



Received: April 20, 2021
Accepted: June 16, 2021
Available online: June 25, 2021

Zebuniso Isanova

Master Student, Termez State University
Termez, Uzbekistan
E-mail: zebunisoisanova04@gmail.com

Зебунисо Исанова

Термиз давлат университети магистранти
Термиз, Ўзбекистон

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATICS IN TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

ANNOTATION

This article focuses on the role of intercultural pragmatics in modern foreign languages teaching and, on the notion, issues of intercultural pragmatics. It also analyses the importance of intercultural communication in the teaching of foreign languages, pragmatic aspects of intercultural communication, the interdependence of linguistic and cultural phenomena. While pragmatics is a branch of linguistics, intercultural pragmatism is developing as a new supplement to pragmatics. The process of intercultural communication includes linguistic and socio-cultural elements. The importance of intercultural communication in the study of a foreign language is that it eliminates cultural misunderstandings, mistrust and helps to adapt to other civilizational traditions of intercultural communication. Nowadays, according to communicative language teaching the main focus is on the development of communicative competence in foreign languages teaching. Sociolinguistic and pragmatic competencies are the integral aspects of this competence. Cultural and social factors are important in developing intercultural communicative competences in order to avoid difficulties that may arise in understanding interlocutors of different cultural backgrounds. Knowledge of the components of a language and cultural foundations such as phraseological units, words and proverbs help to overcome difficulties in intercultural communication and lead not only to understanding of “foreign” culture through “own” culture, but also the pragmatic factors that arise in this case.

ХОРИЖИЙ ТИЛ ЎҚИТИШДА МАДАНИЯТЛАРАРО ПРАГМАТИКАНИНГ АҲАМИЯТИ

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ушбу мақола – маданиятлараро прагматиканинг замонавий чет тилини ўқитишдаги ўрни, прагматика ва маданиятлараро прагматика тушунчаларининг келиб чиқиши тўғрисида. Шунингдек, тадқиқотда чет тилларни ўқитишда маданиятлараро мулоқотнинг аҳамияти, маданиятлараро мулоқотнинг прагматик жиҳати, лингвистик ва маданий ҳодисаларнинг ўзаро боғлиқлиги муҳокама қилинади. Прагматика тилшуносликнинг бир бўлими бўлса, маданиятлараро прагматика прагматиканинг янги қўшимча бўлими сифатида ривожламоқда. Маданиятлараро мулоқот жараёни лингвистик ва ижтимоий-маданий элементларни ўз ичига олади. Чет тилини ўрганишда маданиятлараро мулоқотнинг аҳамияти шундаки, у маданий тушунмовчиликларни ва ишончсизликни йўқ қилади ва маданиятлараро мулоқотнинг бошқа цивилизация анъаналарига мослашишига ёрдам беради. Ҳозирги кунда коммуникатив тилни ўқитиш бўйича чет тилни ўқитишда коммуникатив компетенцияни ривожлантиришга асосий эътибор қаратилмоқда. Бу компетенциянинг ажралмас аспекти социолингвистик ва прагматик компетенциялардир. Маданиятлараро мулоқот компетенциясини ривожлантиришда маданий ва ижтимоий факторлар муҳим аҳамиятга эгадир, чунки бу жараёнда маданий келиб чиқиши бошқа бўлган суҳбатдошларни тушунишда пайдо бўлиши мумкин бўлган қийинчиликларнинг олди олинади. Тилнинг таркибий қисмлари ва маданий асослари – фразеологик бирликлар,

Given that English is the lingua franca in the world, there are many problems with intercultural pragmatics in the process of communication in this language. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the development of intercultural communication competence in the process of teaching English. However, there are a number of problems in the process of teaching a foreign language. The problem can be divided into linguistic, lingua-didactic and methodological aspects.

Key words: intercultural pragmatics, communicative competence, pragmatic competence, intercultural communicative competence, culture, interlocutors.

