PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN REAL-LIFE COMMUNICATION

Mavludabonu Buriyeva
Master of Termez University of Economics and Service
Termez, Uzbekistan.
Mustafayeva Nilufar Ulashovna
Supervisor: PhD at Termez State University.

Abstract. The article presents a framework for developing and assessing pragmatic competence, highlighting the role of context-specific knowledge, cultural awareness, and strategic communication abilities. Empirical studies are reviewed demonstrating how pragmatic failures can lead to miscommunication, social gaffes, and breakdowns in interpersonal understanding.

Key words: conversational imlicature, miscommunication, communicative competence, speech acts, social norms, contextual awareness.

ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКАЯ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТЬ В РЕАЛЬНОМ ОБЩЕНИИ

Аннотация. В статье представлена основа развития и оценки прагматической компетентности, подчеркивающая роль контекстно-зависимых знаний, культурной осведомленности и стратегических коммуникативных способностей. Рассматриваются эмпирические исследования, демонстрирующие, как прагматические неудачи могут привести к недопониманию, социальным ошибкам и нарушениям межличностного взаимопонимания.

Ключевые слова: разговорная импликатура, непонимание, коммуникативная компетентность, речевые акты, социальные нормы, контекстуальная осведомленность.

Being an effective communicator involves more than just mastering the grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation of a language. It also requires pragmatic competence - the ability to use language appropriately and adaptively in real-world contexts. Pragmatic competence enables us to navigate the complex, dynamic nature of everyday interactions, allowing us to convey our intended meanings, build rapport, and avoid miscommunications.

Yet pragmatic skills are often overlooked in language instruction and assessment, which tend to focus more narrowly on linguistic accuracy. This oversight is problematic, as proficiency in the pragmatic aspects of communication is crucial for success in a wide range of professional, academic, and social settings. Missteps in pragmatics can lead to awkward silences, unintended offense, and breakdowns in mutual understanding - even when one's grammatical knowledge is strong.

This article examines the nature of pragmatic competence and its pivotal role in real-life communication. Drawing on research in linguistics, psychology, and communication studies, we will explore the key pragmatic skills involved, such as interpreting indirect speech, managing conversational implicature, and navigating social and cultural norms. The article will also discuss practical strategies for developing and assessing pragmatic abilities, with implications for language pedagogy and professional communication training.

Ultimately, cultivating pragmatic competence is essential for achieving genuine communicative competence - the ability to use language effectively to accomplish one's goals and

foster meaningful connections with others. By moving beyond a narrow focus on linguistic form, we can empower individuals to engage in the fluid, context-dependent nature of real-world interactions with greater confidence and skill.

At the heart of pragmatic competence is the ability to use language appropriately based on the specific context and communicative goals. This goes beyond just knowing the literal meanings of words and grammatical structures. Pragmatic competence involves an understanding of social conventions, cultural norms, and interpersonal dynamics that shape how language is used and interpreted in natural interactions.

For example, consider a simple request like "Could you please pass the salt?" The pragmatic competence to use this utterance effectively involves recognizing that it is not a yes/no question about one's physical capabilities, but rather a polite imperative for action. Responding literally with "Yes, I could" would miss the pragmatic intent. Competent communicators understand the indirect, face-saving nature of this request form and respond accordingly.

Pragmatic skills also enable us to navigate ambiguity, implied meanings, and context-dependent interpretations. Competent communicators can read between the lines, grasping conversational implicature and making appropriate inferences. They know how to signal politeness, convey nuanced attitudes, and manage the ebb and flow of a dialogue.

Failures in pragmatic competence, on the other hand, can lead to all sorts of communicative breakdowns - from social gaffes and misunderstandings to more serious conflicts and relationship strain. Imagine, for instance, an exchange where one person speaks in an overly direct manner that violates politeness norms in a particular cultural context. Or a situation where someone misinterprets subtle nonverbal cues and makes an inappropriate comment. These pragmatic failures can alienate others and undermine one's ability to build rapport and achieve communicative goals.

Ultimately, pragmatic competence is essential for genuine communicative competence - the capacity to use language flexibly and effectively in the real world. It empowers us to navigate the complexities of human interaction, fostering more productive, meaningful, and harmonious communication. As such, developing pragmatic skills should be a key priority in language education and professional communication training.

