

PRAGMATIC COOMPETENCE IN FLT

Dilshod Muminov Abdurashidovich

Turdiyeva Kumush group 12-22 Senior Teacher of the Department of Social and Economic Sciences, Shahrisabz branch of the Tashkent Institute of Chemical Technology

In the State educational standard (2013) the content and requirements of mastering the communicative competence to graduating students on all stages of education are presented. In the local model the communicative competence includes three components: Linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences. Among educators the pragmatic competence has become disputable, so this component needs explanation.

There was a lot of work where pragmatic competence was dealt with in the structure of communicative competence. First pragmatic competence was considered as a part of sociolinguistic competence in Canale and Swain's model (1980), other models include sociolinguistic competence as a part of pragmatic competence (Bachman, 1990), but others consider it as independent but related to other competencies (Celcia- Murcia et al. ,1995). It was replaced with actional competence (Celcia- Murcia et al. ,1995:17). Scientists dealt with actional competence "in conveying and understanding communicative intent, that is, matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force" (Celcia- Murcia et al. ,1996:17).

In the coursebook on methodology of FLT by the local authors (Jalolov, Makhkamova, Ashurov, 2015:17) the pragmatic competences is related to "illocutionary forces imply in the utterance\ discourse that are intended to be understood and produced, as well as the socio-contextual factors, strategies of communication that effect its appropriateness". Thus the pragmatic competence is in the close relationship with linguistic, discourse and sociocultural competences (Leech 1983; Thomas, 1983). Pragmalinguistic competence refers to the linguistic elements used in the different languages to perform speech acts, and sociopragmatic or cultural component is related to implicit social meaning, and there can be different assessments of social aspect of the context, such as the social distance between the speaker and the addressee. According to Kasper (2001:51), pragmalinguistic



knowledge requires mapping of form, meaning, force and context, and sociopragmatics refer to the link between action-relevant context factors and communicative action and does not necessarily require any links to specific forms at all.

Consequently the definition of our local methodologists (Jalolov, Makhkamova, Ashurov, 2015) and singling out this component in the structure of communicative competence is confirmed. Besides it has been proved by researches that differences in linguistic and cultural backgrounds can produce important misunderstandings because they imply different rules of interaction and the use of different linguistic terms to convey meaning. Each speech community has some values and beliefs which are reflected in the cognitive base of people. The speech acts are built in accordance with peoples cognitive base and therefore communicants from “other” culture do not produce or understand speech acts in the same way. Differences between languages reflect differences are seen not only in the general style of the interaction but also in the selection, frequency and distribution of linguistic elements that a lot of research works in intercultural pragmatics demonstrate these facts. That’s why FL learners need to acquire pragmatic competence along with linguistic and sociolinguistic competences (in the local model) to prevent or overcome communicative failure both at the pragmatic and sociopragmatic levels. In spite of complicity of pragmatic competence the students need in this competence to be an efficient speaker in order to interact with native and nonnative speakers of the target language.

References

1. Bachman L. Fundamental considerations in language testing,- oxford:OUP, 1990,
2. Canale M. Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. // Applied Linguistics. 1980, 1. Pp. 1-47.
3. Celcia-Murcia M. Dornyei Z., Thurrell S. Communicative competence : A pedagogically motivated framework with content specification. // Issues in Applied Linguistics. 1995, 6. Pp. 5-35.
4. Jalolov J.J., Makhkamova G.T., Ashurov S.H. English Language Teaching Methodology. –T,: Fan vatexnologia, 2015.



5. G.Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics.//In Rose K.R., Kasper G (eds.) Pragmatics in language teaching.-CambridgeL: CUP,2001.Pp.33-60.
6. Leech G.N. Principles of Pragmatics.- Longman, London,1983.
7. Thomas J. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure.// Applied Linguistics. 1983,4 Pp.91-112.
8. Ўзбекистон Республикаси узлуксиз таълим тизимининг Давлат таълим стандарти. Чет тиллар бўйича таълимнинг барча босқичлари битирувчиларнинг тайёргарлик даражасига қўйиладиган талаблар .// Халқ таълим №4,2013.-Б 4-32.