сўзлар, мақолларни билиш маданиятлараро мулоқотдаги қийинчиликларни бартараф қилади ва “ўз” маданияти орқали “бегона” маданиятни тушунишга олиб келади, лекин бу ҳолда прагматик омиллар юзага келади. Инглиз тили дунёдаги лингво франка тил эканлигини ҳисобга олсак, ушбу тилда мулоқот жараёнида маданиятлараро прагматикага оид кўплаб муоммолар мавжуд. Шунинг учун инглиз тилини ўқитиш жараёнида маданиятлараро мулоқот компетенциясини ривожлатиришга эътибор қаратиш лозим. Аммо хорижий тил ўқитиш жараёнида бу масалада бир қанча муаммолар мавжуд. Муаммони лингвистик, лингводидактик ва услубий жиҳатларга бўлиш мумкин.

Калит сўзлар: маданиятлараро прагматика, прагматика, коммуникатив компетенция, прагматик компетенция, маданиятлараро коммуникатив компетенция, маданият.

INTRODUCTION

Today there is a high demand for new technologies in foreign languages teaching. Over the last two decades, a number of studies have been conducted on relationships between culture and foreign languages teaching [Coupland N. & Jaworski A., 2009; Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Bachman, 1990; Celce-Murcia, 1995; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurell, 1995; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Kramsch C. & Zhu H., 2016]. Intercultural pragmatics is one of the new areas of research, and many scholars have worked in this area as well [Istvan K., 2014; Boxer D., 2002; Wierzbicka A., 2005]. This research is done through data collection and data analysis which is presented in a descriptive way.

THEORETICAL BASIS

The history of the pragmatic concept dates back to the time of Socrates, but its development coincided with the first half of the 20th century and mainly associated with philosophers Peirce, Morris, and Carnap. First, these were the ideas of the philosophers and founders of semiotics C. Morris, and C. Peirce that the notion of pragmatics can be defined as the relation between the sign and its interpreter, that is, the one who creates the given sign (produces) and understands.

The main idea of this philosophical system is the meaning of the semiotic sign as the result of an action performed by the content of this symbol, the result is a study of success. Pierce's theory focuses on the connection between thought and action. Morris argued pragmatics as “the study of the relation of signs to interpreters” [Morris C.W., 1938; 6]. Morris had a broader understanding of pragmatics. Philosopher R.Carnap narrows it down and describes it this way: “If in an investigation explicit reference is

made to the speaker, or to put it in more general terms, to the user of the language, then we assign it [the investigation] to the field of pragmatics...If we abstract from the user of the language and analyze only the expressions and their designate, we are in the field of semantics. And, finally, if we abstract from the designate also and analyze only the relations between the expressions, we are in (logical) syntax" [Carnap R., 1938; 139-214]. This definition of pragmatics is user-oriented. It does not cause impact on an audience or wider social and cultural context in what a language is used.

Secondly, it was the theory of speech acts by J. Austin and J. Searle, who were the first to define utterance as an action and, accordingly, communication as an active process of interaction [Austin J.L., 1962; 139]. In discussing speech acts, Austin singled out three main aspects of each speech act: the so-called locutionary act (the act of uttering speech sounds), the illocutionary act (the conventional nature of an act, stating, ordering), perlocutionary act (the effect that is achieved by performing the act). Searle works on a more thorough and detailed theory of speech act analysis. In his consideration of illocutionary acts, if we pick out a central aspect of his theory, he explicates a set of conditions that must be obtained for the successful performance of particular illocutionary acts, and on that basis he spells out the constitutive rules for that particular speech act [Searle J.R., 1969; 57-64]. There are several scholars who have worked on pragmatics [Stalnaker, 1972; Kasher, 1998; Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983].

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that deals with the use of a language in different contexts and the ways in which people create and understand meanings.

"Pragmatics studies the context within which an interaction occurs as well as the intention of the language user... Pragmatics also explores how listeners and readers can make inferences about what is said and written in order to arrive at an interpretation of the user's intended meaning" [Celce-Murcia M. & Olshtain E., 2000; 20].

Intercultural Pragmatics is a new subfield of pragmatics that was formed independently after 2000.

According to Kecskes intercultural pragmatics is concerned with the way the language system is put to use in social encounters between human beings who have different first languages, communicate in a common language, and, usually, represent different cultures [Istvan K., 2013; 71-84].

