IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY OF DEVELOPING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE OF FUTURE TEACHERS

Sakbaeva Vitaliya
Head of the Uzbek language and literature department
Termez institute of engineering and technology
sakbaevavitavladimirovna@gmail.com

Annotation: *Modern educational institutions have put before them a socially active person with creative thinking, the formation of skills aimed at the flow of information in graduates, the assimilation of new technologies, Independent Education, deepening and expanding existing knowledge.*

Key words: *develop pragmatic competence, modernization, important value, educational process, evaluating the quality of education, main purpose of language teaching.*

The theory of speech acts represents a different line of research on the pragmatic aspect of language. It also recognizes that the main thing in language is its pragmatic, communicative function. Without denying the role of community-shared rules, this theory introduces characteristics such as the speaker's intention, communication goal, and so on. In other words, according to the theory of speech acts, the use of language largely depends on the consciousness of the subject of linguistic activity.

Pragmatics (derived from the Greek word: πράγμα; genitive case πράγματος — deed, action) is a branch of semiotics in which the relations of signs to the subjects who produce and interpret them are studied.

Pragmatics is a branch of semiotics in which the relations of signs (see Sign) to the subjects who produce and interpret them are studied. Pragmatics, as a rule, is considered within the framework of the interdisciplinary field of research of signs and sign systems of semiotics (see Semiotics) together with its two other sections: semantics (see Semantics) and syntactics (see Syntactics). The first of them considers signs in their relation to designated (non—symbolic) objects, the second - the relationship of signs to each other (syntax). The most important subject of study for pragmatics is the pragmatic aspect of language (see Language).

The term "pragmatics" was introduced in the late 30s of the XX century. Morris used it to designate one of the three sections of semiotics (along with syntactics and semantics). However, the very pragmatic aspect of the existence of sign systems (including language) was first carefully considered by C. S. Pierce at the end of the XIX century. Pierce (like Morris, who largely followed his ideas) considered the pragmatic component to be the main one for determining the essence of the sign. The sign becomes such not because of its physical properties, but because of a certain use of it in the community. Therefore, both the way of constructing sign constructions (syntax)

and the relation of signs to designated objects (semantics) are only a means for signs to perform their main function: to provide communication between people.

According to Peirce, cognition is a process of mediating reality by signs. The need for mediation arises because cognitive activity is carried out not by an isolated subject (as the philosophical tradition coming from R. Descartes tries to present it), but by a community that, in its joint actions, develops a general idea of the world. The process of cognition consists in the production and interpretation of signs (mainly linguistic). In this sense, truth, according to Peirce, is not the correspondence of judgments to some objective state of affairs. It represents a consensus reached within the community. In other words, truth is not a semantic concept (as it appears, for example, in A. Tarsky), but a pragmatic one.

For several decades after Peirce, despite the widespread interest in topics related to language and sign systems, pragmatic issues were almost not touched upon by researchers. Most of the works in the field of semiotics, linguistics and philosophy of language focused on the syntactic-semantic approach. A surge of interest in pragmatics (mainly linguistic) arose already in the second half of the 20th century and was associated with developments within the framework of analytical philosophy (see Analytical Philosophy). The first significant events that testified to this were, firstly, the late works of L. Wittgenstein, and secondly, the theory of speech acts by J. Austin.

Humans are social creatures, and when they speak, they are usually having conversations with others (monologues/speeches are an exception). English philosopher Paul Gracey states that when people speak, they have a desire for cooperation (or cooperation). P. For Grice, every statement/opinion that speaks "cooperation" means a potential/probable interference (a potential face-threatening action/act) with the personal rights, autonomy, and desires of another person (Grice, H.P., 1968, 1969, 1975, 1989). That is why interlocutors must express their statements/opinions in a certain way.

According to the definition given by the scientist John Leach, pragmatic linguistics (pragmalinguistics) represents the linguistic strategies and resources necessary to encode and decode this illocution (Leech G.N., 1983). For example, a linguistic strategy for constructing a request is an indirect request (eg Could you open the door, please?). In this case, the linguistic formalization of the sentence includes the presence of a modal verb, the presence of an interrogative form, and encirclement, that is, a certain level of softening of the request (please). From this, we can draw a conclusion that pragmatics is more concerned with pragmatics, and it is manifested individually in each acquired language. Social pragmatics (sociopragmatics) refers to the regulatory norms of the language, that is, it refers to understanding how to express one's opinion in one or another socio-cultural context.

In order to determine how this component appeared and what it is, we will consider different models of communicative competence. Among the whole variety of approaches and models that include pragmatic competence in one way or another,

proposed by foreign authors, some groups can be singled out. For example, scientists V. Loughlin, J. Wayne and Y. Schmidgall explores three such approaches: (1) functional or discourse-oriented models; (2) component models; (3) meaning-oriented models (Laughlin W., Wain, J., Schmidgall, J., 2015).

L.F. Bachman and A.S. In Palmer's model, pragmatic competence appears as an independent element under this name (Bachman L.F., Palmer A.S, 1982, 1996, 2010). These scholars suggested language competence. Pragmatic competence played the most important role in its structure. Pragmatic competence is understood as the interpretation of spoken statements/ideas depending on the social and cultural context. In this, the use of language in discourse has a large number of functions.

