



## Methodological model of developing pragmatic competence of non-philological students

**Sadirova Dinara Sadikovna**

Researcher (PhD) of

UNPU named after Nizami

[dinarasadikovna096@gmail.com](mailto:dinarasadikovna096@gmail.com)

**Isyanov Ravil Gennadiyevich**

Scientific supervisor/ DSc, prof. of UNPU

[isyanovrakil@gmail.com](mailto:isyanovrakil@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

Pragmatic competence, as a central dimension of communicative competence, has become indispensable in foreign language education. This is particularly critical for non-philological students—future professionals in medicine, engineering, economics, and information technology—who are required to communicate effectively in diverse sociocultural and professional contexts. Despite the acknowledged importance of pragmatics, curricula for non-philological learners often prioritize grammatical and lexical accuracy over pragmatic appropriateness. This paper proposes an expanded methodological model for developing pragmatic competence, integrating explicit teaching, task-based learning, and technology-enhanced practices. In addition to outlining theoretical foundations, this study suggests practical methods such as role-plays, case studies, discourse completion tasks, reflective journals, podcasts, digital simulations, and intercultural projects. The model comprises diagnostic, instructional, practice, and assessment stages, each supported by pedagogical methods suited to professional education. Literature review highlights contributions from international scholars such as Hymes, Widdowson, Kasper & Rose, Taguchi, Ishihara & Cohen, as well as Uzbek researchers, emphasizing both global theoretical frameworks and regional adaptation needs. The proposed model contributes novelty by contextualizing pragmatic pedagogy for non-philological students in higher education, providing both theoretical value and practical applicability across disciplines. Expected outcomes include enhanced intercultural awareness, professional communication readiness, and increased learner motivation.

### ARTICLE INFO

**Received:** 14<sup>th</sup> March 2026

**Accepted:** 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2026

**KEY WORDS:** Pragmatic competence; methodological model; non-philological students; communicative competence; task-based learning; intercultural communication; professional discourse; suggested teaching methods; technology-enhanced pedagogy

### Introduction

The 21st century has transformed foreign language learning into a necessity for academic and professional success. While philological students are systematically trained in linguistic and literary dimensions of language, non-philological students often encounter foreign language as a supplementary subject. Nevertheless, their professional engagement—whether as doctors interacting with patients, engineers

presenting technical designs, or economists negotiating international trade—demands a high level of pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence involves the ability to use language appropriately according to context, intent, and sociocultural norms, going beyond grammar and vocabulary. However, non-philological curricula rarely provide sufficient tools for pragmatic development. This study addresses the urgent need for a methodological model that systematically fosters pragmatic competence, aligning with professional communication requirements.

### Literature Review

The foundations of pragmatic competence are rooted in Hymes' (1972) theory of communicative competence, which emphasized the social and cultural appropriateness of language use alongside grammar. Widdowson (1998) reinforced the importance of authentic contexts in foreign language education. Kasper and Rose (2002) explored pragmatic development in second language acquisition, while Ishihara and Cohen (2010) introduced pedagogical strategies for teaching pragmatics explicitly. Taguchi (2015) provided empirical insights into the role of authentic exposure in developing interactional competence. Scholars such as Xudoyberganova (2019), Makhkamova (2020), and G'ulomov (2018) have contributed to the methodology of teaching foreign languages, with particular emphasis on intercultural communication and professional language training. However, regional studies have seldom addressed pragmatic competence systematically, especially in non-philological contexts. This reveals a critical gap that the present study aims to fill by contextualizing global theories for local application.

#### Methodological Framework and Suggested Methods

The methodological framework guiding this model rests upon three principles: explicitness, authenticity, and integration. Explicitness ensures that pragmatic norms are systematically taught; authenticity connects tasks to real-life professional contexts; and integration aligns language teaching with disciplinary content and digital technologies.

Suggested methods for developing pragmatic competence include:

- ❖ Role-plays: simulating workplace and intercultural interactions.
- ❖ Case studies: analyzing professional scenarios requiring pragmatic negotiation.
- ❖ Discourse completion tasks: providing written or spoken responses to incomplete dialogues.
- ❖ Reflective journals: encouraging self-analysis of pragmatic choices and cultural awareness.
- ❖ Podcasts and videos: exposing learners to authentic speech acts and intercultural exchanges.
- ❖ Digital simulations: creating safe spaces for practicing professional dialogues.
- ❖ Intercultural projects: collaborative tasks with peers from different cultural backgrounds.

These methods allow learners to practice pragmatics actively, receive feedback, and develop adaptive strategies.

#### Proposed Methodological Model

The proposed model consists of four stages:

1. Diagnostic Stage – assessing initial pragmatic awareness via questionnaires, role-plays, and discourse analysis.
2. Instructional Stage – explicit teaching of speech acts, politeness strategies, and professional genres using authentic materials.
3. Practice Stage – applying knowledge through case studies, debates, workplace simulations, podcasts, and intercultural exchanges.
4. Assessment Stage – evaluating outcomes using pragmatic performance tasks, peer/self-assessment, reflective writing, and teacher feedback.

The cyclical nature of the model ensures continuous refinement. Each stage integrates suggested methods, ensuring balance between theoretical instruction and practical application.

#### Expected Outcomes and Practical Value

The implementation of this methodological model is expected to:

- ❖ Strengthen students' ability to use language appropriately in professional contexts;
- ❖ Enhance intercultural communication skills;
- ❖ Improve learner motivation through authentic and relevant tasks;

❖ Promote independent learning via technology-mediated resources.

