

Pragmatics and pragmatic competence

Baxodirova Nigoraxon Shavkatxon qizi,

PhD Student of Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

baxodirovanigora@gmail.com

Abstract: Pragmatic competence is the ability to use language effectively and appropriately in different contexts. Pragmatic competence is a fundamental aspect of a more general communicative competence. This article analyzes some terms like, pragmatics, pragmatic approach, pragmatic competence in applied linguistics and foreign language teaching

Key words: pragmatics, pragmatic approach, pragmatic ability, pragmatic competence

Прагматика и прагматическая компетентность

Баходирова Нигорахон Шавкатхон кизи,

Докторант Узбекского государственного университета мировых языков

baxodirovanigora@gmail.com

Аннотация: Прагматическая компетентность — это способность эффективно и уместно использовать язык в различных контекстах. Прагматическая компетентность является фундаментальным аспектом более общей коммуникативной компетенции. В данной статье анализируются такие термины, как прагматика, прагматический подход, прагматическая компетентность в прикладной лингвистике и преподавании иностранного языка.

Ключевые слова: прагматика, прагматический подход, прагматическая способность, прагматическая компетентность.

Pragmatika va pragmatik kompetentsiya

Baxodirova Nigoraxon Shavkatxon qizi,

O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti tayanch doktoranti

baxodirovanigora@gmail.com

Annotatsiya: Pragmatik kompetentsiya - bu turli kontekstlarda tildan samarali va to'g'ri foydalanish qobiliyatidir. Pragmatik kompetentsiya umumiy kommunikativ kompetentsiyaning asosiy jihati hisoblanadi. Ushbu maqolada

pragmatika, pragmatik yondashuv, amaliy tilshunoslikda pragmatik kompetentsiya va chet tilini o'qitishning ba'zi atamalar tahlil qilinadi.

Kalit so'zlar: pragmatik, pragmatik yondashuv, pragmatik qobiliyat, pragmatik kompetentsiya.

Introduction

Pragmatics has several meanings depending on the context. For example, “pragmatic approach” to something means that the implication is that the person is being practical. Yet, the word assumes a more specialized meaning in applied linguistics. In linguistics (the study of language), pragmatics is a specialized branch of study, focusing on the relationship between natural language and users of that language. Pragmatics focuses on conversational implicates or that which a speaker implies and which a listener infers.

Literature Review

To define pragmatics more broadly, experts compare and contrast pragmatics with linguistic semantics (the meaning of a sentence) or compare it to syntax (word order) or semiotics (the study of symbols), all of which are different terms. Longman Dictionary defines pragmatics as the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationships between sentences, the contexts, and the situation in which they are used. Pragmatics includes the study:

- how the interpretation and use of UTTERANCES depends on knowledge of the real world;
- how speakers use and understand SPEECH ACTS;
- how the structure of a sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

Pragmatics is sometimes contrasted with semantics, which deals with meaning without reference to the users and communicative functions of sentences [1].

Another related term is pragmatic ability. Pragmatic ability is known to be the ability to understand the desired meaning delivered by a speaker or writer and the ability to deliver intended meaning appropriately. In other words, it is the

ability to use appropriate communication in social situations, being aware of what to say it, how to say and when to say it.

Pragmatic competence is the ability to use language effectively and appropriately in different contexts. Pragmatic competence is a fundamental aspect of a more general communicative competence. The term was introduced by sociolinguist Jenny Thomas in a 1983 Applied Linguistics article, "Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure, in which she defined it as "the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand a language in context." [2]

“Pragmatic competence , broadly defined as the ability to use the language appropriately in a social context, has become an object of inquiry in a wide range of disciplines including linguistics, applied linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, communication research, and cross-cultural studies.” [3]

The notion of pragmatic competence originates from pragmatics, a subfield in linguistics. Crystal defines pragmatics as “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.” [4]

In Bachman's model, language competence is subdivided into two components, organizational competence and pragmatic competence. Organizational competence comprises knowledge of linguistic units and the rules of joining them together at the levels of sentence (grammatical competence) and discourse (textual competence).

Pragmatic competence subdivides into 'illocutionary competence' and 'sociolinguistic competence'. Illocutionary competence can be glossed as knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out. [5.87]

Leech has proposed, pragmatic competence includes the following basic features: 1) the language level of compliance with the pragmatic language rules; 2) the level of focus on pragmatic social and cultural differences; 3) the level of

attachment mechanism of cognitive constraints; 4) time and space situational context of the level of stress constraints. [6]

Materials and Methods

To what extent does pragmatic competence affect communicative competence? As language is the inseparable aspect of culture, which means that, in order to achieve communicative competence, language learners need to develop cultural competence as well as linguistic competence. This leads learners being culturally competent in two speech communities and becoming bilinguals. In order to appropriately understand a culture and become a member of the new speech community, language learners must develop both lingual and cultural competence.