L.F. Bachman and A.S. In order to understand the role of the pragmatic competence that interests us in the model of language competence proposed by Palmer, we will study this model in more detail. L.F. According to Bachman, language competence consists of two levels of competence: organizational and pragmatic. We will cover only the main aspects and rules of organizational competence and will not dwell on it in detail. Organizational competence includes the language user's ability to control the formal structure of the language, construct and recognize grammatically correct sentences, and construct/create text based on these sentences. This competence includes two more components: grammatical and text/textual sub-competencies.

Competence is not opposed to knowledge, skills and abilities, but stands separately in relation to them.

According to B. Khodzhaev, competence (a Latin word that means to achieve, come right) is the readiness of the subject to effectively organize external and internal resources to set a goal and achieve it, in other words, it is the subject's personal ability to solve certain professional issues [169 ; p. 179]

J. Purpura's so-called meaning-based/meaning-oriented model, developed much later, is a borderline model between grammar and pragmatics. So, J. Purpura's model is a kind of synthesis of the functional and component models proposed much earlier. As a result, a mixed model is obtained that incorporates structuralism and functional orientation from the point of view of interpretation (Purpura J., 2004).

The author made his model L.F. Bachman and A.S. It offers an alternative/alternative to Palmer's theory. Although this scientist considers his concept of communicative competence in a foreign language to be "a conceptualization of language ability that covers the most aspects and aspects" (Purpura J., 2004, p. 54), the author L.F. Bachman and A.S. Palmer's model considered the advantage aspect because it more clearly describes how a speaker uses structural and grammatical knowledge to perform in a specific/concrete context. Nevertheless, J. According to Purpura, it is necessary to bring grammar and pragmatics closer together to understand how they interact/work with each other. To this end, the author proposes a model in which pragmatic and grammatical interdependent/subordinate levels of

language proficiency can be found. J. According to Purpura, although these two types of knowing seem quite different when taken separately, they come together in a particular communicative context. According to the author, the purpose of communication determines the meaning of the speakers' statements. From here, it becomes self-evident that communication is the main purpose of language use for a scientist.

The author distinguishes five types of contextual expression of pragmatic meaning. The first type is called contextual. The second type is called socio-linguistic. Socio-cultural type is the third type. The fourth type is psychological. The last type is rhetorical. J. Purpura pragmatics L.F. Bachman and A.S. Although Palmer's model seems to re-arrange the proposed components, it expands the scope. J. Purpura adds social distance (distance), level of politeness and other concepts developed within the theory of politeness (Brown P., Levinson S.C., 1987). In order to reconstruct the content of the main components of pragmatic competence, the author starts from the concept of "meaning".

It should be noted that during the last few decades, a number of different models have appeared that describe pragmatic phenomena to one degree or another. Although they differ from each other in their individual perspective/perspective, they have a number of common (common) properties, aspects. First of all, the duality of these models is related to the structure. This means that in all such models there is some linguistic (linguistic) or otherwise grammatical component that constitutes the direct code of the statement. Depending on the purpose of communication, the focus on the contextual use of language (reliance, intendedness) serves as the second component. Bidirectional nature of such context and meaning dependence of pragmatic competence is observed in all models. This shows the importance of forming pragmatic competence of foreign language learners.

So, pragmatic competence represents the ability to construct statements, combine them into meaning (discourse), knowledge, rules, the ability to use the statement for various communicative functions, the ability to construct statements in a foreign language in accordance with the characteristics of the interaction of communicators and the socio-cultural context. This competence is expressed in the ability to build a statement in accordance with communicative and pragmatic purpose. There are three principles on which pragmatic competence is built. The first of them is the meaning of the expressed thought (thing, event, concept, event). The second principle is the interaction of the interlocutors with each other and the context with them, and the context itself is the third principle.

As a component of communicative competence in a foreign language, the component composition of pragmatic competence was determined, which includes the following elements: a) the social component (the ability to interpret the social contexts of communication and the social roles of participants in communication; the ability to choose a socially acceptable style of communication); b) the socio-linguistic

(sociolinguistic) component (the ability to interpret the speech statement (social meanings, ; the ability to use the necessary language and speech tools to achieve the goal of communication in accordance with the selected social roles)).

It was proposed to look at the formation of the above-mentioned components of pragmatic competence on the basis of training on pragmatic markers. The formation of the social component of pragmatic competence is carried out by training/teaching parallel and interpretive markers. Social interaction assumes the use of tools that vary depending on the social context of communication of the expression of Appeal and assessment.

USED LITERATURE:

1. Mirzaei, A., Roohani, A., & Esmaeili, M. (2012). Exploring pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic variability in speech act production of L2 learners and native speakers. The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 4(3), 79-102.

2. Cummings, L.(2005). Pragmatics: A Multidisciplinary Perspective. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

3. Cohen, A.D. (2012). Teaching pragmatics in the second language classroom. The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL, 1(1), 35-49. Retrieved April 29, 2015 from