linguafranca imposes a number of requirements on each user of the language. One of them is the requirement to speak English language that will help language users communicate with people from different cultures and social strata, touching on all values and norms, as well as pragmatic aspects of language and culture. According to Matthews [3] it is extremely important for a society that is looking for real benefits in the global market to understand how globalization can affect cross-cultural communication. He further argues that "as society becomes more globally connected, the ability to communicate across cultural boundaries becomes increasingly important."

Perhaps it is for these reasons that it is necessary to include culture in the curricula of a second or foreign language, especially in the teaching of English. When teaching a language, along with its culture, the teacher should also take into account the pragmatic aspects of the language, since understanding pragmatics will help language users avoid false interpretation, which will lead to a pragmatic violation of intercultural communication. Since pragmatics plays a very important role in communicating using language, it is important for students to be sensitive to intercultural pragmatics, which is commonly known as cross -pragmatics, cultural or intercultural pragmatic awareness. However, teaching language along with culture seems problematic, since it is relatively difficult to choose which aspects of culture to teach, which content to include, and also implicitly represent the cultures being studied, which represent differences from the normal knowledge of students. Local culture. Thus, this article attempts to study the main issues of oral

---

[2] Christiansen, T. The rise of English as the global lingua franca: Is the world heading towards greater monolingualism or new forms of plurilingualism? Journal Linguee Linguanggi, 2015, Vol. 15, p.p. 129-154;

[3] Matthews, L. C. & Thakkar, B. The Impact of Globalization on Cross- Cultural Communication. [Online] 2019, Vol. 12 Available: http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfswm/38267.pdf;

discourse, pragmatics, intercultural pragmatics, pragmatic failure, pragmatic awareness and its significance for pedagogy.

Examining the role and significance of pragmatic competence within the framework of communicative competence development holds paramount importance in foreign language education. Proficiency in a foreign language necessitates not only lexical and grammatical proficiency but also the adeptness to employ them contextually. Essential to understanding pragmatic competence are the elucidation of "pragmatics" and "competence." Pragmatic competence denotes the capacity to judiciously select linguistic resources in specific situational contexts.

The term 'competence' has been used to refer to different constructs by linguists and applied linguists[4]. Chomsky (1965) was apparently the first who pointed out the distinction between the terms competence (one's implicit knowledge of language) and performance (the use of language in communication). However, Chomsky made no attempt to address the distinction between competence/knowledge and the ability to use language to achieve communicative purposes (Erton, 2007). Campbell and Wales (1970) criticized Chomsky's definition of competence by advocating that language knowledge also encompasses the ability to use the language in a given context. Chomsky's definition of competence is concerned with an ideal speaker-listener. "In completely homogeneous speech community who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance." [5] Hymes[6] asserted that "such a theory of competence posits ideal objects in abstraction from sociocultural features". Additionally, Hymes (ibid.) highlighted that having a high level of grammatical competence would not be sufficient to become a successful L2 user since some contexts require speakers to use constructions that are technically ungrammatical. Therefore, he underscored the significance of both linguistic/grammatical competence and the knowledge of what type of language is appropriate in any given context.

Hymes (1972) introduced a Communicative Competence (CC) model in response to the Chomskyan concept of competence. Within this framework,

---

[4] Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1995
[5] Chomsky, 1965, p. 3

[6] Hymes 1972, p. 271

linguistic competence was positioned as one element among others. Over time, various scholars such as Canale & Swain (1980), Canale (1983), and Bachman (1990) proposed different models of CC. McConachy (2009) observed that these models all emphasized that language competence encompasses more than just knowing grammar rules. Notably, Bachman (1990) was the first to explicitly include pragmatic competence as a fundamental aspect within his language competence model.

Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983) proposed two primary components of pragmatic competence: pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. Pragmalinguistic competence involves proficiency in utilizing linguistic strategies to carry out specific speech acts, such as employing directness or indirectness, routines, and a variety of linguistic forms that can enhance or soften communicative acts. Sociopragmatic competence, on the other hand, refers to the ability to consider social context and adhere to the associated rules while using language. Similarly, Bachman and Palmer (1996) underscored the essential role of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence in achieving Communicative Competence, using different terms: functional knowledge and sociolinguistic knowledge.

Three distinct models elucidate foreign language communicative competence: functional (or discourse-oriented), component-based, and meaning-oriented models. Functional models perceive pragmatics as the enactment of functional discourse functions. Component-based models entail segmentation into smaller structural units intricately tied to temporal language use. Meaning-oriented models, groundbreaking in their approach, recognize pragmatic competencies as discrete components within communicative competence. Through a thorough analysis and comparison of these models, a comprehensive understanding of pragmatic competencies is synthesized, encompassing bilateral communication competencies, encompassing encoding and utilization, founded upon three guiding principles: contextual language utilization, interlocutor interaction in discourse, and conveyed significance.

The problem of determining the place of pragmatic competence in the composition of foreign language communicative competence has been reflected in the works of many researchers in the field of linguodidactics. For a long period of time in the methodology of teaching a foreign language, the attention of teachers has been focused on training grammatical structures and practicing lexical skills. Nevertheless, the last century has brought many innovations in this area,including the arrival of the now popular communicative approach or method in teaching a

foreign language. This, in particular, highlighted the importance of forming along with linguistic skills (familiarity with grammatical structures, as well as the assimilation of the lexical content of the language), which was the main purpose of teaching until the current period, the formation of some other skills that form other sub-competencies of foreign language communicative competence. Among them, one can single out pragmatic competence, the place of which in the composition of foreign language communicative competence will be discussed below.

