

LINGUISTIC BASIS FOR TEACHING FOREIGN STUDENTS TO USE INTRODUCTORY CONSTRUCTS IN RUSSIAN

Djurayeva Shakhlo

Teacher of SamSIFL

Abstract: *the article deals with the analysis of Teaching Foreign Students to Use Introductory Constructs in Russian which help communicators during the processes of discourse generation, actualization and perception. The research is based on Russian and English academic speech and the materials of the National Russian Corpus. Functional polysemy, a characteristic feature of many discourse markers both in Russian and English, is realized on two levels – beyond the pragmatic functions of these words and within them.*

Key words: *discourse markers, polysemy, functional polysemy, Russian language, English language, desemantization.*

Introductory words as a separate category in Russian were not immediately highlighted. So, in the "Russian Grammar" by M.V. Lomonosov [Lomonosov 1755], they have not yet been mentioned. Only at the beginning of the XIX century, for the first time, attempts were made to distinguish words that convey subjective assessment into a separate class. For example, N. I. Grech in "Practical Grammar of the Russian Language" still classifies water words as adverbs, but draws attention to some features of their functions. Thus, lexemes may probably be among adverbs that "determine the property and image of being, the existence of an object with an indication of possibility" [Greek 1827:223]. However, in the chapter on different genera of sentences, along with the main and subordinate sentence, N. I. Grech highlights the introductory sentence: "The introductory sentence is a completely extraneous sentence that has no grammatical connection with the main one, for example:" I, will you believe, water freezes in the room "[Grech 1827:248].

Thus, N. I. Grech does not yet speak of the existence of introductory words, but for the first time notes the existence in Russian of some special constructions that distinguish an important property: the lack of grammatical connection with the rest of the sentence.

We also find a mention of such constructions in A. Kh. Vostokov in his 1831 "Russian Grammar": "A special sentence may be inserted between parts of the main sentence, called the introductory, which is not bound by pronouns or alliances to the main sentence, and may be omitted without violating the meaning, for example:" He, I think, will return soon, "" We will probably see him "[East ok 1831:227]. Although A. Kh. Vostokov gives an example precisely with the introductory word, he also does not distinguish it

into a separate category, but correlates it with the concept of the introductory sentence. Other examples of introductory words (as it may be) can be found in it among adverbs. At the same time, A. Kh. Vostokov made an important addition to the definition of constructions of this type: he pointed out that they are not connected with the rest of the sentence not only grammatically, but also semantically

In the second half of the 19th century, Y. K. Grot in "Philological Searches" in examples gives a number of introductory words and points to another important feature of them - punctuation. "Commas usually separate adverbs and other similar sayings when they are not part of a sentence, but serve to denote either the degree of confidence of the speaker, or his attitude to the subject of speech, or the basis of his thought, etc., namely the words: of course, it may probably be that the right seems to be remembered, of course, to know, without a doubt, in short, to confess, fortunately, unfortunately, however, you will look, perhaps, there is no dispute, for example, apparently, on the contrary, on the contrary, in my opinion, firstly, on the one hand, etc. [Грот 1899 : 792]. J. K. Grot clearly distinguishes the functions of introductory words, but still classifies them as adverbs or similar expressions.

In the 20th century, introductory words finally occupy a separate niche in Russian grammar. So, A. A. Shakhmatov in the work of 1925-1927 "The Syntax of the Russian Language" identifies a whole section called "Introductory Words." This is how he defines them: "So let's call those words of a sentence that cannot be defined either as the main or minor members of it, words that therefore stand outside the sentence, but pushed in, inserted into it: they add a certain meaning to the sentence, modifying one way or another or supplementing the predicate sentences" [Chess 1941:265].