Intercultural pragmatics studies, above all, problems arising in communication between people with different cultural backgrounds and different cultural expectations.

Intercultural pragmatics have evolved with the help of modern pragmatic theories. In the 1990s there was an increased interest in testing the applicability of the basic principles of Grice's approaches to intercultural interaction, which were largely monolingual in nature due to the growing interest in intercultural pragmatics, interlingual and intercultural communication. As a result, some of the basic principles of Grice's pragmatics have received different interpretations, and the rest needed to be changed. After 2000, intercultural pragmatics developed into an independent interdisciplinary study. According to Kecskes, focusing on both oral and written language processing; the research in intercultural pragmatics has four main

foci (1) interaction between native speakers and nonnative speakers of a language, (2) lingua franca communication in which none of the interlocutors has the same L1, (3) multilingual discourse, and (4) language use and development of individuals who speak more than one language [Istvan K., 2014; 15].

According to Keskcses, intercultural pragmatics is based on a socio-cognitive approach. According to this approach, our mind exists simultaneously both in the head and in the world. Pragmatics is about meaning construction and comprehension that is the result of interaction between two sides of world knowledge: individual world knowledge encapsulated in lexical items/concepts in the producer-interpreter's mind and societal world knowledge present in the actual situational context in which the interaction takes place and is internalized by the producer –interpreter in the process of communication [Istvan K., 2014; 23].

The sociocultural and cognitive approach of linguistic pragmatics includes an analysis of the study of a foreign language, a consideration of how foreigners understand and reproduce speech acts in a foreign language and how their pragmatic competence develops over time.

Intercultural pragmatics involves considering the ways of using a language that is chosen in the case of bilingual communication. As noted in the work of Gumperz J., and Gumperz J.C., both monolinguals and bilinguals use the language in the same way, however, the attitude, namely the pragmatic aspect, may be different [Gumperz J., Gumperz J.C., 2005; 1-24].

People's nationality or ethnicity may indicate the ability to identify ethnic or cultural characteristics in communicative behavior. But in fact, the context of the situation is constructed in such a way that cultures can embrace the process together. It consists of the existing cultural environment of the participants and specially created elements and items too. Intercultural pragmatics is based on this dialectical and dynamic approaches to culture.

As noted in the works of D.Boxer, intercultural pragmatics “takes into account that representatives of different (social, linguistic) communities in the process of communication (oral or written) adhere to norms and rules adopted within this community, as a result of which there is a mismatch of expectations and, often, a distorted understanding of representatives of another community” [Boxer D.; 150-167].

The intercultural aspect of linguistic-pragmatic studies, therefore, is part of intercultural studies and puts at the forefront the study of different types of speech acts in different cultures (for example, the implementation of the category of politeness in different languages).

The way in which empirical answers can be found for patterns and problems in intercultural communication is a detailed and nuanced analysis of concrete communicative events. This is actually what intercultural pragmatics endeavors to do.

In linguistics, pragmatics is often considered monolingual and monocultural. But the monolingual and monocultural perspective of a language use in the modern world is now obsolete, in fact, very insignificant and outdated because in the modern

world, intercultural communication between people has increased, according to a multicultural and multilingual society, both in face-to-face and in online environments. As well as, the main focus of intercultural pragmatics is intercultural communication. Pragmatics is a study based on utterance research. Intercultural pragmatics is at a study discourse level rather than at utterance level.

RESULTS

The role of intercultural pragmatics in teaching foreign languages

“Language has been defined, traditionally, as a tool for communication, and linguistics as the study of language” [Wierzbicka A., 2005].

At present, the criteria for teaching a foreign language is far from teaching direct grammar. Today, emphasis is placed on the development of communicative competence. Successful human communication is not limited to linguistic competence (i.e. pronunciation, lexical items, appropriate word order, etc.); non-linguistic factors such as culture, lifestyle, shared norms, history, and other social circumstances play a role in securing successful communication [Coupland N. & Jaworski A., 2009]. The contemporary model of communicative competence shows that there is much more to learning a language, and they include the vital component of cultural knowledge and awareness [Bachman, 1990]. These ideas are very relevant because foreign language learners learn a foreign language in the country in which they live, even if they know very little about a target language culture. In an EFL class, students are usually monolingual and they learn English while living in their own country [Krieger D., 2005; 8-17]. Von Humboldt affirmed that learning to express oneself in words other than one’s own is to acquire a new standpoint in our world-view; the individual who decides to learn a new language will enter unfamiliar territory, come into contact with new realities, values, attitudes and risk acting in a wrong way.

