

The Role of Communicative Competence in Sociolinguistics

Ermetova Zhamila Ismailovna, Akhmedova Kamola Kudratovna

Urgench State University Uzbekistan, Urgench

Abstract: This article focuses on sociolinguistics, its various aspects and the importance of communicative competence in an intercultural environment..

Keywords: sociolinguistics, communicative competence, social context, speech act, linguist, extralinguistics.

Introduction

Changes in linguistic theory led to the emergence of sociolinguistics. In fact, sociolinguistic theory is a product of the process of transition from so-called structuralism to contextualism. Unlike linguistic theory, sociolinguistic theory emphasizes the relevance of a verbal message in context. Interest in sociolinguistics, or the so-called social aspects of language, has prompted linguists to go beyond simple structural analysis of grammatical systems. As a result, they concentrated on the use of the language by human groups, social strata, geographic regions.

Sociolinguists turned out to be attentive to the variable rules for describing those linguistic forms that were socially loaded. This has led linguists to question the correctness of Chomsky's linguistic competence and any other descriptive method that excludes any preoccupation with language variation and diversity. The flaws in the concept of linguistic competence paved the way for the birth of a more comprehensive concept of communicative competence.

To broaden our understanding of communication in various social contexts, we must study sociolinguistic phenomena. Despite the fact that sociolinguistics is rooted in sociology, they differ in the goals they pursue. The first focuses on society in order to understand the characteristics of the use of language in social contexts. The latter, however, focuses on language for understanding society and its structure. Sociolinguistics began to flourish in the early sixties. However, its origins can be traced back to a very long time. A review of the history of the region demonstrates the theoretical development that it has undergone in the process of moving towards its current state. In fact, progress comes from a contextless view of language to an interpretation of language in its social context. This shift in views is the result of various theories of language and its nature that have been proposed. It is necessary to revisit the theory and philosophy on which the study of language was based in the course of its evolution in order to understand the principles of sociolinguistics and get an idea of how it developed.

Main part

Hymes' pioneering work emphasized the importance of language as a communication system in which knowledge of the use of the language is as important as grammatical knowledge. Although grammatical knowledge is still very important, especially as Chomsky argues, knowledge of the rules governing the correct use of the language is especially important, since without this knowledge the speaker cannot adequately interact with other members of the given speech community. This knowledge will allow the speaker to know, for example, what to say, when to say it, to whom and how to say it in a socially and culturally acceptable way [1].

Simple knowledge of the meanings, forms and functions of a particular language is not enough for speakers, because communication is a complex process. This knowledge should also be applicable to discussions of meaning. Interaction between listeners and speakers or readers and writers clarifies the meaning. In response to the speaker's statements, the listener gives him / her feedback as to whether he / she understands what the speaker has said.

This ensures that the speaker can change what is said if necessary. It will also give the speaker some clues as to whether he / she should repeat his / her word or not. Therefore, in some cases it is assumed that the form of the utterance is guaranteed by the function of the discourse; the grammar can be familiar to the listener to infer the speaker's intentions. However, as first demonstrated by speech act specialists, form is not the only signal of function.

Compared to other branches of linguistics, pragmatics has only recently appeared on the linguistic map. However, in the 1970s, it became an important factor in linguistic thinking. Since then, pragmatics has become an important area of research. Pragmatics can be roughly characterized as the study of the meaning of linguistic utterances to their users and translators.

Pragmatics distinguishes between two intentions or meanings in each statement or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intention of the meaning of the sentence, and the other is the communicative intention or meaning of the speaker. Thus, pragmatics is research that explains the use of language in context. It is associated with the meaning of the speaker, not the meaning of the utterance, and seeks to explain the interaction of social language.

Analyses

Modern linguistics is called the study of language as a system of human communication. In this tradition, pragmatics have come to be applied to learning a language from the perspective of its users, especially the choices they make, the constraints they face when using language in social interaction, and the consequences of their use of the language. have on other participants the act of communication. According to Levinson, pragmatics is the study of "the ability of language users to pair sentences in contexts in which they are appropriate." In fact, pragmatics focuses on the area between semantics, sociolinguistics, and extralinguistic contexts. The boundaries between pragmatics and other areas are not precisely defined [2].