A. A. Shakhmatov brings new things to the knowledge of introductory words, indicating that they are not members of the sentence. Having no grammatical and semantic connection with the rest of the sentence, they complement the meaning and change the statement. A. A. Shakhmatov explains why introductory words were considered among adverbs for so long. The fact is that in many cases, according to A. A. Shakhmatov, their meaning and grammatical function are comparable to the meaning and function of circumstances, and therefore adverbs. But unlike the circumstances, the introductory words are associated with the predicate much weaker: they can be easily eliminated without significant influence on the meaning of the reported. The formal difference between introductory words and other members of the proposal A. A. Shakhmatov considers the possibility of replacing them with a proposal.

As we know, the existence of introductory proposals was noticed by researchers earlier, already with N. I. Grech they were considered in the same row with the main and subordinate proposals. According to A.A. Shakhmatov, the introductory words go back precisely to the introductory sentences and are their reduced version. Based on this idea, A. A. Shakhmatov classifies them depending on which proposals they go back to: one-part or two-part. So, he gives examples of introductory words that go back to one-part verb sentences: I confess, tea, put, hear, look, you, you know, you see, look, perhaps, they say, it seems, it would seem, of course, it means, I remember, it happened, it became, maybe there is nothing to do. The following introductory words were formed from one-part nominal sentences: your will, the kingdom of heaven, damned cruelty.

At the heart of it is audible, full, right, it must, says A. A. Shakhmatov, are single-stock adverbial sentences. Examples of introductory words going back to two-part sentences, he leads I think, I confess, God willing, you know.

In the work "Russian syntax in scientific lighting" [Peshkovsky 1928] A.M. Peshkovsky also gives a classification of introductory words, but according to a different criterion. So, he identifies three groups of introductory words and combinations according to what meaning they have in the sentence:

words and combinations showing how the speaker relates to a particular thought: of course, probably, probably, obviously, let's put, suppose, let's say, seems to remember, I think, of course, apparently, tea, know, yes, no, maybe there should be, perhaps, what is good, in all likelihood, unfortunately, fortunately, fortunately, fortunately, unfortunately, thank God, etc.;

words and combinations showing that the speaker considers the thought expressed not his own: they say, de, they say, as if they say, they can be heard, according to such and such, according to the stories, according to the testimony of such and such, etc.;

words and combinations expressing the relation of this thought to the previous or subsequent speech and standing at the line between introductory words and unions: so, therefore, it means really, truly, exactly, by the way, however, on the contrary, on the contrary, moreover, in one word, in short, in general, so to speak, in general, in particular, the main thing, finally, etc.

So, A.M. Peshkovsky considers introductory sentences to be the progenitors of introductory words. In his opinion, precisely because introductory words are originally part of another thought (introductory sentence), they are so separated from the main content of the statement semantically and grammatically.

A. M. Peshkovsky also notes that over time and the repeated use of introductory words, they lose their original meaning. For example, we see

when there is nothing to see, or in one word when many words are said [Peshkovsky 1956:409].

The next important step in the study of introductory words was made by V.V. Vinogradov in one of his main works, *The Russian Language*, 1947 [Vinogradov 1947]. Before him, researchers noted various features of these words, but V.V. Vinogradov suggested looking at them from a different angle. He considers them in the context of subjective-objective grammatical relations, that is, the relations of the entire statement or sentence to reality (compared to the objective-syntactic relations between words in a phrase, sentence).

Unlike his predecessors, V.V. Vinogradov brings the introductory words closer not to adverbs, but to particles, and classifies them as modal words. V.V. Vinogradov notes that modality can be expressed grammatically, for example, in verb form, but in Russian there are also lexical means - modal words. Modal words do not adjoin the members of the sentence and are not associated with any parts of speech, they lie "as if in a different grammatical plane" [Vinogradov 2001:594], their function is the expression of the modality of the entire statement or its components. Modal words can emphasize the expressiveness of individual words, determine the point of view of the speaker and his attitude to the reported.

Nevertheless, according to V.V. Vinogradov, this category is heterogeneous. "After all, the so-called introductory words include phraseological combinations, full-fledged words, and particles.