Different scholars [Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Bachman, 1990; Celce-Murcia, 1995; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurell, 1995; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000] in the field of applied linguistics have attempted to describe the construct of communicative competence by identifying its various components, one of them being the pragmatic component. Within CEFR, teaching and learning are based on CLT within which four competences are taught during the class.

Communicative competence – an ability and knowledge of a language user about how, what and where to speak appropriately from the view point of culture, traditions, shared rules and norms. An ability of understanding social meaning and being understood within a social context. It consists of four aspects: linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic/discourse, and strategic competence [David L.Ch., Ulugbek A., Svetlana Kh., Klara N., Komila T., 2019].

Celce-Murcia refers to pragmatic competence as actional competence, which comprises knowledge of language functions and knowledge of speech act sets, that is to say, emphasis is paid to the pragmalinguistic aspects of language. In addition, the authors include the sociocultural component as part of their construct of communicative competence. According to them, sociocultural competence refers to knowledge about

appropriate use within particular social and cultural contexts of communication [Celce-Murcia, M., Doˆ rnyei, Z. & Thurrell S., 1995; 535].

The objective of any language learning is no longer defined in terms of the acquisition of communicative competence in a foreign language, which refers to a person's ability to act in a foreign language in linguistically, sociolinguistically and pragmatically appropriate ways [Council of Europe, 2001].

Pragmatic competence – an ability to interpret and convey meaning in (social) context. The intended meaning is more than what is said. A dialogue can be wrong in terms of form/structure and meanings/semantics, but it can be correct from the viewpoint of pragmatic meaning. Once interlocutors understand each other's intended meanings, even with grammatically incorrect sentences, the communication is still successful [David L.Ch., Ulugbek A., Svetlana Kh., Klara N., Komila T., 2019].

Pragmatic competence needs to be taught in a foreign language teaching classes as it enhances students' ability to interpret meanings in social context, in real-life situations. Interactive classroom activities should be conducted around the concepts such as understanding the cooperative principle, through which we enhance students' pragmatic competence.

If we consider that English is *lingua franca*, a student's goal is not only to communicate with native speakers of English, but also with non-native speakers of English. By the English language learning, EFL students' goal is to establish international, more precisely, intercultural communication, and a language becomes a tool used to interact with people all over the world, in areas such as science, technology, business; communication is conducted in English in the fields of arts, entertainment and tourism.

According to Kramsh English is not, in fact, a culture-free language, which people can just acquire for themselves and use as a tool to get things done. It bears traces of the cultural contexts in which it has been used, and contributes to shaping the identity of speakers of English [Kramsch C. & Zhu H., 2016; 38-50].

Therefore, if to work successfully in the culturally diverse environment of our students, it is necessary to develop intercultural communicative competence. The influence of various external factors on intercultural communication is great. The success of communication depends, in many ways, on pragmatic knowledge such as the subject of oral speech, the mother tongue and culture, and its ethnic and social affiliation.

Intercultural communication has many aspects that cover various sides of this action, not only linguistic, but also social and cultural basis of intercultural communication. Intercultural communication means not only a direct dialogue between representatives of different cultures, but also a pragmatic understanding of this communication. Pragmatic factors influencing the process of communication include: context, background encyclopedic knowledge of communicators as an external factor modeling the social structure of society, including social, cultural elements; forms of communication and mass media; intention and speech actions; subject. Thus, the analysis of cultural-pragmatic means opens the possibility of

demonstrating cultural pragmatics in the practice of teaching foreign languages, as well as the study of information, subject, text, speech, their axiological significance, associated with the study of forms of action. For effective intercultural interaction and practical learning purposes, cultural and pragmatic characterization of a language as a means of intercultural communication is necessary.

