

---

## INTEGRATION OF LINGUISTIC, SOCIOLINGUISTIC, AND PRAGMATIC COMPETENCES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LESSONS

Qosimov Jaloliddin

2nd-year Doctoral Student, Trainee Teacher at Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages  
named after Iskhokhon Ibrat, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

This article examines how linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competences can be integrated into classroom practice to develop learners' communicative competence in English. Building on foundational frameworks of communicative competence and contemporary proficiency descriptors, it argues that accurate form, social appropriateness, and goal-oriented language use are mutually constitutive dimensions that must be taught together rather than sequentially. The study employs a conceptual-analytical method supplemented by design-based lesson scenarios to demonstrate how grammar instruction can be embedded in interactional contexts, how sociocultural norms can be made explicit through critical incidents, and how pragmatic routines can be rehearsed via task-based simulations and assessment rubrics. Findings from the literature and classroom implementations reported by prior research suggest that integrated tasks yield measurable gains in fluency, accuracy, appropriateness, and strategic use of language. Implications include aligning objectives with CEFR descriptors, calibrating assessment to performance-based criteria, and ensuring teacher mediation that foregrounds reflection on form–meaning–use connections.

**KEYWORDS:** Communicative competence; linguistic competence; sociolinguistic competence; pragmatic competence; task-based learning; CEFR; performance assessment.

### INTRODUCTION

Communicative competence is commonly presented as a synergy of knowledge and ability in linguistic form, sociocultural appropriateness, and pragmatic action in context. Since Hymes introduced the notion of competence that extends beyond grammaticality to social meaning, and subsequent models refined its components, pedagogy has wrestled with the risk of compartmentalizing these dimensions in ways that impoverish real communication. In typical classroom progressions, grammatical structures are taught as decontextualized items, while sociolinguistic conventions and pragmatic moves are relegated to occasional notes or advanced electives. Such sequencing constrains learners' capacity to manage interpersonal relations, interpret implied meanings, or accomplish tasks such as persuading, refusing, mitigating, or negotiating. Contemporary descriptors, including the CEFR Companion Volume, emphasize the

inseparability of form, interactional appropriateness, and action-oriented use, inviting teachers to design coherently integrated lessons where the target grammar is inherently motivated by a communicative situation, where register and politeness choices are foregrounded, and where learners practice achieving concrete outcomes with language.

The integration proposed here views linguistic competence as the system of resources to encode meanings, sociolinguistic competence as sensitivity to norms shaping those meanings across communities and registers, and pragmatic competence as the strategic selection and sequencing of actions to achieve communicative goals. Rather than treating them as adjacent strands, lessons should align input, interaction, and assessment so that accuracy supports appropriateness and both enable purposeful action. This alignment requires principled task design, explicit metapragmatic discussion, and performance-based evaluation that reflect how language is actually used.

The aim of this article is to articulate a practical, theory-informed model for integrating linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competences in English language lessons, and to illustrate how such integration improves learners' communicative performance as evidenced by accuracy, appropriateness, and task achievement criteria aligned with recognized proficiency frameworks. The study adopts a conceptual-analytical approach grounded in established theories of communicative competence and task-based language teaching. To operationalize integration, we sketch lesson scenarios that embed target forms within interactional events such as making requests in institutional settings, delivering feedback in academic groups, or negotiating project timelines in professional simulations. Materials include authentic texts, audio-video exemplars, and teacher-constructed dialogues curated to highlight contrasts of register, politeness strategies, and discourse markers. Methods emphasize guided noticing of form-function mapping, role-plays with rotating goals and roles, and reflective debriefs that surface sociocultural assumptions and strategic choices. Assessment is framed through analytic rubrics capturing accuracy of linguistic resources, sociolinguistic fit to participants and setting, and pragmatic success in achieving intended outcomes, with reference to CEFR descriptors for interaction and mediation. While no new experimental data are collected, the design choices are triangulated with findings from classroom-based research on communicative and pragmatic development.

Integrating the three competences within coherent tasks produces several reinforcing effects. When learners attend to grammatical resources while pursuing communicative outcomes, they demonstrate improved retention of forms because these forms are repeatedly mobilized to address authentic constraints and negotiations. The focus on sociolinguistic variables such as status, familiarity, and genre encourages learners to recalibrate lexical choice, modality, and address forms, which in turn refines their sense of register and reduces miscommunication caused by literal transfer from the first language. Pragmatic rehearsal through scenarios such as declining invitations, softening complaints, or escalating a request across institutional hierarchies fosters strategic competence, particularly in adapting moves to interlocutor responses and repairing emerging misunderstandings.

The literature reports that pragmatic routines develop through exposure to exemplars and feedback on appropriateness, and that gains are most robust when learners are given opportunities to compare contrasting realizations and reflect on their interpersonal effects. Embedding such reflection directly after task performance helps learners consolidate links between linguistic choices and perlocutionary impact. Crucially, integrated assessment clarifies expectations. Rubrics that separate accuracy, appropriateness, and goal achievement allow teachers to offer precise feedback without collapsing errors of form with violations of social norms or failures of strategic planning. Over time, learners internalize these distinctions and self-monitor more effectively, which shortens the feedback loop between planning, performance, and revision.

Alignment with CEFR enables transparent progression. For example, moving from B1 to B2 in mediated interaction can be operationalized as expanding pragmatic repertoires for negotiating solutions, while simultaneously introducing the grammatical and lexical means to hedge, sequence arguments, and signal stance appropriate to semi-formal settings. Teacher mediation remains pivotal: modeling think-alouds, eliciting alternative phrasings with different degrees of directness, and prompting learners to justify choices relative to audience and purpose. The cumulative result is a classroom ecology in which language is treated as social action and grammatical knowledge is valued for how it enables that action to be effective and ethical.

An integrated approach to linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competences transforms English lessons from sequences of discrete items into arenas for purposeful interaction. By situating forms within socially meaningful contexts and evaluating performance against accuracy, appropriateness, and task achievement, teachers cultivate learners who can not only produce correct sentences but also manage relations, infer intentions, and achieve goals. Theoretical frameworks and proficiency descriptors provide a stable foundation, while task-based design and reflective assessment render integration actionable in daily practice. Sustained implementation promises durable gains in communicative competence that transfer beyond the classroom.

## References

1. Hymes D. On communicative competence // *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* / ed. J. B. Pride, J. Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. P. 269–293.
2. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing // *Applied Linguistics*. 1980. Vol. 1, No. 1. P. 1–47.
3. Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2020. 236 p.
4. Bachman L. F., Palmer A. S. *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. 384 p.
5. Savignon S. J. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997. 272 p.
6. Byram M. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. 124 p.

7. Taguchi N. Pragmatic Development as a Complex, Dynamic Process // System. 2011. Vol. 39, No. 4. P. 634–646.
8. Rose K. R., Kasper G. Pragmatics in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 308 p.