In addition, according to the generally accepted opinion, they are adjacent to them, functionally heterogeneous syntactic constructions are close to them, freely decomposing into different parts of speech. Indeed, in the category of modality, they converge in function and combine words and expressions of different structures and different meanings. Separating modal-determinative particles from introductory words is sometimes extremely difficult." [Vinogradov 2001:599].

So, he distinguishes modal particles in this category, for example: they say, de, tea, you, perhaps, it seems, perhaps, something, simply, directly, on the contrary, however, which, in his opinion, go back to the old pronominal and verbal forms (they say - to say). The boundary between modal particles and modal words themselves is uncertain and mobile and depends on the phonetic properties of the word, its semantic weight, functional connection with other words.

As examples of modal words, V.V. Vinogradov gives really, literally, in fact, true, of course, truly (of adverbial origin), it can be seen, heard, fully, obviously, it should (of the same type with words of the category of state), I confess, you see, you know, sorry, they say, of course, it seems, it means to

know (of verbal origin), a word, by the way, in particular (formed from noun forms with prepositions and without), the main thing (derived from the adjective). Also in the modality category, he distinguishes modal phrases of the verb and nominal type. He refers to the former such expressions, as in fact, generally speaking, so to speak, who knows him, it must be to the latter - to amazement, to regret, to my misfortune, in my opinion, according to, at least, apparently, in one word, in fact, in the end, what is good, after all, just, besides

V.V. Vinogradov himself does not decide to draw clear unambiguous boundaries in this category, but it is important for us that he defines introductory words precisely within the framework of modality and assigns them the corresponding functions. V.V. Vinogradov divides modal words into 12 digits depending on their functions in the sentence:

Subjective transmission of someone else's speech and its assessment to the speakers: according to the opinion, according to legend, according to rumors, they say as they say.

Evaluation of style, mode of expression: literally, so to speak, in short, in fact, generally speaking, that is, in other words, a word.

Designation of the nature of speech expression or the emotional tone of the statement: a joke to say, do not be offended, confess to say.

The emotional-will attitude of the speaker to the subject of the message: right, to know, perhaps, perhaps, right, tea, unfortunately, fortunately, unfortunately.

Logical assessment of the reliability of the statement: probably understandable, undoubtedly, certainly obvious, apparently, of course, indeed, maybe, in fact, genuine.

The ratio of the content of any segment of speech to the general sequence of thoughts in the course of utterance, the designation of different types of logical or expressive relation of subsequent thought to the previous message: therefore, by the way, it became not only, in particular, for example, the main thing, in the end.

The designation of the order of the movement of thought: firstly, secondly.

Subjective surprise of remembering, joining an association: by the way, besides, one to another, at the same time.

The expression of comparison in the composition of the main members of the sentence: as if for sure.

Call to the interlocutor, the desire to draw his attention to any fact, to cause a certain attitude to the message: you see, you know, sorry.

Subjective assessment of a measure, number, degree of something: the most, the least, at least, hardly.

Transitional words and expressions approaching interjections: thank God, damn it, the jester knows.

In addition, V.V. Vinogradov writes about the peculiarity of the use of modal words and their importance in writing and speaking: "Modal words and particles in colloquial speech carry the same logical, expressive and stylistic functions as in the book language. But, in addition, here they sometimes serve as a kind of "alogic," expressive seasoning of speech and even its ornamentation "[Vinogradov 2001:608].

