misinterpretation, reduced communicative effectiveness, and potential misunderstandings in cross-cultural interactions. Therefore, developing sensitivity to idiomatic usage and its cultural background is a key component of achieving communicative competence in a second language.

Conclusion. This research has explored how blue color idioms function in English and Uzbek from emotional and psychological perspectives. The findings demonstrate that such idioms reflect both universal human experiences and culture-specific meanings. While English idioms often associate blue with sadness, Uzbek expressions tend to emphasize natural and symbolic aspects of the color. This highlights the role of culture in shaping language. The study confirms that idioms are essential tools for expressing complex emotions and ideas, linking language with cognition and cultural identity. Future research could expand this analysis by examining other colors or additional languages to gain a broader understanding of color symbolism in language.

References:

(1). Mark Johnson & George Lakoff. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

(2). Zoltán Kövecses. Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

(3). Shavkat Rahmatullayev. O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati. Toshkent, "O'qituvchi", 2006.

(4). Wierzbicka Anna. Semantics: Primes and Universals. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996.

Tursunova Munisa Muhammadsharif qizi (Phd Candidate, Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization Engineers National Research University; E-mail: munisatursunova77@gmail.com)

ARGUMENTATION IN EFL: DEVELOPING STRUCTURED, SENSITIVE, AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION

Annotation. *This pre-test/post-test single-group experiment investigates how systematic instruction in Toulmin's (1958) six-component model of argument affects EFL learners' argumentative competence and politeness management. Over ten weeks, 28 adult B2-level EFL learners, Uzbekistan received struc-tured instruction in all six Toulmin component, each scaffolded with explicit face-management strategies. Learners completed a validated argumentative discourse task at pre- and post-intervention stages; their oral and written output was coded using a purpose-built Toulmin Argumentation Scoring Rubric (TASR). The study concludes that Toulmin's model, when taught as a face-aware pragmatic framework rather than a purely logical schema, constitutes a powerful scaffold for advancing both argumentative and interac-tional competence in EFL contexts.*

Keywords: *Toulmin model, EFL argumentation, pre-test/post-test persuasive discourse, pragmatic competence, politeness.*

Tursunova Munisa Muhammadsharif qizi (Toshkent Irrigatsiya va qishloq xo'jaligini mexanizatsiyalash muhandislari instituti milliy tadqiqot universiteti tayanch doktoranti;Email:munisatursunova77@gmail.com)

EFLDA ARGUMENTATSIYA: STRUKTURALI, SENSITIV VA PERSUASIV MULOQOTNI RIVOJLANTIRISH

Annotatsiya. *Mazkur pre-test/post-test bir guruhli eksperimental tadqiqot Stephen Toulminning (1958) argumentning olti komponentli modeli asosida olib borilgan tizimli o'qitish EFL o'rganuvchilarining argumentativ kompetensiyasi va muloyimlikni boshqarish (politeness management) ko'nikmalariga qanday ta'sir qilishini o'rganadi. O'n hafta davomida B2 darajadagi 28 nafar katta yoshli EFL o'rganuvchilariga Toulmin modelining barcha olti komponenti bo'yicha tizimli ta'lim berildi, bunda har bir komponent yuzni saqlash (face-management) strategiyalari bilan mustahkamlandi. Tadqiqot shuni ko'rsatadiki, Toulmin modeli faqat mantiqiy sxema sifatida emas, balki pragmatik jihatdan asoslangan, yuzga sezgir model sifatida o'qitilganda, EFL kontekstida argumentativ hamda interaksional kompetensiyani rivojlantirish uchun kuchli pedagogik tayanch bo'lib xizmat qiladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *Toulmin modeli, EFL argumentatsiyasi, pre-test/post-test, persuasiv diskurs, pragmatik kompetensiya, muloyimlik.*

Турсунова Муниса Мухаммадшариф кизи (Докторант Национального исследовательского университета «Ташкентский институт инженеров ирригации и механизации сельского хозяйства»; E-mail: munisatursunova77@gmail.com)

АРГУМЕНТАЦИЯ В EFL: РАЗВИТИЕ СТРУКТУРИРОВАННОЙ, ЧУВСТВИТЕЛЬНОЙ И УБЕДИТЕЛЬНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

