

ON LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE

Sultanova Guzalkhon Saidabbasovna

senior teacher of ESP The University of geological sciences Email: sguzal2004@mail.ru

The development of Uzbek society in the context of personally oriented education puts forward new demands on the personality of a graduate of a modern university. Including from the standpoint of his successful socialization. There is a rethinking of the goals, objectives, content, methods and techniques of teaching, clarification of the structure and content of the goal-setting concepts of a foreign language as a course of study and, in particular, linguistic competence, identification of approaches and principles, methods and techniques and their description taking into account the goals and specifics of teaching.

At different stages of the introduction of the course "foreign language", the problem of forming knowledge about the language (linguistic competence) was the most important. However, the solutions to this problem were different and depended on what place was given to this subject in the educational system and what tasks it was called upon to solve.

Linguistic competence is interpreted ambiguously in foreign language teaching methods; this concept is used as a synonym for language competence. Chomsky uses it mainly to characterize those issues that are the proper concern of grammar, while relegating other issues concerning speech behavior to performance. Chomsky contrasts linguistic competence to linguistic performance. Competence is what we know when we know a language; performance is how we use that knowledge, including both the datable occurrences of linguistic acts (however individuated) and the psychological processing that subserves them.

Alan Gardiner interprets this distinction as a distinction between language as the activity of speaking and the underlying knowledge or technique of this activity (science, knowledge).

Thus, linguistic performance differs from time to time. The processes that produce linguistic knowledge remain the same; how they are utilized differs. So performance - what speakers actually do or can do - is contrasted with competence - the system of processes that produces the linguistic knowledge involved in speakers' linguistic doings. (In this dichotomy the term "performance" is used for two things. When linguistic performance is spoken of as data, it is what the speaker actually does. But theories of performance are generally best understood as theories of a speaker's capacities to perceive, understand, etc. under various conditions.)

The notion of competence came into linguistics with transformational grammar, and remains after the decline-disintegration - of classical transformational grammar, although even in linguistics there is some reactionary criticism.

A theory of linguistic competence does not describe the behavior of any actual speaker, but it does describe an ideal to which the behavioral capacities of actual speakers approximate, more or less depending on conditions, and hence, it plays a role in predicting their actual behavioral capacities. The linguistic theory of competence is not an idealization

in the sense that it is merely a theory of performance for an ideal speaker; that is, one without non-linguistic performance limitations.

Coseriu declares that language as activity, which, by the way, must be understood as 'speaking and understanding', does not exhaust itself in the mechanical realization or application of an already existing knowledge. Moreover, as it is a question of a productive activity, we can also regard it in terms of its products. This can be observed most clearly and directly in the case of 'texts'; a text is nothing but the product of a speech act or of a sequence of speech acts, or, rather: these speech acts themselves as a product, which can be either retained in memory or recorded and preserved in a material, in taped, written, or printed form.

For Chomsky the objective of grammar is to formalize competence. Now, it has been argued, many things the speaker-hearer knows about his language, and which are thus by definition part of his competence, are not handled by a generative grammar. Phenomena that must be based on a tacit knowledge of the rules of use of

language include the following:

1. Tendencies for hesitations to appear before certain words in a sentence and for certain words to be repeated after hesitations (see Matthews, 1967);
2. Varying transition probabilities between words and utterances (Hockett, 1968, p. 39; in referring to these, Hockett does not criticize Chomsky's notion of competence);
3. Relations between sentences, which inter alia make some sequences of sentences unacceptable (see Matthews, 1967);
4. A host of socio-cultural factors determining, among others, not what is acceptable grammatically but what is deemed appropriate in a given situation (Hymes, in press).

The identification of linguistic competence as an independent one is important for understanding the cognitive function of the subject "foreign language". Mastering a language involves not only acquiring knowledge about the language and mastering the language material itself. It is known that one can know pronunciation norms, words and rules of their use, grammatical forms and constructions well, be able to use different ways of expressing the same thought (have mastered synonymy), in other words, be competent in linguistic and language terms, but not be able to use this knowledge and skills adequately in a real speech situation, or, as scientists say, a communicative situation. In other words, for language proficiency, the skills and abilities of using certain words and grammatical constructions in specific communication situations are important.

REFERENCES:

1. M. Schlesinger. On Linguistic Competence. Pragmatics of Natural Languages. D.Riedel Publishing Company, Dordrecht-Holland, 1971
2. Collins John. Linguistic Competence without Knowledge of Language. Philosophy Compass, Volume 2, Issue 6, 2007
3. Eugenio Coseriu. Linguistic Competence: What is it Really? The Modern Language Review, Vol. 80, No. 4. Modern Humanities Research Association

4. John Tienson. Linguistic Competence. Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences and Affiliated Societies, 1983
5. Пыркова Т.А. Содержание и структура лингвистической компетенции. Актуальные вопросы филологической науки XXI века, 2014