In the process of intercultural communication, difficulties arise in understanding another partner with a different cultural background. The identified communication barriers are pragmatic and sociocultural. Cultural-pragmatic information is in the language of culture and must be appropriately interpreted by a communicator in a foreign language.

Intercultural communication for the purpose of teaching foreign languages, because the end result of the communicative method is aimed at entering foreign language communication. A necessary condition for its successful implementation and objectively adequate understanding in intercultural communication is knowledge about cultural traditions and the specifics of the cultural life of native speakers.

Cultural concepts, symbols, phraseological units, proverbs, words with cultural components represent the socio-cultural-pragmatic factors of intercultural communication, the knowledge of which determines the socio-cultural competencies of interlocutors in intercultural communication.

The above reasoning confronts the need to go beyond phonetics, vocabulary, grammar and turn to the simultaneous study of culture in the context of teaching foreign languages. Learning and teaching a foreign language is an interpersonal and intercultural process. Thus, languages learning and teaching are related to the field of intercultural communication. In this way we prevent problems that may arise on the side of intercultural pragmatics. When studying intercultural communication, students develop not only successful communication, but also qualities such as tolerance between peoples, respect for other nations' cultures. Improving communication development and self-expression in foreign languages and cultural consciousness are closely related to each other, so it is important to have culturally specific elements in the context from primary education.

Cultural knowledge and its understanding, cultural and linguistic diversity in our country and other regions of the world, include the need to maintain it. It is also a cultural expression, a firm understanding of your culture and feelings; personality can be the basis for an open attitude and respect for diversity.

DISCUSSION

Transition from methodological observations and evidences to the development of a system based on the interdependence of various knowledge: cultural, social, linguistic, cultural and linguistic knowledge for general methodological purposes, helps to systematize the forms and introduce them into the educational process based on cognitive foreign language learning. The language, as an integral part of culture and its phraseological and paremiological composition, reflects the values, traditions, norms, the image of the world, customs, beliefs, the history of the country

and the people. Knowledge of the cultural background through the components of the language: phraseological units, sayings, proverbs, removes the difficulties in intercultural communication and leads to the understanding of a “foreign” culture through the prism of “one's” culture, but taking into account the pragmatic factors that arise in this case. At the same time, it is important to explain the strategy. The significance of the problem lies in the fact that it can be divided into linguistic, linguo-didactic and methodological aspects.

The linguistic side of the problem lies in the fact that linguistics is the main science for the methodology of teaching foreign languages, since the formation and development of new teaching methods is associated with a theoretical description of the language. One of the main tasks of the science of linguodidactics and methodology is to abandon formal teaching and to look at a language as a social phenomenon that reveals the whole world of another culture and a person's way of life. If linguistic elements have been studied to a certain extent, selected and distributed over the years of study, then the issues related to knowledge and mastery of a foreign language culture have not received a linguodidactic and methodological solution. Special attention is required if cultural concepts are taught at English lessons, because it involves the spread of the English language around the world; many people who are non-native speakers of English use this language to communicate with other non-native speakers. Conversations about culture in the English classrooms need to go past references to a local speaker who is part of a monolingual network, that is, finding out about American or British cultural viewpoints could diminish the conceivable outcomes of recognizing other less dominant social groups, varieties of English used in different parts of the world. Considering that language is associated with culture, there are variants of a certain language, and in turn, these variants have their own cultures. For instance, a native English speaker from Malaysia does not have the same culture as an English-speaking Canadian. So, understanding the cultural orientations of people is important for a successful communication.

Culture is growing and moving on a global scale. The challenge for English teachers is to decide which side of the culture to explain. Thus, the training of English teachers requires to teach them semiotic issues awareness, speech analysis and interpretation.

In specific, there are four basic steps to integrating a pragmatically appropriate language into EFL classroom. First, an identification of the human action which will result from observing students' conversational or communication use, anticipating students' needs, or asking students to spot areas of difficulty. Selections should be made learners' needs or interests and by this or future kind of a target–language contact. Next, data collection and outline, which can be accomplished by observing or recording spontaneous conversations or by collecting data through role plays or discourse completion questionnaires (written role plays). Third, texts and materials to be used should be evaluated for authenticity. Counting on the act, teachers should check for representation of the act in several types and topics of conversations, and also the status and relationship of speakers, to call some parameters. Then, development of

latest materials within which even inappropriate or incomplete dialogues can be used profitably. It should be understood by learners that English though acknowledged as a world language, is not exclusive to judge that a particular culture is more important than others.