Аннотация*. Данное одно-групповое экспериментальное исследование типа pre-test/post-test изучает, как систематическое обучение на основе шестикомпонентной модели аргументации*

Stephen Toulmin (1958) влияет на аргументативную компетенцию и управление вежливостью у изучающих английский язык как иностранный (EFL). В течение десяти недель 28 взрослых обучающихся уровня B2 проходили структурированное обучение всем шести компонентам модели Тулмина, при этом каждый компонент сопровождался эксплицитными стратегиями управления лицом (face-management). Участники выполняли валидизированное задание по аргументативному дискурсу до и после интервенции; их устная и письменная продукция кодировалась с использованием специально разработанной Рубрики оценки аргументации Тулмина (TASR). Исследование показывает, что модель Тулмина, преподаваемая не только как логическая схема, но и как прагматически ориентированная, чувствительная к категории «лица» модель, является мощным средством развития как аргументативной, так и интеракционной компетенции в контексте EFL.

Ключевые слова: *модель Тулмина, аргументация в EFL, pre-test/post-test, убедительный дискурс, прагматическая компетенция, вежливость.*

Introduction. Argumentation occupies an increasingly prominent place in EFL curricula worldwide, driven by growing recognition that critical thinking, persuasive communication, and evidence-based reasoning are core competencies for academic and professional participation in English-medium environments [1;248 p.], [6;159 p.]. Yet classroom practitioners consistently report a paradox: when learners are asked to argue, they frequently either capitulate to avoid conflict or escalate into blunt, face-threatening challenges that derail productive discussion. Neither outcome reflects the sophisticated, face-sensitive argumentative discourse that real-world contexts demand.

The present study proposes that this paradox can be substantially resolved by treating Toulmin's (1958) six-component model of argument not merely as a logical schema but as a pragmatic framework, each component of which carries distinct face implications that can be explicitly taught [5;264 p..]. When learners understand that a qualifier is not just a logical hedge but also a politeness device that signals epistemic humility and protects the interlocutor's face, or that a well-constructed rebuttal begins with acknowledgment rather than rejection, argumentation instruction becomes simultaneously a lesson in reasoning and in relational intelligence [3;328 p.]. This study tests whether such an integrated approach produces measurable gains in both argumentation quality and face management.

Methods. A single-group pre-test/post-test quasi-experimental design was adopted. This design is appropriate when a control group is not feasible in naturalistic classroom settings and when the research aim is to document within-group change across a structured intervention [4;416 p.). The independent variable was the ten-week integrated Toulmin–face theory instructional treatment; the dependent variables were scores on each of the six Toulmin components as measured by the

Figure 1

Experimental procedure overview

Week 0	Week 1–2	Week 3–4	Week 5–6	Week 7–9	Week 10
Pre-test Argumentative discourse task; TASR scoring by two raters	Claim + Data Positions and evidence; positive face framing	Warrant + Backing Reasoning chains; negative politeness hedges	Qualifier + Rebuttal Face-saving qualifiers; concession-first rebuttals	Integration Full Toulmin arguments in face-sensitive debate and writing	Post-test Parallel task; TASR re-scored blind

Note. Each phase built on the previous. Face-theory scaffolding was introduced from weeks 3–4 and integrated throughout weeks 5–10.

Participants and setting. Twenty-eight adult learners (mean age 23.8, 16 females, 12 male) enrolled in a B2 General English course at a TIIAME National Research University in Tashkent participated. All had received standard communicative EFL instruction but had not previously encountered Toulmin's model or explicit face-theory instruction. The classroom teacher held an MA in Applied Linguistics and was trained in both frameworks prior to the intervention.

The Toulmin Argumentation Scoring Rubric (TASR). The TASR was developed specifically for this study, operationalizing each of Toulmin's six components on a 0–10 analytic scale. Face-management subscores were embedded within the warrant, qualifier, and rebuttal components, reflecting the study's theoretical premise that these are the components most directly implicated in face-threat management. Inter-rater reliability was established through double-blind scoring of 20% of transcripts (Cohen's $\kappa = .84$).

Results. Pre-test and post-test TASR scores across all six Toulmin components.

