
**THE PROBLEM OF IMPROVING THE PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE
AMONG STUDENTS OF LINGUISTS**

Arman Rsaliev

Uzbekistan State University of World languages

armanrsaliev@gmail.com

Abstract:

The article is devoted to considering the issue of improving the pragmatic competence and its features in teaching the students of linguists. It also discusses the different points of linguists in defining the conception of the pragmatic competence.

Keywords: communication, context, competence, pragmatics, pragmatic competence

For a very long time, learning a foreign language has meant that the only things that the students have learned are the grammar and vocabulary. Nevertheless, as a result of the development of a communicative approach to teaching foreign languages in the second half of the 20th century, it became necessary to master not only linguistic competence (which includes grammar and lexical units), as was previously done, but also a number of other competencies.

Let's begin by defining pragmatics as the primary important component of pragmatic competency. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used in communication, with a focus on how rather than what is stated. The American philosopher C. Morris coined the term "pragmatics," and along with semantics and syntax, he saw it as a crucial component of semiotics. [9]

Semantics examines a word's meaning in isolation from the situation or use in which it is used, whereas pragmatics places special emphasis on these circumstances. More than a collection of guidelines for correctly crafting sentences, pragmatics focuses on how language is used in communication. Speaker and listener, or writer and reader must both be present for communication to occur. The interaction of communicants is thus constantly taken into account in pragmatics.

Because of this, communication involves more than just the speaker encoding signals and the listener decoding symbols. It entails a difficult process of interpretation that depends not only on what is meant but also on what to say in terms of the sociocultural setting. This definition of pragmatics refers to "the skill of analyzing the unspoken". [11] What the speaker (writer) means by what is said (written), and how this is understood by the listener (or reader) in this scenario, is a key question in pragmatics. [8]

The context of the message is extremely important to the meaning of what is delivered. The way that communication develops depends on the activity in which it is employed. Language users select language forms based on the social environment, which includes elements including speaker identity, listener attitudes, activity kind, and speaker position. [10] Additionally, many signal types are used to comprehend the speech. Both

verbal and non-verbal expressions, such as prosody, kinematics, gestures, and facial expressions, are used in interpretation. The listener effectively derives conclusions from the collection of interrelated behavioral events originating from several communication subsystems (or "modalities") occurring at the same time. It takes the form of a single (often aural and visual) image that is delivered and received. [3]

The notion of speech acts is one of the cornerstones of pragmatics. A remark with a performative purpose in language and communication is referred to as a speech act in linguistics and philosophy of language. According to J.L. Austin, there are three degrees of analysis for a speech act:

- locutionary act: the actual utterance and its apparent meaning, including phonetic, factual, and ritual actions corresponding to the verbal, syntactic, and semantic aspects of any meaningful utterance;
 - illocutionary act: intended meaning as an appropriate verbal action in a particular socio-cultural context;
 - perlocutionary act: the actual effect of an utterance, such as persuading, intimidating, enlightening, inspiring, or in any other way compelling someone to do or understand;[1]
- So, it follows that being aware of a foreign language's pragmatic norms ensures that the required perlocutionary act, or effective communication, is received from the interlocutor.

The Brown-Levinson theory of politeness is an additional fundamental component of pragmatics. [2] In the first section, the theory of politeness is examined in its entirety, including its nature and operational framework. The researchers list etiquette techniques in the second section. English, Tamil, and Tzeltal are the three languages used by Brown and Levinson. As a result of the work of these two pragmatics researchers, specifically the theory of politeness, the idea of "face" is introduced.

It is worth noting that all interlocutors are interested in maintaining two types of "face" during the interaction: "positive face" and "negative face". A "positive face," according to P. Brown and S. Levinson, is a person's desire to receive approval and positive evaluation from others while communicating. While the "negative face" is the desire for others not to interfere with one's freedom of action. Using the concept of "face", P. Brown and S. Levinson consider "politeness" as also a phenomenon of a dual nature: "positive politeness" and "negative politeness". Positive politeness is demonstrated by satisfying a "positive face" in two ways:

- 1) by emphasizing similarities between participants
- 2) by expressing an assessment of the interlocutor's self-esteem.

Negative politeness can be expressed in two ways as well. First, it is expressed by preserving the interlocutor's "face" (either "negative" or "positive") through face-threatening acts such as advice and disapproval. Second, there is a way to satisfy the "negative face" when the rights of the interlocutor are not violated. In other words, politeness is expressed not only in the reduction of threatening acts, but also in the satisfaction on the interlocutors' faces, whether or not the threatening act occurs.