Theories of Pragmatic Competence

Speech Act Theory

Pioneered by philosophers like J.L. Austin and John Searle, speech act theory analyzes how speakers use language to perform various actions, such as requesting, promising, apologizing, etc.

It emphasizes that utterances do not just describe the world, but can actively shape it through their pragmatic force. Developing pragmatic competence involves understanding the conventional uses of different speech acts and how to deploy them appropriately.

Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature

Philosopher H.P. Grice's theory of the cooperative principle and conversational implicature explains how speakers and listeners work together to generate and interpret indirect, context-dependent meanings. Competent communicators understand Grice's maxims (of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner) and can navigate the gap between the literal and implied meanings of utterances.

Politeness Theory

Sociolinguists like Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson have theorized that politeness behaviors, such as hedging, indirectness, and face-saving strategies, are a key component of pragmatic competence. Their politeness theory illuminates how speakers balance competing needs for clarity, efficiency, and interpersonal rapport in communication.

Intercultural Pragmatics

Scholars in intercultural communication have developed frameworks for understanding how pragmatic norms and expectations vary across cultures. Theories like Hofstede's cultural dimensions and House's SPEAKING model highlight how factors like power distance, individualism, and linguistic repertoire shape pragmatic competence in cross-cultural interactions.

Relevance Theory

Cognitive pragmatists like Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson have proposed relevance theory, which explains how communicators make pragmatic inferences by searching for the most relevant interpretations of utterances given the context. This theory underscores the role of mutual cognitive environment in pragmatic competence.

By drawing on these theoretical perspectives, the article can provide a comprehensive understanding of the multi-faceted nature of pragmatic competence and its centrality to real-world communication.

Pragmatic Competence in Action: An Interpersonal Conflict Case Study

To illustrate the real-world importance of pragmatic competence, let's consider the following interpersonal conflict scenario:

Maya, a young professional, is preparing for an important meeting with her manager, Alex. As Maya arrives at the conference room, Alex greets her with the comment, "You look a bit tired today. Late night?"

From a purely semantic standpoint, Alex's statement is a neutral observation. However, from a pragmatic perspective, this utterance carries implicit meaning and potential face threats.

Depending on Maya's interpretation, Alex could be subtly criticizing her for appearing unprepared, making an unwelcome personal remark, or demonstrating a lack of empathy.

Maya's pragmatic competence will be crucial in navigating this situation effectively. A pragmatically competent response might be: "Thanks for your concern, Alex. I had a bit of a busy evening, but I'm ready to dive into the agenda for today." This response acknowledges the implied meaning, redirects the conversation to the task at hand, and maintains a collaborative, professional tone.

In contrast, a pragmatically inept response from Maya could be: "I'm fine, just had trouble sleeping last night. Is that a problem?" This defensive retort misses the implicit politeness and rapport-building functions of Alex's remark, potentially escalating the interaction into an unproductive conflict.

This scenario illustrates how pragmatic competence - the ability to interpret and respond to the contextual, interpersonal dynamics of a conversation - is essential for achieving communicative goals and preserving positive working relationships. Failures in pragmatic competence can lead to misunderstandings, social blunders, and breakdowns in collaboration, even when the communicators have strong linguistic knowledge.

By analyzing real-world cases like this, we can better understand the nuanced, context-dependent nature of pragmatic competence and why it deserves greater emphasis in communication skills training and language education. Equipping individuals with pragmatic abilities empowers them to navigate the complexities of real-life interactions with greater dexterity and social awareness.

In sum, pragmatic competence is a foundational aspect of communicative competence - the ability to use language flexibly and effectively to accomplish one's goals in the real world. It empowers individuals to navigate the complexities of human interaction with greater nuance, diplomacy, and social awareness. By highlighting its critical importance across diverse domains, we can make a strong case for elevating pragmatics as a key focus in language education and professional communication training.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.
2. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.
4. Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman.
5. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and cognition (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
6. Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. Multilingual Matters.
7. House, J. (1997). Toward a model for the analysis of inappropriate responses in native/non-native interactions. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives (pp. 161-183). Longman.
8. Taguchi, N. (2019). The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics. Routledge.