TWO CATEGORIES OF LEARNERS' DIVERGENCE AFFECTING THEIR LEARNING

Shakirov Bobirjon Muminjon o'g'li
Kattakurgan city specialized school
Under the system of the agency of specialized educational institutions
English Teacher

Annotation: *When language learners experience interacting with people who are native speakers of their language, it is noticeable that language learners' pragmatic behavior does not necessarily reflect anticipated patterns, behind which there are definitely several reasons. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) examined five common factors of learners' divergence from pragmatic norms, including negative transfer of pragmatic norms, limited grammatical ability in the L2, overgeneralization of perceived L2 pragmatic norms, effect of instruction or instructional materials and resistance to using perceived L2 pragmatic norms. In spite of the fact that pragmatic ability is considered as one of the most complicated and challenging features of communicative competence, non-native like language application is not always deemed as negative, rather it reflects innovative, creative aspects as Ishihara and Cohen (2010) stated. At the same time, it is important to note that there are circumstances in which language pragmatics can be misunderstood and result in unwanted implications. That is why, centering focus on teaching pragmatics in the classroom in order to avoid divergence is crucially vital. Teachers should always feel the main causes of pragmatic divergence on learners and pay attention to fixing these potential incidents by conducting reasonable and effective activities or teaching methods.*

Key words: *pragmatic norms; teaching pragmatics, pragmatic awareness, communicative competence*

First Divergence. To begin with, I will analyze the effect of instruction or instructional materials which is likely to diverge my learners form pragmatic norms. I conduct the speaking-instructed lessons which put main focus on preparation for IELTS or CEFR exams for my students. For speaking test, band descriptors mention that in order to obtain a higher score, a candidate should be willing to speak at length, develop topics fully and appropriately, use a variety of complex structures. Based on these instructions, my learners are exposed to practicing oral skills for several months until their exam, even

they are likely to carry on producing their speech in that way, to clarify they continually speak fully with complex grammar structures and a range of big words. As a result of this speaking instruction, when they encounter with native speakers in real life, they might diverge from pragmatic norms, as they are highly likely to feel as if they were sitting in an exam and they might produce complex sentences, even if the situation is simple and requires short answers. For example, after the learners are subjected to preparing for speaking exam for months, supposing they met a native speaker somewhere maybe any historical place or social places. In this case, the native asks a question such as "Do you like watching films?". In fact, for this question, it would be sufficient to answer shortly, like "Yes, I do" or "Yes I like films". By contrast, it is possible that my students may answer thoroughly and in a complicated way that could seem weird for the native speaker. My students potential answer could be like that: "It is true that films are a one part of human life to enjoy free time after busy and arduous working day. As for me, I am really fond of watching films on TV or my laptop, whereby I can watch a wide variety of films ranging from comedies to horrors". This response might illustrate too lengthy spoken discourse and result in native speaker's astonishment or even misunderstandings, eventually early quitting of the communication.

Second Divergence. Another pragmatic divergence which is going to have an influence my students on the horizon is negative transfer of pragmatic norms which means applying first and dominant language norms when having a contact with L2 native speakers. In fact, this trend can produce reasonable results on the condition that learners' pragmatic norms tend to be homogenous and usable to L2 as Ishihara and Cohen (2010) pointed out. On the other hand, it is highly possible that learners are immersed in their original pragmatic norms when they have to communicate with the native speakers whose language they are learning. For instance, in our culture after greetings, people have the habit to ask about their family, children, even their spouses all of which seem to be strange in other cultures especially English-speaking countries. In our country, people can accept this circumstance as a usual habit, and they respond what the speaker ask without any misunderstandings taking place. Supposing, any of my students travelled to Europe with good language skills but lacking in pragmatic norms, they would have trouble having an interaction with native speakers, as he or she would rely on their own language pragmatic norms and even they would be avoided by locals owing to their speaking medium and tone.

In order to inhibit these kinds of incidents, teachers ought to formulate some activities which ensure improving learners' pragmatic awareness of L2.

REFERENCES:

1.   Ishihara N. and Cohen D. (2010) Describing speech acts: linking research and pedagogy: Chapter-4. UK: Pearson Educational Limited

2.   Ishihara N. and Cohen D. (2010) Learners' pragmatics: potential causes of divergence; Chapter-5. UK: Pearson Educational Limited

3.   Jenny Dooley and Virgina Evans (1999) Grammarway-3 with answers, Express publishing

4.   Raymond Murphy (2019) English Grammar in Use; Fifth edition. Cambridge University Press

5.   http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/descriptions.html