Of course, oral speech is more colorful, diverse, saturated with expressive vocabulary and a large number of modal words that make it so special. Knowing this fact helps in creating a lively, realistic dialogue in fiction. V.V. Vinogradov notes that modal words and other expressions in modal function began to be widely used by writers of the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The new approach proposed by V.V. Vinogradov was picked up by scientists and reflected in textbooks and academic grammars of the Russian language. For example, A.A. Reformed in the 1967 Introduction to Linguistics considers modal introductory words and sentences within the framework of such a grammatical phenomenon as the introduction: "Within both simple and complex sentences, you can find such elements that are grammatically unrelated to the surrounding text; these can be separate lexemes, collocations, and entire sentences. This phenomenon is called insertion. "

As examples of modal introductory words and sentences, A.A. Reformed gives the following examples: I, de, chintz traded; We seem to be late; He must have forgotten the address; And he, may Allah forgive him, confused everything; This, according to Bogoroditsky, does not apply to submission [Reformed 2008:345].

In the 1980 "Russian Grammar" [Grammar 1980], introductory words are mentioned in the chapter on the means of forming and expressing subjective-modal meanings. Subjective modality is the attitude of the speaker to the reported. It may be absent from the statement, or it may be expressed by a wide variety of linguistic means, syntactic and lexical, including the use of introductory words (or modal words, these terms are equated in Russian Grammar).

The same reality can be assessed by the speaker from different sides, cause a different emotional attitude: it can be correlated with something, opposed, the speaker can be sure or unsure of the truth of the statement, determine the source of the reported or emphasize individual parts. The Russian Grammar gives such an example for comparison: It seems to be interesting to visit there and Visit there (of course, of course, as if, indeed), interesting [Grammar 1980:215]. If in the first case the speakers are told simply a certain fact that is interesting in the implied place, then in other cases the speaker already gives a subjective assessment of this fact, namely,

expresses a different degree of confidence/uncertainty that is interesting in the implied place. He can be absolutely confident in the reported (of course, of course) or doubt (it seems as if).

And in the example of being there, I heard, an interesting speaker is generally removed from his own assessment of the fact, pointing to an indefinite source of information.

In general, the range of subjective-modal meanings expressed in introductory words, "Russian grammar" is limited to seven:

Accentuating, emphasizing, highlighting, desire to attract the attention of the interlocutor: I remind you that it is important, imagine, agree, note, for example.

Sometimes this meaning is weakened and the introductory words act as insertion words that do not carry a semantic load and indicate the difficulty of the speaker or the search for a suitable expression: so to speak, you know, you have to say, in general, the main thing, in fact.

Expression of subjective attitude, emotional reaction: fortunately, to joy, which is good (joy, approval); unfortunately, unfortunately, in trouble, as on purpose (disapproval, regret); to surprise, to amazement, a strange thing (surprise); an hour is uneven, which is good, God forbid (fear); probably, I think, perhaps, I think, apparently, probably, maybe, without a doubt, of course, it goes without saying, of course, indisputably, indeed (reliability); in some way, in a sense (uncertainty); Let's assume, for example, it is possible (assumption); speaking by conscience, to say by honor.

Attitude to style, manner of speech (it is better to say, in other words, roughly speaking, in a word, easier to say).

The expression of connections, relationships, dependencies, correspondence, opposition (in addition, in addition, therefore, it became, especially, firstly, according to custom, as always, on the contrary, on the contrary).

Designation of the source of the reported (according to rumors, in terms of, as they say, in my opinion, as you know, they say).

Characteristic of the measure, degree (at least to one degree or another).

Characteristic of time (happens, as it happens).

Unlike the classification of V.V. Vinogradov, in this case only introductory words are spoken, while V.V. Vinogradov considered modal particles. Therefore, it is natural that the classification of "Russian Grammar" does not mention comparative expressions in the main members of the sentence and transitional words and expressions approaching interjections (paragraphs 9 and 12, respectively, in the classification of V.V. Vinogradov).

"Russian grammar" also distinguishes the function of designating the source of the message, assessing the manner and method of expression, measure and degree, and attracting the attention of the interlocutor. Introductory words characterizing speech expressiveness, emotionality, as well as authenticity, are combined into one group. All introductory words denoting the connection of thoughts, sequence, comparison, contrast, generalization are combined. A group indicating a time characteristic is highlighted.

