

PRAGMATIC CONTRAST AS A NEW WAY OF LEARNING

Kh.Idrisova

The 1st year MA course student

Current paradigms of language research characterized by anthropocentric and cross-disciplinary research. Since the early 1970s, language structural description has been used by speakers in intra and intercultural communication to conduct a multi-paradigm research on practical communication and to study the condition of linguistic means. Then, under the influence of the language-philosophical ideas of AustinJ., SearleJ., , HabermasJ., semiotic ones of MorrisCh., PeirceCh., and socio-pragmatic ones of Ervin-TrippS., they were forming a linguistic-pragmatic direction in analyzing them [1, 112]. Linguistic pragmatics were aimed at identifying universal characteristics of the communication process at the beginning of its development. The main aims were to describe the basic communication unit structure, to classify speech acts and to characterize the conditions required for the successful performance of speech acts. But soon it became obvious that people talk differently in different societies and communities. That difference is profound and systematic in terms of speech [2, 55].

As opposed to the predominately monolingual and monocultural research paradigms, we are currently witnessing a style of research that finds its goals in the multilingual and multicultural interaction between speakers from various national, ethnic, and racial origins. On the other hand, contrasting linguistics may result in comparative studies of communication and communication units in the context of second language acquisition.

In the former, the issue facing a speaker of a second language is highlighted, and significant communication blunders as well as the speaker's ancestry are described. To compare Luna's language systems on the way to learning the target language (a non-native language), data from a native language and a term known as Inter language are typically employed [3, 19]. Over the past two decades, there has been a significant evolution in interlanguage pragmatics, and many different languages have been compared. The most significant contribution to the growth of this tendency has been made by the project "Request for the apologies: a cross-cultural study of patterns of speech act implementation." The goal of the research was to create a database of speech act realizations in eight distinct languages, including Australian, American, British, Canadian, French (Canadian), Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian. Of special interest were requests and excuses. The major findings from the

TIL HÁM AWDARMA MÁSELELERI

V ilimiy maqalalar toplami

research activity carried out by the project group were published in 1981, at which time they devised a specific technique for data collecting and analysis. The methodology was extensively used in subsequent study on additional languages. The practical components of the overall explanation of how two or more languages contrast are included in the second comparative study direction. One of the main directions in contemporary linguistic research is contrast analysis. In addition to everything else, it enables the discovery of structural and functional similarities and differences between the examined languages, which can serve as the foundation for typological generalizations.

However, it is clear that all linguistic levels and the greatest number of linguistic phenomena can be compared, which is difficult to do for each linguistic pair. A transmitted pragmatic level is currently one of the language domains that has received the least amount of research. This has been stressed by numerous linguists [3, 25].

The necessity for more research into the specifics of behavioral communication in the various language groups is rather obvious in light of the aforementioned needs for pragmatic linguistic research. The purpose of these research studies is to find patterns and distinctions in the operation of the utterances that fulfill the pragmatic goal and the prototype and peripheral means expressed by the key speech actions in each illocution type and in each of the compared languages.

Combining both methods of comparative language study used by experts from many cultures is the most efficient way to accomplish these objectives. On the other hand, best practices can be applied to gather and examine the information generated by these methodologies. On the other hand, it will assist in creating a more reassuring and compelling message to explain the occurrences under research.

Direct communication is where interaction occurs at a specific time, and it is here that various socio-cultural, age-, gender-, and other differences are exposed. The moral and ethical norms that have come to be understood by the culture as tactics for verbal and nonverbal behavior are carried by representatives of that culture's distinctive linguistic and social structure.

The following groups of factors define communication behavior characteristics:

1. Socio-pragmatic;
2. Cultural;
3. Situational;
4. Linguistic [3, 15-17].

TIL HÁM AWDARMA MÁSELELERI

V ilimiy maqalalar toplami

Socio-pragmatic factors are linked to the interacting individuals and reflect their social position. Different features of communicating people here belong first of all:

- The social status, membership, occupation, education, status of the interlocutory group, etc. may be symmetrically and asymmetrically related;
- Social distance: zero, neutral or close relations between partners;
- Bio-physiological features, especially the sex and age of interlocutors;
- Nationality;
- Psychological type, temperament, extrovert or introvert orientation of the interlocutors, pathological elements;
- Language skills, language code knowledge that interlocutors use in verbal interactions;
- Grade of interlocutor knowledge.

The cultural specifics of the society to which they belong are related by cultural elements. Traditions, practices, and cultural standards all reflect this. The primary elements are as follows:

- Politicization norms guiding interlocutor relations in a specific circumstance;
- Etiquette standards, historic general principles dictating patterns of conduct in a culture. Without a doubt, the idea of civility and the idea of etiquette speech are strongly related. However, we believe it would be incorrect to compare these two ideas. While the use of suitable linguist language differs in politeness, speech etiquette establishes the standards of conduct and hence in some circumstances, in a mutually respectful fashion. These manners guidelines are not moral guidelines. These regulations are immoral.

- Social stereotypes as a standardized opinion on or representing certain social groups;

Situation factors are directly related to the communication situation. The following are:

- Time and location -links of speech to other statements.
- Current psychologie, mood, current knowledge, goals and interests of interlocutors, etc.

The main linguistic factors are linked to the particulars of a systematic structural language organization:

- Set of the grammar category for the specific language;
- Specifics for organizing the national discourse.

Many of the above factors have national characteristics.

References:

1. Ashurova D. Language and Cultural Studies // Хорижий филология, 2006, 4-сон. 11-146.
2. Kitis, E., Connectives and ideology. -Paper presented at the Fourth International Symposium on Critical of London, 1995.-17-47p.
3. Blakemore, D. Relevance and Linguistic Meaning. -Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. -62p.
4. Арзымбетова, С. (2023). АЎДАРМА БАРЫСЫНДА КОГНИТИВ ЖАНТАСЫЎ ӨЗГЕШЕЛИКЛЕРИ. Центральноеазиатский журнал образования и инноваций, 2(7), 163-165.
5. Bilyalova, A., Gilyazeva, E., & Nurullina, A. (2019). Phraseological units as a mirror of national mentality. Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1-9.