



sensitivity, emphasizing the importance of maintaining ethical standards in cross-cultural communication.

6. Future Trends: Consider discussing future trends and potential developments in the field of secondary interpretation in light of increasing language contact and globalization. Explore how interpreters can adapt to evolving linguistic landscapes and technological advancements to meet the demands of a rapidly changing global communication environment.

In conclusion, language contact in the context of globalization has a profound impact on the process of secondary interpretation. While it can enrich interpreters' linguistic skills and broaden their cultural horizons, it also presents challenges in terms of stylistic, lexical, and syntactic differences between languages. To navigate these challenges effectively, interpreters must develop a deep understanding of both source and target languages, as well as the cultural contexts in which they operate. By embracing linguistic diversity and adapting to the evolving landscape of global communication, interpreters can enhance their ability to facilitate cross-cultural understanding and promote effective communication in an interconnected world.

References

1. Baker, Mona. "In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation." Routledge, 2018.
2. Grosjean, François. "Bilingual: Life and Reality." Harvard University Press, 2010.
3. Holmes, James S. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.
4. Poplack, Shana. "Code-Switching (Linguistic)." The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction, 2015.
5. Sánchez, Rosina Márquez. "Translation and Language Contact in the Digital Age." Multilingual Matters, 2017.

LINGUODIDACTIC ISSUES IN ENHANCING STUDENTS' PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

Eshchanov (Yeshanov) Marat Urazaliyevich
PhD Student
Uzbekistan State World Languages University



Abstract

The aim of the article is to discuss the linguodidactic issues of incorporating pragmatic competence into English language education. It also highlights innovative trends in the instruction of pragmatic competence in English language classrooms and their reflection in international communication and English teacher professional development context.

Key words: English language training, English as an international language, communication, approach, pragmatic, pragmatic competence, teaching, curriculum, learner, task, fluency, discourse, method, strategies, context, instruction

Learning and mastering English for international communication and various specific purposes in both educational and professional contexts play a pivotal role in the current globalized world. Being tensely connected with 21 century skills, comprehensive English language training allows advanced and pragmatic mutual and global cooperation between groups of educators and stakeholders and diverse communities right across the world and boosts social and personal developments in communications as well as in job industry.

English language teaching has become a popular educational training and significant component of instructional policy in the Republic of Uzbekistan. Over the last ten years, a number of projects and official documents have been released in order to expand advancements in effective training and mastery of foreign languages. One of the key documents in foreign language education promotion, the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers adopted in May 2013 on “Endorsing state educational standard on foreign language in continuous education” allowed important scientific and applied practices in the use and design of approaches to the teaching and training of foreign languages at all stages of education. This official document highlighted communicative competence – linguistic competence, pragmatic competence, sociolinguistic competence as the core components of foreign language instruction and proficiency. As a result, the current practices in foreign language education, especially English education in the country have benefited a broad set of CEFR-based and innovative curriculum using Communicative Approach.

Pragmatic competence is viewed as vital for effective communication in English as an international language (EIL), necessitating its thorough integration into EIL-



aware pedagogy. However, despite this close association, the recognition and empirical application of EIL within second language (L2) pragmatics are relatively recent developments. This status quo is influenced by historical trends spanning both non-EIL and EIL-aware periods. Bachman (1990) states that the integration of pragmatics into English language teaching was delayed despite earlier acknowledgment of its significance within communicative competence frameworks. In the same way, while the importance of pragmatics in various conceptualizations of EIL is acknowledged, its explicit incorporation into pedagogy is only now gaining traction. Current attention in pragmatics pedagogy primarily revolves around exploring teachers' and learners' beliefs about EIL pragmatics rather than implementing concrete EIL-based pragmatic teaching methods. This chapter aims to elucidate the historical evolution of the interface between EIL and pragmatics pedagogy during both non-EIL and EIL-aware eras.

The term “non-EIL era” refers to a period when pragmatics pedagogy was not influenced by the relevant concepts and insights from English as an international language theory. During this time, pragmatics pedagogy primarily involved descriptive and acquisitional studies of second language pragmatics, reflecting distinct historical phases outlined by Tajeddin and Alemi (2020). According to their classification, the historical trajectory of second language pragmatics can be categorized into three periods: Descriptive Pragmatic Awareness, Acquisitional Pragmatic Awareness, and (Critical) Pragmatic Awakening. Building on this framework, we discuss an expanded classification. In the initial period, primarily dominant in the 1980s, there was limited emphasis on pragmatics pedagogy. Studies mainly focused on speech acts within a single language or across cultural domains, exploring speech act realization strategies in the first language and second language or two native languages. However, pragmatics pedagogy began to gain momentum in the early 1990s, marking the second period of L2 pragmatics history, characterized by a focus on acquisitional pragmatics. During this phase, research centered on the pragmatic acquisition of L2 learners, addressing topics such as the teachability of pragmatics, effective instructional tasks,



and the relationship between L2 pragmatics and second language acquisition theories (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999, 2010; Barron, 2003; Cohen, 1996, 2010; Cohen & Tarone, 1994; Kasper, 1997; Kasper & Rose, 1999; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Rose & Kasper, 2001, 2020). The descriptive and acquisitional phases of pragmatic awareness largely align with what is meant by the non-EIL era of pragmatics pedagogy.