Although this theoretical component of their work has the potential to be applied to a wide range of interactions, P. Brown and S. Levinson's list of politeness strategies focuses on a very narrow range of interactions. The examples they provide are mostly single statements with clear communicative goals. P. Brown and S. Levinson frequently overlook the fact that most single statements are simply parts of a larger exchange of remarks between two or more participants. Understanding politeness strategies, on the other hand, is critical in the development of pragmatic competence for foreign language learners.

The Brown-Levinson politeness strategies are shown in Table 1.

Brown-Levinson Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies	Explanation	Usage situations
Bald on-record	Do nothing to reduce the threat to the listener's "face" and is thus used in close relationships or when information must be conveyed quickly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - urgent situation; - needed efficiency; - task orientation; - lack of desire to maintain someone's "face"; - the performance of an action that threatens the "face" is in the interests of the listener; - greetings; offers
Positive politeness	It is used as a way to make the listener feel close and belonging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participation in the interests, needs, wishes of the listener; - use of solidarity identification markers in the group; - optimism; - the inclusion of both the speaker and the listener in the action; - offer or promise; - increased interest in the listener and his interests; - avoidance of disagreements; - jokes
Negative politeness	It is used as a way to interact with the listener in an unobtrusive way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of indirect questions; - pessimism; pressure minimization; - use of structures such as nominalization, passive forms of the verb; - use of multiple pronouns, etc.
Off-record (indirect)	It is used to remove the speaker's pressure on the listener and only allude to the speaker's idea or specific request.	-relying on implicature

Humans are social creatures, and when they speak, they are typically conversing with others (with the exception of monologues). According to Paul Grice, an English language philosopher, when people speak, they have the intention of cooperating. P. Grice defines "cooperating" as knowing that every utterance is a potential interference with another's personal rights, autonomy, and desire. [4-7] As a result, interlocutors must formulate their statements in a specific manner.

P. Grice's cooperation principle is a set of rules that must be followed during a conversation. It is made up of four maxims (categories) that speakers must follow in order to be understood correctly.

The maxim of quantity means that one tries to be as informative as possible and provides only the information required.

The maxim of quality means that one should try to be truthful and not give information that is false or not supported by evidence.

The maxim of relevance explains the fact that the replicas must correspond to the topic of conversation.

The maxim of manners means that speakers should avoid ambiguity or obscurity and be direct and understandable. This maxim includes the following elements:

- avoidance of incomprehensible expressions;
- avoidance of ambiguity;
- brevity of statements (avoidance of verbosity);
- organization;

It should be noted that over the last few decades, a variety of models that describe pragmatic phenomena have emerged. Although their perspectives differ, they share several characteristics. First and foremost, this relates to the models' dual structure. This means that all such models contain a linguistic component, also known as a grammatical component, that serves as the utterance's immediate code. The second component is a focus on the use of language in context, depending on the purpose of communication. [12] All models show a bidirectional dependence on the context and meaning of pragmatic competence. This highlights the significance of developing foreign language learners' pragmatic competence.

Thus, pragmatic competence is a set of knowledge, rules for constructing statements, combining them into a text (discourse), the ability to use statements for various communicative functions, and the ability to construct statements in a foreign language in accordance with the characteristics of communicant interaction and the socio-cultural context. This competency is manifested in the ability to construct an utterance in accordance with the communicative and pragmatic goals.

To summarize, pragmatic competence is a set of specific knowledge about how to correctly structure statements and perform communicative functions. However, it is frequently not given the attention that it deserves when learning a foreign language. As a result, foreign language learners who have mastered language competence but not pragmatic competence can reproduce grammatically perfect speech, but this does not achieve communicative goals.



REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2. Brown P., Levinson S.C. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. 1987.
3. Crystal D. A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. Oxford, England: Blackwell. 1985.
4. Grice H.P. Utterer's meaning, sentence meaning, and word meaning. *Foundations of Language*. 1968. 4, 117-137.
5. Grice H.P. Utterer's meaning and intention. *The Philosophical Review*. 1969. 78(2), 147-177.
6. Grice H.P. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press. 1975.
7. Grice H.P. *Studies in the way of the words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1989.
8. Leech G.N. *Principles of pragmatics*. London, England: Longman. 1983.
9. Morris C. Foundations of the theory of signs. In Neuratin O., Carnap R., Morris C. (Eds.) *International encyclopedia of unified science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1938. Vol.2, bk 1.
10. Ohta A. A longitudinal study of the development of expression of alignment in Japanese as a foreign language. In Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language teaching*, (pp.103-120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.
11. Yule G. *Pragmatics*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. 1996. 59
12. Yule Niezgodka K., Roever C. Pragmatic and grammatical awareness. In K. R. Rose G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 63-79). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. 2001.