BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

PEDAGOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING LINGUISTIC AND PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

Liliya Xamzayevna Belix
Senior teacher, Tashkent state university of oriental studies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Ibadullayeva Umida Habibullayevna
Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages
Uzbekistan University of Journalism and Mass Communications
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23492436

Abstract. This article examines the pedagogical foundations for developing linguistic and pragmatic competence in English language classes. It explores the relationship between knowledge of grammatical structures, vocabulary, and pronunciation and the ability to use these resources appropriately in different social contexts. Particular attention is given to communicative language teaching, task-based learning, contextualized instruction, and reflective feedback. The discussion considers how role plays, authentic dialogues, and collaborative tasks can help learners express intentions, interpret implied meanings, and select language appropriate to interlocutors, purposes, and situations. It also addresses the teacher's role in drawing attention to politeness, register, and cultural variation without presenting communicative norms as fixed or universal. The article proposes an integrated approach to lesson planning and assessment that connects linguistic accuracy with contextual appropriateness, supporting learners' development as effective and socially aware users of English.
Keywords: linguistic competence, pragmatic competence, English language teaching, communicative competence, contextualized instruction, contextual appropriateness.

Introduction: The development of communicative competence is a central goal of English language education. Achieving this goal requires learners to acquire linguistic knowledge and understand how to use it appropriately in interaction. Grammatical accuracy, vocabulary knowledge, and pronunciation contribute to the construction of meaningful utterances, but successful communication also depends on interpreting intentions, recognizing relationships between speakers, and responding to contextual expectations. English language classes therefore need to address linguistic and pragmatic competence as interconnected dimensions of language learning.

Linguistic competence provides learners with the resources necessary to formulate and understand utterances. Pragmatic competence concerns the ability to interpret and express meaning in relation to communicative purposes and social circumstances. It involves, for example, making requests, expressing disagreement, offering apologies, and understanding meanings that are implied rather than directly stated. A learner may produce a grammatically accurate sentence while remaining uncertain about its suitability for a particular interlocutor or situation. The request "Give me your notes," for instance, may be linguistically well formed, yet its interpretation depends on familiarity, tone, urgency, and the expectations of the participants. This relationship demonstrates why language instruction should connect the study of linguistic forms with opportunities to examine their communicative effects.

A significant pedagogical challenge is to establish this connection systematically. Exercises that concentrate on isolated structures can help learners practise accuracy, but they provide limited

opportunities to explore how meaning changes across situations. Conversely, communicative activities may encourage participation without necessarily directing learners' attention to the language choices that shape an interaction. An integrated approach requires purposeful movement between explanation, contextualized practice, interaction, and reflection. Learners need opportunities to consider both how an utterance is constructed and why a particular formulation may be suitable in a given context.

The development of pragmatic competence also requires sensitivity to cultural and individual variation. Appropriate language use cannot always be reduced to a single preferred expression or a fixed set of politeness rules. Speakers may communicate similar intentions through different linguistic choices, and the interpretation of those choices can vary across communities and relationships. Classroom instruction should therefore encourage learners to compare alternatives, explain their decisions, and negotiate meaning. Such activities can support informed communicative choices while respecting learners' identities and experiences.

Against this background, the present article examines the pedagogical foundations for integrating linguistic and pragmatic competence in English language classes. It considers the contribution of communicative language teaching, task-based learning, contextualized instruction, and reflective feedback to lesson design. Particular attention is paid to activities that connect linguistic accuracy with the expression of intentions and awareness of context. The article aims to outline principles for teaching and assessment that help learners use English effectively, appropriately, and flexibly across communicative situations.

Materials and methods: This article employs a qualitative, conceptual approach to examine the pedagogical foundations for developing linguistic and pragmatic competence in English language classes. The methodology combines pedagogical analysis, comparative analysis of contextualized utterances, and instructional task design. It aims to explain how linguistic resources can be connected with communicative purposes and social contexts. No classroom experiment or learner dataset is reported; the activities and examples serve as illustrations of the proposed approach.

The analytical materials comprise model dialogues, short situational descriptions, and sample classroom tasks involving requests, apologies, refusals, and expressions of disagreement. These communicative functions provide opportunities to examine the relationship between grammatical construction and contextual interpretation. The situations vary according to the relationship between speakers, the purpose of the interaction, and the degree of inconvenience associated with a request.

The materials address two interconnected dimensions of competence. The linguistic dimension includes grammatical accuracy, vocabulary choice, and the organization of utterances. The pragmatic dimension includes the expression of communicative intentions, sensitivity to interpersonal relationships, and the interpretation of implied meanings. Pronunciation and intonation are considered relevant to spoken interaction, although they cannot be evaluated directly through written examples alone.

Pedagogical analysis is used to examine the alignment between learning objectives, classroom activities, and assessment criteria. Each proposed task is evaluated according to whether it creates opportunities to practise linguistic forms and make meaningful choices about their use.