Table 1

TASR pre-test and post-test mean scores by Toulmin component (n = 28, max = 10)

Toulmin component	Pre-test mean (SD)	Post-test mean (SD)	Mean gain	t-value	p-value	Effect size (d)
Claim	4.8 (1.2)	7.9 (0.9)	+3.1	9.84	$p < .001$	1.86
Data	4.2 (1.4)	7.5 (1.1)	+3.3	8.97	$p < .001$	1.70
Warrant	2.9 (1.5)	6.3 (1.2)	+3.4	10.21	$p < .001$	1.93
Backing	3.1 (1.3)	6.7 (1.0)	+3.6	10.55	$p < .001$	2.00
Qualifier	2.4 (1.1)	5.5 (1.3)	+3.1	9.12	$p < .001$	1.73
Rebuttal	2.1 (1.0)	5.9 (1.4)	+3.8	12.44	$p < .001$	2.36
Overall TASR	3.6 (0.8)	7.1 (0.7)	+3.5	18.60	$p < .001$	2.26

The results are unambiguous in direction: all six components showed statistically significant and practically large gains. Three patterns are worthy of note. First, the components receiving dedicated face-theory instruction – warrant, qualifier, and rebuttal – were precisely those with the lowest pre-test means, confirming that these are the most underdeveloped aspects of EFL learners' argumentative repertoire. Second, rebuttal showed the largest absolute gain (+3.8) and the largest effect size (d = 2.36), suggesting that face-aware instruction is especially transformative for the most socially charged argumentative move. Third, claim and data – the components most closely resemble familiar school-writing tasks – showed the highest pre-test baselines and the smallest relative gains, consistent with the hypothesis that structural components requiring pragmatic sensitivity are disproportionately underdeveloped in standard EFL instruction.

Discussion. The present study's results offer some of the strongest classroom-based evidence to date for the pedagogical utility of Toulmin's model in EFL contexts. The consistent, large-effect gains across all six components validate the model's structural clarity as a scaffold: learners who previously produced undifferentiated arguments – little more than claims followed by opinion – were, within ten weeks, producing arguments with explicit warrants, qualified claims, and face-sensitive rebuttals. The model's component-by-component teachability was central to this success; teachers could isolate warrant instruction and focus learner attention on the logical bridge without overwhelming the lesson with all six elements simultaneously. The very procedural clarity that makes Toulmin's model pedagogically tractable also constitutes its principal theoretical limitation. As Walton (2006) argues, real argumentative dialogue is emergent, multi-party, and responsive – none of which the model's linear architecture captures [7; 324-p.]. In the present study, learners who had mastered the six components in scripted tasks occasionally struggled to deploy them fluidly in live debate, reverting to simpler claim-and-opinion structures under interactional pressure. This suggests that Toulmin instruction may be necessary but not sufficient: learners need additional exposure to unscripted dialogic argumentation before the model's components fully migrate from metalinguistic knowledge to communicative competence.

Conclusion. The evidence assembled in this study establishes a clear and practically significant result: systematic, component-by-component instruction in Toulmin's six-component model, integrated with Brown and Levinson's face-management strategies, produces large and statistically robust gains in EFL learners' argumentative competence across all components [2;345 p.]. The finding that the three components most implicated in face-threat – warrant, qualifier, and rebuttal – showed both the greatest pre-intervention deficit and the greatest post-intervention gains strongly supports the study's core theoretical claim: that face theory is not a supplementary add-on to argumentation pedagogy but an integral part of what makes argumentation teachable and learnable in socially embedded EFL contexts. Future research should examine whether these gains persist at six-month follow-up, whether they transfer to unscripted oral debate, and how the framework functions across different L1 cultural and rhetorical backgrounds.

References:

[1]. Andrews R. Argumentation in Higher Education. Improving Practice through Theory and Research. London, Routledge, 2010, 248 p.

[2]. Brown P., Levinson S.C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987, 345 p.

[3]. Kuhn D. The Skills of Argument. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 1991, 328 p.

[4]. Mackey A., Gass S.M. Second Language Research: Methodology and Design. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005, 416 p.

[5]. Toulmin S.E. The Uses of Argument. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 1958, 264 p.
[6]. Vigotsky L.S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978, 159 p.
[7]. Walton D. Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2006, 324 p.