The challenges for the learners to accommodate the cross-cultural pragmatics is to grasp the norms and cultural values of the target society; thus the learners can avoid cross-cultural pragmatic failure. The supply of input and therefore the salience of relevant linguistic features within the input from the purpose of view of learners, the method of cross-cultural understanding may be enhanced eventually.

There are also a number of problems in assessing intercultural communicative competence.

The four traditional language skills are essential components of integral EFL classes, but are they enough to assist our students become communicatively competent? In other words, are the skills enough to enable students to use the scheme appropriately under any circumstance? Provided that communicative competence is the goal of most EFL language classrooms, EFL instruction must attend to all or any of its components: organization, pragmatic, strategic and even psychomotor strategies. Brown argued that [Brown, 2000; 29], communicative goals are best achieved by giving attention to language use and not just usage, to fluency and not just accuracy, to authentic language and contexts, and to the students' eventual need to apply classroom learning to unrehearsed contexts within the real world. But how can we concentrate on language use, fluency, authentic language and context in our EFL classrooms?

Damen [Damen L., 1997; 12] contends that, firstly, we must always remember that a language learning implies and embraces culture learning. We should remember that whenever we teach a language, we are teaching a system of cultural customs, ways of thinking, feeling, and acting [Brown, 2000; 29].

To achieve success EFL teachers, the environment of the classroom should be made as open as possible to meaningful cultural learning. Consistent with Damen [Damen L., 1997; 13], culture learning, along with the four traditional skills, i.e. reading, writing, listening, and speaking, may be accorded its rightful place as a fifth skill, adding its particular dimension to every of the opposite four. The caveat to Damen's statement is that culture and grammar are sometimes called skills, but they are somewhat different from the standard four skills, as these skills intersect and overlap with listening, reading, speaking and writing specifically ways [Oxford R., 1990; 6].

Moreover, teaching culture as a skill, compared with reading, writing, speaking, and listening, has been undermined in language instructions. The language instructor assumes that emphasizing the four mentioned skills is sufficient as students may have already acquired some knowledge of a selected culture. When it involves teaching the culture of the English-speaking peoples with their social and political underpinnings, many EFL students know little or no if anything. Thus, teaching the culture of those countries to its learners should assume a good more important position within the curriculum as it enhances students' overall

learning experience. What's worth mentioning, however, is that culture shouldn't be considered, as Kramsch [Kramsch C., 1993; 8] puts it, an “expandable” fifth skill tacked on to the teaching of speaking, listening, reading and writing. If a language is viewed as a social practice, then culture should become the core of a language teaching to the extent that cultural awareness should be viewed as enabling language proficiency. Be that as it may, a course planning and a course design should integrate the language skills within a context of meaningful cultural learning when teaching within a communicative framework.

CONCLUSION

Teaching and learning English have a number of challenges, with different approaches being put forward in the process throughout history. Each approach reveals some opportunities and obstacles. However, there is no denying that understanding the essence of a language determines the method of teaching.

In our country the communicative language teaching according to CEFR has been accepted. CLT is based on the teaching of communicative competence.

Communicative competence refers to the grammatical knowledge of a language, that syntax, morphology, phonology, and the like, as well as how and when to use words correctly.

Successful language use for communication is the development of communicative competence and language usage implies that language is limited by the socio-cultural norms of the society in which it is used.

The process of intercultural communication includes linguistic and socio-cultural elements. The importance of intercultural communication in the study of a foreign language is that it eliminates cultural misunderstandings, mistrust and helps to adapt to other civilizational traditions of intercultural communication. Nowadays, according to a communicative language teaching the main focus is on the development of communicative competence in a foreign languages teaching. Sociolinguistic and pragmatic competencies are the integral aspects of this competence. These competencies are part of the system of continuing education in the Republic of Uzbekistan. It is also defined in the state educational standard as the main objectives and tasks of discipline.