In fact, pragmatics is often divided into two components: pragminuistics, which deals with the relevance of form, and sociopragmatics, which deals with the relevance of meaning in a social context. Pragmatic competence is the speaker's knowledge and use of the rules of propriety and courtesy that dictate how the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts. Speech acts are one of the key areas of linguistic pragmatics. Specific speech acts include an apology, a complaint, an invitation, a compliment, a refusal, a request, and an offer.

Most linguists seem to agree that pragmatics is about learning a language from the perspective of users, especially the choices they make, the constraints they face when using language in social interaction, and the impact of their use of language on others. participants in the act of communication. In other words, pragmatics involves the study of: (1) how the interpretation and use of utterances depends on knowledge of the real world; (2) how the relationship between speaker and listener affects sentence structure; and (3) how speech acts are used and understood by speakers.

Many researchers in the field of second language learning and sociolinguistics have argued that in order to acquire competence similar to their native language, language learners must learn the rules of using language and ways of speaking, as well as language skills. Research often shows

that although second language learners have already acquired an advanced level of grammatical competence, their misuse of language in context often leads to interpersonal disruptions. This failure is called pragmatic failure. Pragmatic failure is a term for a learner unsuccessfully trying to code and convey a specific intent.

The second type of pragmatic failure that Thomas highlights is what she calls "sociopragmatic failure." It has to do with knowing "what to say" and "who to say it to". Many of the misunderstandings that arise stem from what Thomas defines as differences in assessments of what she calls "size of imposition," "taboo," "cross-cultural differing assessments of relative power or social distance." Thomas provides a useful way to look at the type of diversity that exists across cultures and often leads to cross-cultural issues. In doing so, she highlights what she considers to be the main areas in which there are differences in cultural rules regarding speech behavior.

It is inevitable that cultural differences between Uzbek and English-speaking countries create barriers to intercultural communication. Differences in social conventions, values, thought patterns, social habits, and customs are all possible sources of pragmatic failure. Different cultures have different ways of thinking, speech rules, social values and the relative weight of pragmatic principles, and these intercultural differences in the assessment of social parameters negatively influenced the language choice of language users, which ultimately led to sociopragmatic failure. In intercultural interaction, participants from different cultures can adhere to their cultural traditions and behave as they see fit. Therefore, it may be difficult for them to adapt to the way each other speaks, and they will make a pragmatic failure that will inevitably lead to misunderstandings. For example, the Palestinian people find it extremely impolite and even sometimes arrogant to invite without persistence. It would be better not to invite at all. However, native speakers of American English generally believe that persistence can be a form of imposition.

It was pointed out that social factors influence speech behavior in a social context and that social dynamics always determines the contribution of the person of the interlocutors. To assess the degree of politeness, the interlocutors must consider social factors. Three main factors are involved in the courtesy system for manipulating the relationships of individuals: strength, distance, and severity of the imposition. First, power, according to Brown and Levinson, concerns the asymmetric social status of individuals. When two interlocutors are at different social distances, the more the powerful can unconsciously impose a low status on the person. Usually, the greater the disagreement between the interlocutors, the stronger the force of imposing a lower status one. So the degree of overlap increases depending on the distance between the interlocutors. Moreover, social distance can be the result of differences in gender, rank, and proximity. These three factors, individually or in combination, influence and develop politeness and its linguistic manifestations.

Conclusion

Cultural and social values and norms that differ interculturally, and the variety of contextual elements involved in any communicative act, render the rules of courtesy incapable of capturing such a complex phenomenon. Therefore, I would like to end this intrusion into the nature of politeness by presenting it as a social, cultural and pragmatic phenomenon, specific in its linguistic means and universal in its purpose.

References

1. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
2. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Leech, G. N. (1980). *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

4. Thomas, J. (1986). The dynamics of discourse: A pragmatic analysis of confrontational interaction (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). London: Lancaster University.