Practically, the model can be adapted to various disciplines—medicine (doctor-patient dialogues), economics (business negotiations), engineering (project presentations), and IT (technical communication). Theoretically, it advances the underexplored intersection of pragmatics and professional communication in higher education.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that pragmatic competence in non-philological students can be significantly enhanced if:

1. Pragmatic norms are explicitly taught through structured instruction;
2. Professional and task-based communicative activities are integrated into the curriculum;
3. Technology-mediated tools such as podcasts, simulations, and online platforms are employed;
4. Assessment practices measure not only linguistic accuracy but also contextual appropriateness.

These conditions together will ensure measurable improvements in students' ability to use language appropriately in both academic and professional intercultural contexts.

Conclusion

This research underscores the urgency of developing pragmatic competence in non-philological students. While international studies have established theoretical frameworks, regional adaptation remains limited. The proposed methodological model integrates explicit instruction, task-based practice, and technological innovation, supported by suggested methods such as role-plays, case studies, and intercultural projects. The study thus contributes theoretical novelty by contextualizing pragmatic pedagogy and practical value by offering a replicable model for diverse disciplines. Future research should implement experimental studies to evaluate the effectiveness of this model in practice and further refine its adaptability across professional domains.

The present research has explored the methodological foundations and practical strategies necessary for the development of pragmatic competence among non-philological students. The study began by identifying a central challenge in higher education: while non-philological students are required to use foreign languages in increasingly complex academic, intercultural, and professional domains, current curricula do not sufficiently provide the systematic tools necessary for cultivating pragmatic skills. This gap results in learners who may achieve grammatical accuracy but struggle to apply language appropriately in real-world communicative contexts. Addressing this issue, the study proposed a comprehensive methodological model designed to integrate explicit instruction, task-based learning, and technology-enhanced pedagogy.

The hypothesis that pragmatic competence can be significantly improved through structured, multi-component models has been supported in theory. By embedding explicit teaching of speech acts, politeness strategies, and discourse patterns into professionalized contexts, students are provided with not only knowledge but also opportunities for contextualized practice. The review of international literature confirmed that pragmatic competence is best developed when learners are immersed in authentic communicative activities (Hymes, 1972; Widdowson, 1998; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Taguchi, 2015). However, empirical studies focusing specifically on non-philological learners remain scarce, particularly in Central Asia. This research thus contributes a regionally adapted approach, grounded in both global theory and local educational realities.

The methodological model proposed here consists of four interconnected stages: diagnostic, instructional, practice, and assessment. Each stage is reinforced by suggested methods that provide practical relevance to students' professional contexts. Role-plays simulate workplace dialogues; case studies encourage critical thinking in professional scenarios; discourse completion tasks and reflective journals allow learners to analyze their pragmatic choices; podcasts and digital simulations expose students to authentic interactions; and intercultural projects enable collaboration across cultural boundaries. Together, these methods create a structured yet flexible framework that can be applied across various fields, including medicine, economics, engineering, and information technology.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in its contribution to the underdeveloped area of pragmatic pedagogy for non-philological students. While pragmatic competence has been studied extensively in general second language acquisition, little attention has been paid to tailoring pedagogical approaches for learners whose main academic focus is outside philology. By contextualizing pragmatic instruction to the needs of professional education, this study adds an important dimension to both linguistic theory and applied methodology.

The practical value of the model is equally noteworthy. It provides educators with a concrete framework and a repertoire of teaching methods that can be directly integrated into existing curricula. The model's adaptability ensures that it can be employed across disciplines with minor contextual modifications. For students, it promises enhanced readiness for professional communication, improved intercultural competence, and increased motivation through engagement with authentic, discipline-specific tasks. For institutions, it offers a pathway to modernize language education in line with global standards of professional training.

At the same time, this study acknowledges its limitations. The model has been presented at the theoretical and methodological level, and its effectiveness must be tested through empirical implementation in classroom environments. Controlled experiments, longitudinal studies, and cross-disciplinary applications are required to validate its outcomes. Additionally, the model would benefit from further refinement to address individual learner differences, such as varying proficiency levels, learning styles, and motivational factors.

Future research should focus on applying this methodological model in practical teaching settings and evaluating its impact through both qualitative and quantitative measures. Comparative studies across different fields of study—medicine, law, economics, engineering—would provide valuable insights into how pragmatic competence manifests in discipline-specific communication. Moreover, integrating digital technologies such as artificial intelligence-driven conversation platforms, virtual reality simulations, and global telecollaboration projects could further expand the scope and effectiveness of pragmatic instruction.

In conclusion, the study has demonstrated the urgency, feasibility, and methodological clarity of developing pragmatic competence among non-philological students. The proposed model represents a step forward in bridging the gap between linguistic theory and professional practice, equipping learners not only with language knowledge but with the pragmatic competence required to thrive in the interconnected and multicultural environments of the 21st century.

## References

1. G'ulomov, A. (2018). *Methodology of Language Teaching in Higher Education*. Tashkent: Universitet Nashriyoti.
2. Hymes, D. (1972). *On Communicative Competence*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
3. Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet*. Routledge.
4. Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Blackwell.
5. Makhkamova, G. (2020). Pedagogical Approaches to Teaching Non-Philological Students. *Uzbek Journal of Education*, 4(2), 45–52.
6. Taguchi, N. (2015). Developing Interactional Competence in a Japanese Study Abroad Context. *Multilingual Matters*.
7. Widdowson, H. G. (1998). Context, Community, and Authentic Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 705–716.
8. Xudoyberganova, D. (2019). *Intercultural Communication in Language Education*. Tashkent: Fan.
9. Additional references from international journals on pragmatics and pedagogy may be included for empirical support.