

# THE EXTENT OF PRAGMALINGUISTICS ACQUISITION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LINGUISTICS

Anora Abduraimova

Teacher, The Department of Integrated Course of English Language,  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: anora.abduraimova@mail.ru

+998 90 9732619

## Abstract

This study explores the level of pragmalinguistic competence in English and Uzbek linguistic studies, focusing on how each language's scholars and learners acquire and apply pragmatic language use. Pragmalinguistics, a subfield of pragmatics, studies the linguistic resources that speakers use to perform communicative acts. The paper uses qualitative content analysis of textbooks, academic curricula, and learner performance to assess the extent of pragmalinguistics integration in both English and Uzbek linguistics. Findings reveal significant differences in depth and focus, suggesting broader implications for curriculum development and language instruction in multilingual contexts.

## Introduction

In the evolving field of linguistics, pragmalinguistics has emerged as a vital component, particularly within language learning and intercultural communication. Pragmalinguistics refers to the specific linguistic tools (e.g., modal verbs, speech act formulas, politeness markers) used to convey communicative intentions. The extent to which these tools are studied and taught varies across linguistic traditions. This paper investigates the acquisition and treatment of pragmalinguistics in English and Uzbek linguistic education. The central research question is: *To what extent is pragmalinguistics integrated and acquired within English and Uzbek linguistic contexts?*

Understanding this integration is essential for improving second-language acquisition, translation studies, and intercultural pragmatics. Uzbek, as a Turkic language with strong sociocultural conventions, offers a contrasting case to

English, a global lingua franca with a wide range of pragmatic flexibility. By comparing both, this study aims to highlight potential gaps and propose ways to strengthen pragmalinguistic instruction.

## **2. Methodology**

This study employed a qualitative comparative approach, focusing on three primary sources:

1. Linguistics curricula from leading universities in Uzbekistan and English-speaking countries.
2. Key textbooks and academic materials in English and Uzbek pragmatics.
3. Interviews and performance analyses of graduate-level linguistics students from Tashkent State University and an English-speaking institution (e.g., University of Birmingham).

The collected data were analyzed using content analysis techniques, particularly thematic coding to identify patterns in pragmalinguistic focus, terminology, and practical application.

Inclusion criteria:

- Materials must focus on linguistic or applied linguistic education.
- Courses must offer explicit or implicit pragmatics/pragmalinguistics content.
- Students selected must have completed at least one course in pragmatics or discourse analysis.

## **3. Results**

The findings reveal noticeable differences in the treatment and acquisition of pragmalinguistics in English and Uzbek linguistics.

### **3.1 English Linguistics**

English linguistics curricula generally include well-developed modules on pragmatics, discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics. Pragmalinguistic elements such as speech act theory, implicature, deixis, and politeness strategies are systematically taught. Key textbooks like Yule (1996) and Levinson (1983) are standard, offering comprehensive explanations and practical examples.

Moreover, students in English-speaking institutions demonstrated better proficiency in identifying and using pragmalinguistic devices, particularly in academic and intercultural communication.

### 3.2 Uzbek Linguistics

In contrast, Uzbek linguistic curricula often focus more heavily on grammar, syntax, and morphology. While pragmatics is introduced in higher-level courses, pragmalinguistics as a specific subfield receives less attention. Terminology in Uzbek-language texts sometimes lacks equivalents for nuanced pragmatic concepts, making it difficult for learners to grasp subtleties of meaning and context.

Interviews with Uzbek linguistics students revealed limited familiarity with terms like "face-threatening acts" or "hedging," and many viewed pragmatic competence as secondary to grammatical accuracy.

### 3.3 Comparative Themes

Category	English Linguistics	Uzbek Linguistics
Pragmalinguistic focus	High	Low to moderate
Terminological clarity	Well-developed	Emerging/incomplete
Application in class	Frequent role-play, corpora	Limited case examples
Student proficiency	Advanced	Intermediate

## 4. Discussion

The results suggest that pragmalinguistics is more deeply embedded in English linguistic education than in Uzbek linguistic studies. Several factors contribute to this gap:

**Curriculum Design:** English-speaking institutions integrate pragmalinguistics early and extensively, while Uzbek institutions often treat it as an optional or specialized topic.

**Cultural Factors:** English as a global language demands high intercultural pragmatics competence. Uzbek, being more regionally concentrated, may emphasize sociolinguistic norms internal to its culture.

**Resource Availability:** English-language resources in pragmatics are abundant and up-to-date, while Uzbek-language materials are fewer and often translations lacking full contextual adaptation.

Improving pragmalinguistics acquisition in Uzbek linguistics could benefit learners in translation, international communication, and cross-cultural contexts.

One way forward is the inclusion of English-authored pragmatics texts in Uzbek curricula, paired with localized examples to maintain relevance.

## 5. Conclusion

This study highlights a significant difference in how pragmalinguistics is acquired in English versus Uzbek linguistic education. While English linguistics provides students with structured, practical understanding of pragmatic language use, Uzbek linguistics remains more structurally focused. Bridging this gap requires curriculum reform, better resource development, and teacher training in pragmatic instruction. Future research might explore student outcomes in intercultural communication settings to further validate the importance of pragmalinguistic competence.

## References

1. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
3. Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
4. Uzbekistan National Curriculum for Higher Education in Philology (2022).
5. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.