Kazakova Malika Uktamovna (Navoiy State University, Faculty of Philology, Department of Practical English, Lecturer)

LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY

Annotation. *This article examines language interference as a sociolinguistic phenomenon in multilingual education, with focus on the Uzbek–Russian–English trilingual environment of Central Asian higher education. Cross-linguistic transfer persists in multilingual students' speech and writing long after formal instruction should have eliminated it, and purely structural accounts cannot explain why. Drawing on a thematic analysis of fifty-two scholarly sources, the study identifies three interacting groups of determinants – social, cultural, and psychological – and shows how they jointly shape observable interference patterns. Theoretically, the article synthesizes Anglophone sociolinguistics, post-Soviet linguoculturology, and contemporary SLA research; practically, it offers recommendations for trilingual programme design, teacher training, and language policy.*

Keywords: *language interference, multilingual education, sociolinguistics, code-switching, cross-linguistic influence, trilingualism, Uzbek–Russian–English education, family language policy, language anxiety, symbolic capital.*

KO'P TILLI TA'LIMDA TIL INTERFERENSIYASI: SOTSIOLINGVISTIK TADQIQOT

Kazakova Malika Uktamovna (Navoiy davlat universiteti Tillar fakulteti "Ingliz tili, amaliy fanlar" kafedrasi o'qituvchisi; ORCID: 0009-0001-8162-3829; kazakovamalika0@gmail.com)

Annotatsiya. *Maqolada til interferensiyasi ko'p tilli ta'lim sharoitida sotsiolingvistik hodisa sifatida tahlil qilinadi; asosiy e'tibor Markaziy Osiyo oliy ta'limidagi o'zbek–rus–ingliz uch tilli muhitiga qaratiladi. Tillararo ko'chish rasmiy ta'limga qaramay barqaror saqlanadi va uni faqat tuzilmaviy omillar bilan tushu-ntirib bo'lmaydi. Ellik ikkita ilmiy manbaning mavzuli tahlili asosida uchta omillar guruhi – ijtimoiy, madaniy va psixologik – ajratilgan va ularning birgalikdagi ta'siri ko'rsatilgan. Ilmiy hissa – uchta tadqiqot an'anasini yagona doiraga birlashtirish; amaliy hissa – uchtilli ta'lim dasturlariga oid tavsiyalar.*

Kalit so'zlar: *til interferensiyasi, ko'p tilli ta'lim, sotsiolingvistika, kodlarni almashtirish, tillararo ta'sir, uchtillilik, o'zbek–rus–ingliz ta'lim, oilaviy til siyosati, til tashvishi, ramziy kapital.*

Казакова Малика Уктамовна (преподаватель кафедры практического английского языка филологического факультета Навоийского государственного университета)

ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯ В МНОГОЯЗЫЧНОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ: СОЦИОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ

Аннотация. *В статье рассматривается языковая интерференция как социолингвистическое явление в условиях многоязычного образования, с особым вниманием к узбекско-русско-английской трёхъязычной среде высшего образования Центральной Азии. Проблема состоит в устойчивости межъязыкового переноса, не объяснимого исключительно структурными факторами. На основе тематического анализа пятидесяти двух научных источников выделены три взаимосвязанные группы детерминант – социальные, культурные и психологические – и показано их совместное действие. Научный вклад – синтез англоязычной социолингвистики, постсоветской лингвокультурологии и современных SLA-исследований; практический – рекомендации по проектированию трёхъязычных программ.*

Ключевые слова: *языковая интерференция, многоязычное образование, социолингвистика, кодовое переключение, межъязыковое влияние, трилингвизм, узбекско-русско-английское образование, семейная языковая политика, языковая тревожность, символический капитал.*

Introduction. Language interference – the unintended influence of one language on another in the speech of a bi- or multilingual speaker – has remained a central puzzle of sociolinguistics for more than half a century. The phenomenon resists purely structural explanation: knowing the typological contrasts between two languages does not allow us to predict reliably which features will transfer, in which direction, or with what frequency. This recalcitrance drove researchers to look beyond grammar toward the social, cultural, and psychological forces that mediate between language systems and their actual use. In post-Soviet Central Asia, and Uzbekistan in particular, students operate in a specific trilingual configuration: