[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:

Uzbek as state and home language, Russian as regional lingua franca and partial medium of higher education, English as the emerging language of international academic mobility [1;3–9 p.]. The present study integrates social, cultural, and psychological factors into one analytical framework, synthesising three previously isolated research traditions – Anglophone sociolinguistics, post-Soviet linguoculturology, and contemporary SLA research – with practical aims for trilingual education policy in Uzbekistan.

**Literature Review.** Language interference was first set out systematically by U. Weinreich [2;1–10 p.], who distinguished structural from non-structural determinants and insisted that bilingual experience and social attitudes shape how structural pressures actually surface. T.Odlin [3;25–48 p.] broadened this under cross-linguistic influence, demonstrating that predictions based purely on language pairs fail without learner-internal and social variables. The decisive turn toward sociolinguistic explanation came with S. Thomason and T.Kaufman [4;35–57 p.], whose socially driven hypothesis holds that the intensity and direction of contact-induced change depend primarily on the social history of contact, not on typological proximity. P.Bourdieu added a further layer through his account of language as symbolic capital [5;43–65 p.], shifting language choice from a structural fact to a social act invested with prestige and identity. C. Myers-Scotton [6;75–98 p.] approached the field through code-switching, helping draw the line between deliberate code-mixing and unintentional transfer – a line that blurs in the speech of multilingual students.

S.Jarvis and A.Pavlenko [7;112–145 p.] integrated conceptual transfer with structural and pragmatic transfer; J.Rothman's Typological Primacy Model [8;107–127 p.] argues that in L3 acquisition transfer is selected on the basis of typological proximity – with direct consequences for Uzbek–Russian–English learners, since Russian, typologically closer to English than Uzbek, often becomes the L3 transfer source. Psychological work has approached interference through anxiety [9;125–132 p.], motivation [10;9–42 p.], and the cognitive load of bilingual processing [11;67–81 p.]. The recent study by A.Abdulrahman [12; pp. 69–80] provides quantitative evidence that learners rank psychological factors highest, social factors second, cultural factors third. Within the post-Soviet space, D.Hasanova [1;3–9 p.] and M.Djuraeva [13; 87–130 p.] have documented the sociolinguistic complexity of these environments. What is missing is an integrated framework for the specific case of Uzbek–Russian–English education – the gap this article addresses.

**Research Methodology.** The study is qualitative and deductive with an interpretivist orientation [5; pp. 43–65]: a theoretical analytical study based on documentary research, proceeding through source identification, thematic coding, conceptual synthesis, and application to the Uzbek–Russian–English context. The corpus consists of fifty-two peer-reviewed publications selected through purposive sampling, with inclusion criteria of primary focus on cross-linguistic influence or related phenomena; availability in English, Russian, or Uzbek; and a chronological range from 1953 (Weinreich) to 2024. Data collection drew on JSTOR, Scopus, eLIBRARY.RU, and Google Scholar with a trilingual keyword strategy. Validity is strengthened by triangulation across three research traditions which have historically developed in relative isolation – itself a methodological contribution of the work.

**Analysis and Results.** The thematic analysis produced a three-tier structure of interference determinants.

***Social factors.*** Five social factors recur across the literature. Language ecology determines which languages are activated most often and serve as default transfer sources; urban Uzbek learners typically operate in dense trilingual environments while rural learners encounter Russian and English mainly in institutional contexts [13;87–130 p.]. Prestige and symbolic capital [5;43–65 p.] set the social value of each language. Family language policy [14;907–922 p.] establishes the baseline pattern of home language use. Peer-group practices normalise specific code-mixing patterns and turn certain transfer features into identity markers. The educational environment – the language regime of the classroom — either reinforces or corrects interference at the institutional level [12;69–80 p.].

**Cultural factors.** Three cultural factors emerged. First, contact between languages is also contact between conceptual organisations of experience [7;112–145 p.]: the transfer of Russian distinctions such as голубой/синий or интеллигентный/умный into English is conceptual interference operating below the lexical surface. Second, acculturation strategies [15;697–712 p.] generate distinct interference profiles – integration favours balanced multilingualism, assimilation drives unidirectional transfer. Third, pragmatic transfer is especially persistent because it operates below the threshold of conscious awareness; the transfer of Russian rhetorical conventions (heavy nominalisation, long periodic sentences, impersonal constructions) into English academic writing resists correction through grammatical instruction alone.