Thus, the idea of separating Russian introductory constructions into a separate class appeared among domestic linguists only at the beginning of the 19th century and gradually developed, referring them first to certain groups of dialects, then to modal particles, and finally in the 20th century, introductory words and phrases were finally established as an independent grammatical category as a means of forming and expressing subjective modal meanings.

REFERENCES:

1. Buronova D. B. Theoretical methodological basis of studying the author's art method //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2022. – T. 12. – №. 2. – С. 47-52.
2. Baxodirovna D. B. ARTISTIC STYLE OF THE WORKS OF ERNEST SETON-THOMPSON //British View. – 2023. – T. 8. – №. 2.
3. Umida K. et al. DEVELOPMENT STAGES OF THE CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTIVISM //湖南大学学报 (自然科学版). – 2022. – T. 49. – №. 07.
4. Rakhimova Marguba Khamzaevna In search of a backbone mechanism in language // Евразийский научный журнал. 2021. №4. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/in-search-of-a-backbone-mechanism-in-language> (дата обращения: 15.06.2023).
5. Rakhimova M. K. COMPARISONS AND THEIR FUNCTION IN THE NOVEL" THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS" BY A. ROY //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2021. – T. 1. – №. 9. – С. 708-710.
6. Bakhtiyorovna S. I., Fevzievna K. L., Khamzaevna R. M. How to support healthy class competition in an English lesson //ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL. – 2021. – T. 11. – №. 2. – С. 399-402.
7. Abduraximova F. MENTALITY AND NATIONALITY IN PROVERBS OF ENGLISH, UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES //Eurasian Journal of Academic Research. – 2022. – T. 2. – №. 2. – С. 691-694.

8. qizi Abduraximova F. K. INGLIZ TILINI O'QITISHDA MAQOLLARNING ROLI //SCHOLAR. – 2023. – T. 1. – №. 12. – C. 123-127.
9. qizi Abduraximova F. K. LINGVOKOGNITOLOGIYA: TIL VA TAFAKKUR //Results of National Scientific Research International Journal. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 4. – C. 47-50.
10. qizi Abduraximova F. K. LINGVOKOGNITOLOGIYA: TIL VA TAFAKKUR //Results of National Scientific Research International Journal. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 4. – C. 47-50.
11. qizi Abduraximova F. K. USAGE OF MULTIMEDIA IN ENGLISH TEACHING //Results of National Scientific Research International Journal. – 2022. – T. 1. – №. 8. – C. 96-101.
12. Fayzullayeva M. B., Sattarova I. B., Makhmudova M. A. The effect of teaching vocabulary through ICT on EFL learners //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – T. 11. – №. 4. – C. 1632-1637.
13. Baxtiyorovna S. I. Importance of videoconferencing in education and comparison of some types of applications //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2022. – T. 12. – №. 2. – C. 319-322.
14. Shoyzokhovich S. S., Bahtiyarovna S. I., Fevziyevna K. L. Poly functionality of a word in the context of speech //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – T. 11. – №. 4. – C. 488-491.
15. Sattarova I. SELECTING THE MOST APPROPRIATE METHOD ACCORDING TO THE GRADES //МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ. – 2020. – C. 405-408.
16. Sattorova F. E. Modern methods in teaching foreign language //Science and Education. – 2021. – T. 2. – №. 4. – C. 297-302.
17. Elmurodovna S. F. THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE OF LANGUAGE LEARNERS //Eurasian Journal of Academic Research. – 2022. – T. 2. – №. 2. – C. 100-105.
18. Elmurodovna S. F. THE ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN CLT (COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING) //Berlin Studies Transnational Journal of Science and Humanities. – 2021. – T. 1. – №. 1.5 Pedagogical sciences.
19. Sattorova F., Nasrullaev J. FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE FOR TEACHING LISTENING EFFICIENTLY IN ESL/EFL CLASSROOMS //BRIDGE TO SCIENCE: RESEARCH WORKS. – 2018. – C. 113.
20. Narzullayevna S. N., Odina B. Linguistic skills such as familiarity with grammatical structures, vocabulary, and phonetics //Sciencepublish. org. – C. 41.
21. Mehriniso N., Siddiqova N. N. USING INTERACTIVE METHODS FOR THE FORMATION OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES //THE THEORY OF RECENT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF PEDAGOGY. – 2023. – T. 1. – №. 5. – C. 10-14.