Comparative utterance analysis examines alternative ways of expressing a similar intention. For example, "Send me the document," "Could you send me the document?" and "Would it be possible to send me the document by Friday?" are compared in relation to directness, grammatical structure, and contextual suitability. The analysis does not assume that the longest or most indirect

expression is always the most appropriate. Instead, suitability is considered in relation to the participants, their relationship, and the immediate purpose of the exchange.

Contextual analysis explores how changes in a situation influence language choice. Learners may be asked to make the same request to a close friend, an unfamiliar classmate, and a lecturer. This comparison makes it possible to discuss how familiarity, institutional roles, urgency, and the size of the request affect interpretation.

Task-design analysis considers how noticing, guided practice, interaction, and reflection can be combined within a lesson. These stages are treated as a proposed instructional sequence rather than an experimentally validated intervention.

The instructional procedure consists of four stages:

Contextual noticing. Learners examine a short dialogue and identify the speakers, their intentions, and the language used to express those intentions.

Guided comparison. Learners compare alternative formulations and discuss how each might be interpreted in the specified situation.

Communicative practice. Pairs or small groups complete role plays or problem-solving tasks requiring them to select and adapt expressions.

Reflection and revision. Learners explain their choices, consider feedback, and revise their utterances where necessary.

For example, a task may require a student to request an extension for an assignment. Learners first identify relevant linguistic resources, such as modal verbs, question forms, and expressions of reason. They then consider how to acknowledge the inconvenience, communicate the request clearly, and respond if the extension is refused. Assessment focuses on the whole exchange rather than a single memorized expression.

Dimension	**Criterion**	**Illustrative focus**
Linguistic competence	Grammatical control	Accurate construction of questions and modal expressions
Linguistic competence	Lexical suitability	Selection of words that express the intended meaning
Pragmatic competence	Clarity of intention	Whether the request, refusal, or apology is understandable
Pragmatic competence	Contextual appropriateness	How language choices relate to the participants and situation
Interactional performance	Responsiveness	Ability to acknowledge, clarify, and respond to another speaker
Reflective awareness	Explanation of choices	Ability to discuss alternatives and revise an utterance

These criteria are intended to support formative feedback rather than measure conformity to one fixed communicative norm. A grammatically accurate response may require further contextual adjustment, while a contextually suitable response may still contain linguistic errors. Evaluating these dimensions separately allows feedback to identify the learner's specific needs.

The methodology provides a framework for designing integrated instruction and analysing classroom tasks. Its conceptual scope means that claims about learning gains would require subsequent classroom research using documented learner performance, clearly defined assessment procedures, and appropriate comparisons over time.

Results and discussion: The conceptual analysis identifies several principles for integrating linguistic and pragmatic competence in English language classes. These observations arise from the examination of model utterances and proposed classroom tasks; they do not represent measured changes in learners' performance. The discussion focuses on the relationship between linguistic accuracy, contextual appropriateness, instructional sequencing, and assessment.

The comparison of model utterances demonstrates that grammatical correctness and pragmatic suitability require separate but connected consideration. "Send me the document" and "Could you send me the document?" are both grammatically acceptable, yet they offer different ways of presenting a request. Their suitability depends on the relationship between speakers, the urgency of the situation, and the expectations established within the interaction.

This comparison suggests that teaching should extend beyond identifying correct sentence forms. Learners also need opportunities to explain why they would choose a particular expression and how another person might interpret it. However, indirectness should not be treated as an automatic indicator of politeness. A direct request may be suitable in a familiar relationship or an urgent situation, while a more elaborate formulation may be unnecessary. The instructional objective is therefore to develop informed choice rather than dependence on a single preferred expression.

The analysis of situational tasks highlights the value of varying the context while retaining the same communicative intention. Asking a friend for notes, requesting clarification from a lecturer, and seeking assistance from an unfamiliar person all involve requesting, but each situation presents different interpersonal conditions.

Communicative situation	Illustrative expression	Focus of classroom discussion
Asking a close friend for notes	"Can you send me your notes?"	Familiarity and the expectations of the relationship
Asking a lecturer for clarification	"Could you explain the final point again, please?"	Institutional roles and clarity of the request
Requesting an assignment extension	"Would it be possible to submit the assignment on Monday?"	The degree of inconvenience and the need for explanation
Disagreeing during group work	"I see your point, but another option might be…"	Acknowledging a contribution while introducing an alternative

These expressions are possible choices rather than prescribed answers. Their pedagogical value lies in the discussion they generate. Learners can consider alternative formulations, anticipate responses, and identify circumstances in which a different choice would be more effective. This approach connects grammatical and lexical practice with interpretation and decision-making.

The proposed instructional sequence brings together noticing, comparison, interaction, and reflection. Each stage addresses a different learning need. Noticing directs attention to relevant features; comparison makes alternatives visible; interaction requires learners to make choices; and reflection provides an opportunity to reconsider those choices.

For example, an assignment-extension task can begin with an examination of modal verbs and question forms. Learners then compare ways of explaining a difficulty and acknowledging inconvenience before participating in a role play. A follow-up response from the lecturer introduces an additional requirement: the learner must respond to acceptance, refusal, or a request for further information. The task consequently moves beyond producing an isolated request towards managing an exchange.

The conceptual implication is that explicit instruction and communicative practice serve complementary purposes. Explanation provides resources for participation, while interaction creates a reason to select and adapt those resources. Whether this sequence produces measurable learning gains remains a question for classroom investigation.

The assessment framework distinguishes linguistic errors from problems of contextual suitability. This distinction makes feedback more specific. A learner may communicate an intention appropriately while using an inaccurate question form. Another learner may construct an accurate sentence whose tone creates an unintended impression in the specified situation.

Feedback can therefore address both formulation and interpretation. Instead of simply labelling an utterance "inappropriate," the teacher can ask learners to consider how it might be understood, which contextual features matter, and what alternative wording could achieve their intention. Such discussion preserves the learner's role in making communicative decisions.

Reflection also enables learners to explain choices that may initially appear unexpected. A direct formulation, for instance, may have been selected to express urgency. Examining the reasoning behind an utterance supports a more balanced evaluation than judging it against one model answer.

The analysis further indicates that pragmatic assessment requires flexibility. Model dialogues are useful instructional resources, but they should not imply that all English speakers share identical expectations. Classroom evaluation should allow multiple defensible responses when learners communicate clearly and account for the relevant circumstances.

Accordingly, the proposed criteria assess grammatical control, lexical suitability, clarity of intention, contextual appropriateness, and responsiveness separately. This structure helps teachers identify specific strengths and needs without reducing communicative competence to either accuracy alone or conformity to a fixed politeness formula.

Overall, the conceptual findings support lesson designs that connect language forms with intentions, relationships, and interactional consequences. Their practical effectiveness should be examined through future classroom research using recorded interactions, transparent scoring criteria, and learner reflections. Such evidence would help establish how the proposed activities influence linguistic performance and pragmatic decision-making over time.

Conclusion: The conceptual analysis suggests that developing linguistic and pragmatic competence requires an integrated approach to English language teaching. Grammatical knowledge and vocabulary provide essential resources for communication, while pragmatic awareness helps learners adapt these resources to their intentions, interlocutors, and circumstances. Instruction should therefore connect linguistic accuracy with opportunities to interpret meanings, compare expressions, and make context-sensitive choices.

Contextualized dialogues, role plays, collaborative tasks, and reflective feedback provide a practical framework for this integration. Their pedagogical value lies in encouraging learners to explain their choices, respond to others, and revise language in light of its communicative effects. Teachers should recognize cultural and individual variation, allowing multiple appropriate responses rather than presenting one expression as universally preferable. Assessment should likewise distinguish grammatical control, clarity of intention, contextual suitability, and responsiveness.

As this article presents a conceptual framework, it does not establish measurable improvements in learner competence. Further classroom research is needed to evaluate the proposed instructional sequence through documented interactions and transparent assessment

procedures. Nevertheless, the framework offers a basis for designing lessons that support accurate, flexible, and socially aware communication in English.

References

1. Ibadullayeva Umida Habibullayevna. Teaching writing for comprehension in prose fiction analysis // Вестник науки и образования. 2020. №8-1 (86). URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/teaching-writing-for-comprehension-in-prose-fiction-analysis
2. Ibadullayeva Umida Habibullayevna (2021). FUNCTION OF RHETORICAL AND SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS. Вестник науки и образования, (1-2 (104)), 29-31.
3. Ishihara N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet. Pearson Longman. Cambridge Core
4. Nunan D. (2004). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge University Press. Task-Based Language Teaching
5. Rose K. R., & Kasper G. (Eds.). (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. Cambridge University Press. Pragmatics in Language Teaching
6. Taguchi N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31, 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018 .
7. Shahnoza Ikramovna Yakubova, Liliya Xamzayevna Belix, & Worldly Knowledge Publishing Centre. (2026). ELEKTRON LUG'ATLAR VA ULARNING TILSHUNOSLIKDAGI AHAMIYATI [Dataset]. In ILM FAN XABARNOMASI (Vol. 13, Issue 02, pp. 3201–3204). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20465646
8. Shakhnoza Ikramovna Yakubova, Liliya Xamzayevna Belix. STYLISTIC TRANSFORMATIONS IN RUSSIAN–UZBEK TRANSLATION AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. (2026). International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, 6(02), 2354-2357. https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai/article/view/11427
9. Chernobrovkina, I. (2025). AN INTEGRATED APPROACH IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE LESSONS: INTERDISCIPLINARY CONNECTIONS. Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations, 1(3), 192–194. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/jmsi/article/view/102550
10. Shakirova Dilfuza Zoidovna, Liliya Belix Xamzayevna.. WORK ON FORMING GRAMMATICAL SKILLS IN FOREIGN STUDENTS IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE LESSONS. (2025). Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations, 1(3), 1225-1228. https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.jmsi.113515