In English teaching, communicative competence is defined to be the learners' ability to understand main points of native speaker in areal communication situation and the ability to deliver a response with little or no effort, without errors that interfere the meaning. Canale and Swain in Rose and Kasper [7; 64] put forward three sub-competencies, which are extended by Canale into four sub-competencies. The sub-competencies are grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.

- Grammatical competence refers to the knowledge of linguistic code features such as phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics
- Sociolinguistic competence refers to the knowledge of contextually appropriate language use.
- Discourse competence is the knowledge of achieving coherence and cohesion in spoken or written communication.
- Strategic competence refers to the knowledge of how to use communication strategies to handle breakdowns in communication and make communication effective.

According to Chomsky, pragmatic competence is defined as the ability to place "language in the institutional settings of its use, relating intentions and purposes to the linguistic means at hand." [8; 225] Chomsky

distinguishes pragmatic competence from grammatical competence. Grammatical competence in this instance is limited to knowledge of form and meaning whereas pragmatics is concerned with knowledge of conditions and manner of appropriate use. For Chomsky, theories of grammatical and pragmatic competence must find their place in a theory of performance that takes into account the structures of memory, our mode of organizing experience and so on. Whereas for Chomsky pragmatic competence is a wider term which includes communicative competence as one of its components, Fraser and Rientel view communicative competence as the more general level which incorporates not only pragmatic competence but also the areas of “discourse analysis”, “conversational analysis”, “conversational interaction” and “ethno methodological” studies. They point out “any serious study of language use must go beyond the utterance level - what we have called pragmatic competence - to the more general level of communicative competence which embodies the areas mentioned above.” [9; 78]

Results and Discussions

In the field of language learning and teaching, “Linguistic competence may be thought of as the learners’ knowledge of the structures and vocabulary of the language and his ability to produce and comprehend well-formed sentences in the language”. [10; 35]. Oller goes on to say that pragmatics defines the “goal of teaching a language as inducing the student not merely to manipulate meaningless sound sequences, but to send and receive messages in the language. “ [11; 507]. Such a view of pragmatics coincides with that of communicative competence seen as the learners; use of “the language to send and receive messages in concrete situation and for specific purposes” [10; 36].

It is concerned with “the ability of the second language learner to use the language in a social context to perform the various speech acts of requesting apologizing and the like” [11]. Foreign language communicative

competence, is seen as the “ability to function dynamically in a truly communicative setting adapting to all of the informational elements in the context be they linguistic or non-verbal”. [12; 8-9]

Conclusion

Thus, we can see that although communicative competence implies an underlying knowledge and a potential to communicate well, its definition is usually associated with actual performance in a social situation. That means, if learners have an enhanced communicative competence they can use language correctly according to grammatical rules. If they owe pragmatic competence, they can use the language in a socio-culturally appropriate way thanks to increased awareness of linguistic structures and social norms.

References:

1. Bachman, L. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Chomsky, N 1981 Rules and representation. Basil Blackwell Oxford. p. 225)
3. Crystal, D. (1997). A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. 4th edition. Cambridge, MA: Blackwel Richards J.C, Platt J, Platt H. LONGMAN DICTIONARY OF LANGUAGE TEACHING & APPLIED LINGUISTICS- Singapore, 1992. -284-285pp
4. Fraser, B. & Rintell, E. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. In discourse analysis. Second language. ed. D. Larsen and Freeman. Newbury house, publishers Inc, Rowley Massachussetts.
5. Fisher, R.A. 1984 Testing written communicative competence in French. Modern Language Journal. VOl 68 n I. 13-19.
6. Leech, G. (1990). Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman
7. Oller. Jr. 1970 Transformational theory and pragmatics. The modern Language Journal vol 54. 504.507p. 507)

8. Rose, K.R and G. Kasper. (2001). Pragmatics in Language Teaching pp.1-9
in Rose, K.R. and G. Kasper (eds). Pragmatics in Language Teaching. New
York: Cambridge University Press
9. Taguchi Naoko Pragmatic competence.2009
10. Thomas, Jenny. "Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure," 1983. Rpt. in World
Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics, Vol. 4, ed. by Kingsley Bolton
and Braj B. Kachru. Routledge, 2006
11. Savignon, S. 1972 Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign
language teaching. Philadelphia P.A. Centre for curriculum Development. p.
8-9