Cultural and social factors are important in developing the intercultural communicative competence in order to avoid difficulties that may arise in understanding interlocutors of different cultural background. Knowledge of the components of language and cultural foundations such as phraseological units, words, proverbs, overcome difficulties in intercultural communication and lead to understanding not only of “foreign” culture through “own” culture, but also the pragmatic factors that arise in this case.

Given that English is the lingua franca in the world, there are many problems with intercultural pragmatics in the process of communication in this language. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the development of intercultural communication competence in the process of teaching English. However, there are a number of

problems in the process of teaching a foreign language. The problem can be divided into linguistic, lingua-didactic and methodological aspects.

The pragmatic aspect of intercultural communication confirms the relationship of linguistic and cultural phenomena, their interdependence and role in intercultural communication. The process of intercultural communication is diverse and multidimensional. The components of this process make it possible to assert the presence of both linguistic and sociocultural elements in it. The importance of intercultural communication in learning a foreign language lies in the fact that it helps to resolve cultural misunderstandings, miscommunications, and mistrust, appropriateness of other civilization traditions. It can be very difficult to fully explore the abilities of both recipients and to know the effective aspects of pragmatics. That is why, students need to make up for what is deficient in their language proficiency by methods for techniques – methodologies for finding out about foreign language pragmatics speedily, techniques for performing pragmatics viably, and systems for basically adapting to their lack of language capability.

REFERENCES

1. ACTFL. (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century* (3rd ed).. Yonkers, New York: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.
2. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with Words*. 139 p.
3. Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Boxer, D. (2002). Discourse issues in cross-cultural pragmatics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 150-167.
5. Brown, H.D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles* (pp. 25-29). USA: Pearson ESL.
6. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to Second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-48.
7. Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.
8. Carnap, R. (1938). *Foundations of logic and mathematics*.
9. Carnap, R., & Morris, C. (Eds). *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* (pp. 139–214). University of Chicago Press.
10. Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 20 p.
11. Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). The elaboration of sociolinguistic competence: Implications for teacher education. In J.E. Alatis, C.A. Strachle, M. Ronkin (Eds.), *Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistic, and Sociolinguistic Aspects* (pp. 699-710). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
12. Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). A pedagogical framework for communicative competence: A Pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.
13. Celik, S., & Erbay, S. (2013). Cultural Perspectives of Turkish ELT Coursebooks: Standardized Teaching Texts Incorporate Intercultural Features?". *Education and Science*, 38(167).
14. Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Coupland, N., & Jaworski, A. (2009). *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. England: Palgrave.

16. Damen, L. (1997). *Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension in the Language Classroom*. USA: Addison-Wesley. 12 p.
17. David, L.Ch., Azizov, A., & Khan, S. (2019). *Reconceptualizing language teaching: An in-service teacher education course in Uzbekistan*. Tashkent: Baqtriya Press. 208 p.
18. Gumperz, J. (2005). Making space for bilingual communicative practice. *Intercultural pragmatics*, 2(1), 1–24.
19. Istvan, K. (2013). Why do we say what we say the way we say it. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 48(1), 71–84.
20. Istvan, K. (2014). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 23 p.
21. Kasher, A. (1998). *Pragmatics: critical concepts*.
22. Kramsch, C., & Zhu, H. (2016). Language and culture in ELT. *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching*, 38-50.
23. Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching* (p. 8). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
24. Leech. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
25. Levinson. (1983). *Pragmatics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
26. Macmillan, G.H.P. (2004). *Logic and Conversation*. In: *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts*, 41-58.
27. Morris, C.W. (1938). Foundations of the Theory of Signs. *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science I* (p. 6). University of Chicago Press.
28. Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know* (p. 6). Boston: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
29. Richards, C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*.
30. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (pp. 57-64). Cambridge University Press.
31. Stalnaker, R.C. (1972). Pragmatics. *Semantics of natural language* (pp. 380-397). Boston.
32. UNESCO. (2009). *Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue: UNESCO World Report*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001847/184755e.pdf>
33. Wierzbicka, A. (2005). *Intercultural pragmatics and communication*.