**Psychological factors.** Foreign language classroom anxiety [9;125–132 p.] reduces the cognitive resources available for monitoring output; more than 90% of multilingual learners identify anxiety as a major barrier [12; pp. 69–80]. Motivation in Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System [10;9–42 p.] modulates the intensity of self-monitoring. The cognitive load of multilingual production [11; pp. 67–81] rises sharply when speakers must simultaneously select the target language, inhibit non-target languages, maintain grammatical accuracy, and monitor pragmatic appropriateness; the inhibitory mechanism is imperfect and surfaces as interference under fatigue or pressure. Age of acquisition sets baseline constraints but is heavily modulated by the social and motivational variables above.

**Interaction of factors.** The three groups form an integrated configuration in which each tier mediates the others. The hierarchy proposed in [12;69–80 p.] – psychological factors as most proximal, social as intermediate, cultural as background – receives partial support, with one qualification: in trilingual settings the weight of cultural factors rises substantially, because students operate simultaneously in three cultural ecologies (Turkic, post-Soviet, Anglophone). This is the principal theoretical result of the study: a triangulated framework predicting that interference patterns in Uzbek–Russian–English students show (a) anxiety-driven retreat to L1/L2 structures in high-stakes academic production, (b) prestige-driven asymmetry favouring English in formal contexts and Uzbek in informal ones, and (c) pragmatic interference from Russian academic conventions in English writing.

**Conclusion and Recommendations.** Four points summarise the principal findings. First, structural linguistic explanations are not enough: any adequate account of interference must incorporate social, cultural, and psychological factors. Second, three groups of determinants were identified – social, cultural, and psychological – each with its own lineage and empirical literature. Third, the three groups interact systematically and cannot be reduced to any single tier without loss of explanatory power. Fourth, in trilingual settings such as Uzbek–Russian–English higher education, cultural factors carry greater weight than in monolingual SLA models because students operate in multiple cultural ecologies at once.

**For instructional practice:** language instruction should be supplemented by explicit attention to pragmatic and rhetorical conventions; classrooms should foster psychological safety and treat error as a developmental stage; curricula should acknowledge hybrid multilingual registers while still developing register-appropriate monolingual production. **For educational policy:** trilingual programmes should build sociolinguistic awareness components alongside grammar instruction; family language policy support should be integrated into national policy; teacher training should include multilingual classroom management and intercultural competence. **For future research:** empirical studies are needed that combine sociolinguistic surveys, psychometric assessment (FLCAS, L2 Motivational Self System Questionnaire), and recorded production; longitudinal designs would clarify how interference evolves across academic stages; comparative work with Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan would help identify regionally specific patterns; Rothman's Typological Primacy Model deserves direct empirical testing in Uzbek–Russian–English learners.

**References:**

(1). Hasanova D. Teaching and Learning English in Uzbekistan. English Today. 2007, vol. 23, № 1, p. 3–9.

(2). Weinreich U. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. New York, Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953, 148 p.

(3). Odlin T. Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989, 210 p.

(4). Thomason S.G., Kaufman T. Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1988, 411 p.

(5). Bourdieu P. Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991, 302 p.

(6). Myers-Scotton C. Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 196 p.

(7). Jarvis S., Pavlenko A. Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition. New York, London, Routledge, 2008, 287 p.

(8). Rothman J. L3 Syntactic Transfer Selectivity and Typological Determinacy. The Typological Primacy Model. Second Language Research, 2011, 27, № 1, p. 107–127.

(9). Horwitz E.K., Horwitz M.B., Cope J. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. "The Modern Language Journal", 1986, vol. 70, № 2, p. 125–132.

(10). Dörnyei Z. The L2 Motivational Self System. Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self / ed. by Z. Dörnyei, E.Ushioda. Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 2009, p. 9–42.

(11). Green D.W. Mental Control of the Bilingual Lexico-Semantic System. Bilingualism, Language and Cognition. 1998, vol. 1, № 2, p. 67–81.