While second language pragmatics researchers began consistently addressing English as an international language (EIL) in pragmatics pedagogy in the 2010s, the integration of pragmatics into mainstream EIL studies dates back to the 1990s, particularly evident in conceptual papers and book chapters from the 2000s. Cogo (2009) advocated for recognizing differences in EIL conversations and the employment of pragmatic strategies. Murray (2012) stressed the importance of enhancing L2 learners' pragmatic competence to prepare them for EIL communication. However, it has only been in recent years that L2 pragmatics has seriously considered EIL-related concepts in pedagogy. Pioneering researchers like House (2010) argued for the development of pragmatic fluency among EIL users, while House (2013) focused on the development of pragmatic competence in EIL, particularly regarding discourse markers for expressing subjectivity and connectivity. LoCastro (2012) briefly addressed the interface between EIL and classroom pragmatic development, highlighting the dilemma faced by EIL teachers regarding what to prioritize in language instruction. Ishihara (2012) was among the first to emphasize the incorporation of EIL in L2 pragmatics pedagogy, emphasizing the need for EIL users to acquire and practice pragmatic competence in today's globalized world. Taguchi and Ishihara (2018) reviewed EIL pragmatic studies, advocating for a broader definition of EIL pragmatic competence centered on speakers' creativity and adaptability in interaction, which includes shaping illocutionary force, co-constructing norms, navigating communicative demands, and displaying alignment with interlocutors. This definition underscores the range of abilities necessary for effective communication in EIL settings.



Conclusion: In conclusion, in the light of the importance of pragmatics in English as an international language, it becomes evident that the strand of pragmatics pedagogy oriented towards EIL holds significant potential in shaping an EIL-aware approach to second language (L2) pragmatics instruction. However, in contrast to researchers focusing on EIL, scholars in pragmatics have only recently begun to engage with the concept of EIL from a conceptual standpoint. Consequently, there is a lack of research exploring the perspectives of learners, teachers, and policymakers regarding pragmatics pedagogy shaped by EIL principles. Furthermore, the actual implementation of pragmatics instruction informed by EIL-related concepts remains largely unexplored.

The nascent yet limited intersection between pragmatics pedagogy and EIL points toward future directions for both instruction and research in pragmatics. In terms of instruction, EIL should inform the development of teaching materials, instructional tasks, and assessment methods for learners' pragmatic skills. These materials should encompass examples from both native and non-native English speakers, reflecting various forms of world Englishes and illustrating variations in pragmatic norms and conventions. Teaching activities should also focus on developing learners' intercultural negotiation strategies for navigating pragmatic challenges in EIL contexts.

Given the crucial role of teachers in pragmatics instruction, there is a pressing need for teacher education courses aimed at enhancing teachers' knowledge and practice in pragmatics, with a specific focus on EIL-informed instruction. Additionally, efforts should be made to integrate pragmatic assessment within the context of EIL, thereby promoting positive feedback for pragmatics teaching and learning.

The interface between EIL and pragmatics pedagogy presents numerous avenues for promising research. One essential area is to explore stakeholders' perspectives on pragmatics pedagogy aligned with EIL characteristics. These stakeholders, including learners, teachers, and educational supervisors, play a pivotal role in shaping and implementing EIL-based pragmatics pedagogy and should be actively involved and informed about its developments.



References

1. Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Bardovi Harlig, K. (1999). The interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49(4), 677 713.
3. Barron, A. (2019). Pragmatic development and stay abroad. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 146, 43 53.
4. Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings* (pp. 254 273). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
5. Cohen, A. D. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 253 267.
6. García, C. (1999). The three stages of Venezuelan invitations and responses. *Multi lingua: Journal of Cross Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 18(4), 391 433.
7. House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 225 252.
8. Ishihara, N. (2012). Incorporating a critical approach into teaching pragmatics: A story based approach. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 29 36.
9. Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81 104.
10. LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for Language Educators: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
11. McKay, S. L. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an International Language* (pp. 227 234). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
12. Taguchi, N., & Ishihara, N. (2018). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca: Research and pedagogy in the era of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38, 80 101.
13. Taguchi, N., & Sykes, J. M. (2013). *Technology in Interlanguage Pragmatics Research and Teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
14. Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M. (2020). Pragmatics and good language teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from Good Language Teachers* (pp. 189 202). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(3), 369 386.
16. Рахмонов, А. Б. (2022, February). КРЕАТИВНАЯ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЯ КАК ОДНА ИЗ КЛЮЧЕВЫХ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЙ ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЯ. In *The 7 th International scientific and practical conference "Science, innovations and education: problems and prospects" (February 9-11, 2022) CPN Publishing Group, Tokyo, Japan. 2022. 842 p.* (p. 469).

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES OF INCREASING THE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF PHILOLOGY STUDENTS

Farxodova Dilnoza

*O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
13.00.02 – Ta'lim va tarbiya nazaryasi*