First of all, let's define what pragmatics is as a central significant element of pragmatic competence. Pragmatics studies how language is used in communication; in particular, paying attention no longer to the plan of content, but to the plan of expression of the utterance. The term pragmatics It was introduced by the American philosopher C. Morris, who considered it as an integral part of semiotics along with semantics and syntax.[7] Great importance for conclusions about the meaning what is being transmitted has a context in which communication takes place. Communication unfolds in different ways, depending on the activity in which it is used. The language user chooses the linguistic form depending on the social situation, which includes such factors as the speaker's identity, attitude to the listener, type of activity and position of the speaker.[8] In addition, the understanding of the utterance is based on different types of signals. Interpretation depends on both verbal and non-verbal expressions, such as prosody, kinesics, gestures and facial expressions. Indeed, listeners draw conclusions from the totality of interacting behavioral events from different communication subsystems (or "modalities"), which are simultaneously transmitted and received in the form of a single (usually auditory-visual) image.[9] Referring to the term "linguistic competence", it is worth mentioning that it was introduced into use by a scientist from the USA N. Chomsky . He considered this term as the opposite of the concept of "language use" (literally "linguistic execution"). Word "ability" was considered by N. Chomsky as something necessary "to perform a certain, mainly linguistic activity- activities in the native language". [10] N. Chomsky considers linguistic competence as a kind of knowledge about the linguistic structure reflected in the speaker's brain at the mental level. The use of language found application to linguistic means in a specific example, that is,

---

[7] Morris C. Foundations of the theory of signs // International Encyclopedia of Unified Science / eds. by O. Neuratin, R. Carnap, C. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Vol. 2, bk 1.

[8] Ohta A. A longitudinal study of the development of expression of alignment in Japanese as a foreign language // Pragmatics and Language Teaching / eds. by G. Kasper, K. Rose. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. P. 103-120.

[9] Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

[10] Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton and Co, 1957.

in the specified context.[11] In modern linguodidactics and methods of teaching foreign languages, this term has changed its content, but its introduction into scientific use It's still recognized for N. Chomsky. In general, pragmatic competence can be defined as the ability to convey an intended utterance with all its nuances in any socio-cultural context and interpret the message as intended by the speaker. However, it is worth tracing how pragmatic competence was considered by different scientists, and what they understood by pragmatic competence.

The primary objective of a foreign language instructor is to enhance proficiency in the target language and impart skills in intercultural communication. Traditionally, this falls under intercultural communication studies rather than English language courses. However, given the evolving global landscape and the increasing demand for effective foreign language communication, there's a need to reassess the framework of language education in higher technical institutions. This involves broadening the curriculum to integrate pragmatic elements throughout the program, catering to students of all English proficiency levels.

When thinking about learning materials for observation (awareness), one can suggest various resources, for example, monologues and dialogues extracted from non-fiction films, feature films or business English textbooks and accompanying resources (Market Leader [12], Business Result[13], The Business[14]). An understanding of how to design tasks to practice pragmatic competence can be obtained from the Teaching Pragmatics website of the US Department of State's Resource center of American English, and from specialist literature such as Teaching pragmatics by Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Rebecca Mahan-Taylor (Teaching Pragmatics. Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Rebecca Mahan-Taylor) [15]; Pragmatics: Teaching Speech Acts (Tesol Classroom Practice Series)[16], Pragmatics: Teaching Natural Conversation (Classroom Practice Series)[17]. Currently, the goal of an English teacher at university is to develop curricula that include pragmatic competence, tasks and exercises for its practice, as well as materials for testing mastery of pragmatic competence.

---

[11] Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1967

[12] Market Leader. 3d Edition. – Pearson. – URL: https://www.pearsonelt.com/catalogue/business-english/market-leader.html/

[13] Business Result. – OUP. – URL:
https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/business_esp/business_result_dvd_edition/?cc=ru &selLanguage=ru

[14] The Business. – Macmillan English. – URL: http://www.macmillanenglish.com/cours es/thebusiness/

[15] Bardovi-Harlig K., Mahan-Taylor R. Teaching Pragmatics. – USA: Office of English Language Programs of the U.S. Department of State, 2003.

[16] Pragmatics: Teaching Speech Acts (Tesol Classroom Practice Series).

[17] Pragmatics: Teaching Natural Conversation (Classroom Practice Series).

REFERECE

1. Kawar, T. I. (2012). Cross Cultural Differences in Management. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3, 105-111. Retrieved on December12,2019 from https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_6_Special_Issue_March_2012/13.pdf;

2. Christiansen, T. The rise of English as the global lingua franca: Is the world heading towards greater monolingualism or new forms of plurilingualism? Journal Linguee Linguanggi, 2015, Vol. 15, p.p. 129-154;

3. Matthews, L. C. & Thakkar, B. The Impact of Globalization on Cross- Cultural Communication. [Online] 2019, Vol. 12 Available: http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfswm/38267.pdf;

4. Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1995

5. Morris C. Foundations of the theory of signs // International Encyclopedia of Unified Science / eds. by O. Neuratin, R. Carnap, C. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Vol. 2, bk 1.

6. Ohta A. A longitudinal study of the development of expression of alignment in Japanese as a foreign language // Pragmatics and Language Teaching / eds. by G. Kasper, K. Rose. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. P. 103-120.

7. Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

8. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton and Co, 1957.

9. Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1967

10. Market Leader. 3d Edition. – Pearson. – URL: https://www.pearsonelt.com/catalogue/business-english/market-leader.html/

11. Business Result. – OUP. – URL: https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/business_esp/business_result_dvd_edition/?cc=ru &selLanguage=ru

12. The Business. – Macmillan English. – URL: http://www.macmillanenglish.com/cours es/thebusiness/