(12). Abdulrahman A. Insights into Cultural, Social, and Psychological Factors that Influence Foreign Language Learning. BATARA DIDI. "English Language Journal", 2023, vol. 2, № 2, p. 69–80.
(13). Djuraeva M. Multilingualism, Language, and Ideology Across Time and Space. Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan: Doctoral Dissertation. Madison, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 2018, 187 p.
(14). King K.A., Fogle L., Logan-Terry A. Family Language Policy. "Language and Linguistics Compass", 2008, vol. 2, № 5, p. 907–922.
(15). Berry J.W. Acculturation: Living Successfully in Two Cultures. "International Journal of Intercultural Relations", 2005, vol. 29, № 6, p. 697–712.

**Olimjonova Fazilat Rustam qizi (Student of Tashkent State Transport University; mail: rustamovnafazilat0110@gmail.com)**

## GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION: BETWEEN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

***Annotation.*** *This article provides an in-depth analysis of grammatical transformations, which remain one of the most fundamental aspects of the translation process. Using examples extracted from Emily Brontë`s «Wuthering Heights», this research demonstrates precisely how a translator applies these techniques in practice.*

***Key words.*** *Grammatical transformation, translation theory, linguistic norms, equivalence, contextual meaning, source language, target language, adaptation.*

**Olimjonova Fazilat Rustam qizi (Toshkent davlat Transport universiteti talabasi; E-mail: rustamovnafazilat0110@gmail.com)**

## ADABIY TARJIMADA GRAMMATIK TRANSFORMATSIYALAR: INGLIZ VA RUS TILLARI MISOLIDA

***Annotatsiya.*** *Ushbu maqolada tarjima jarayonidagi eng muhim jihatlardan biri bo'lgan grammatik transformatsiyalar o'rganiladi. Emili Brontening «Wuthering heights» asaridan olingan misollar mavzuni yanada aniqroq tushunishga hamda tarjimon ushbu usullarni amaliyotda qanday qo'llanishini ko'rib chiqishga yordam beradi.*

***Kalit so'zlar:*** *grammatik transformatsiya, tarjima nazariyasi, til normalari, ekvivalentlik, kontekstual ma'no, asl til, tarjima tili, moslashtirish.*

**Олимжонова Фазилат Рустам кизи (студентка Ташкентского государственного транспортного университета; mail: rustamovnafazilat0110@gmail.com)**

## ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОМ ПЕРЕВОДЕ: МЕЖДУ АНГЛИЙСКИМ И РУССКИМ ЯЗЫКАМИ

***Аннотация.*** *В этой статье глубоко изучается одна из самых важных трансформаций в процессе перевода. Примеры, которые были проанализированы из книги Эмили Бронте «Грозовой Перевал» помогают понять тему еще точнее с доказательствами именно как переводчик применяет их в переводе.*

***Ключевые слова:*** *грамматическая трансформация, теория перевода, лингвистические нормы, эквивалентность, контекстуальное значение, исходный язык, переводящий язык, адаптация.*

**Introduction.** In the translation process, it is important to consider various features of each language because they will affect the translation. Each language has its own grammar, word order, punctuation rules, and sometimes they can be lost while rendering into other languages; changed into other grammar structure; or there can be addition to preserve the meaning of the source language. As a translators, we must find balance between preserving originality of the text and also to making it more understandable for the readers. Sometimes, grammar rules are the features that will play great role to demonstrate one language's authenticity, for example, some grammatical structures in Russian don't even exist in English language. It means, translators use transformations to keep the meaning, structure to make it sound more natural.

**Literature review and methodology.** Fiction is any work where the events, elements, or characters are imaginary. Literary fiction refers to books, novels, or short stories that tells a story from the author`s imagination. Etymologically, the word fiction is derived from the Latin word fictus, which means form. According to Searle [1;319 p.], works of fiction result from an author`s intention to perform a particular sort of illocutionary act. Also (Currie, 1990) fiction is produced when authors of stories intend that readers may believe the stories are true [2;7 p.]

To understand why grammatical transformations are necessary in translating fiction we should know first how they have been told or preserved through the generations. Until the high middle ages, books were