22. Siddikova N. N., Gafforova S., Gafforova I. APPROACHES TO DEVELOPING FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING SYSTEM IN NONLINGUISTIC HIGH SCHOOLS OF UZBEKISTAN //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2022. – Т. 2. – №. Special Issue 24. – С. 381-388.

23. Narzullayevna S. N., Iroda G. Types of interactive methods in developing intercultural competence in different age groups //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2022. – Т. 12. – №. 4. – С. 159-162.

24. Siddikova N. N., Makhmudovna M. A., Alisherovna O. I. Philosophical and methodological analysis of organizational learning concepts //ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL. – 2021. – Т. 11. – №. 2. – С. 403-407.

25. Fayzullayeva M. B. et al. USING TECHNOLOGIES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING //ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 5. – С. 1-5.

26. Fayzullayeva M. B. Information and communication technologies in English lessons." //Экономика и социум. – 2022. – Т. 5. – С. 96.

27. Fayzullayeva M. B. THE PROBLEMS OF USAGE INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES (ICT) IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM //Eurasian Journal of Academic Research. – 2022. – Т. 2. – №. 2. – С. 725-730.

28. Fayzullayeva M. B. ICT is the key of motivation in teaching FL //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2021. – Т. 1. – №. 9. – С. 711-716.

29. Рахимова М. Х. и др. МАГИЧЕСКИЙ РЕАЛИЗМ В РУССКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ НА ПРИМЕРЕ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЙ БУЛГАКОВА //Экономика и социум. – 2023. – №. 3-1 (106). – С. 450-454.

30. Fayzullayeva M. B., Sattarova I. B., Makhmudova M. A. The effect of teaching vocabulary through ICT on EFL learners //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – Т. 11. – №. 4. – С. 1632-1637.

31. Джураева Ш. Г. ПОЛИФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОСТЬ АНТОНИМИЧЕСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ У СУЩЕСТВИТЕЛЬНЫХ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ //УЧЕНЫЙ XXI ВЕКА. – С. 47.

32. Джураева Ш. Г. ПОЛИФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОСТЬ И СЕМАНТИКА МНОГОЗНАЧНЫХ СУЩЕСТВИТЕЛЬНЫХ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ //УЧЕНЫЙ XXI ВЕКА. – С. 52.

33. Джураева Ш. Г. РОЛЬ КОНТЕКСТА В РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ АНТОНИМИЧЕСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ, ЗАКЛЮЧЁННЫХ В ПАРАДИГМАТИЧЕСКИХ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКАХ СЛОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ //УЧЕНЫЙ XXI ВЕКА. – С. 58.

34. Джураева Ш. Г. СООТНОШЕНИЕ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЙ СТРУКТУРЫ СЛОВА И ЕГО СОЧЕТАЕМОСТИ В РАЗВИТИИ ПОЛИФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОСТИ //УЧЕНЫЙ XXI ВЕКА. – С. 62.

35. Шомуродова Ш. Ж. КОНТЕКСТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ПРОЯВЛЕНИЯ СТИЛИСТИЧЕСКОГО ЗНАЧЕНИЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ //Научные школы. Молодежь в науке и культуре XXI в. – 2017. – С. 240-241.

36. Шомуродова Ш. Ж. ИЗУЧЕНИЕ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИХ ПРЕОБРАЗОВАНИЙ ПРИ ОДНОСТРУКТУРНОЙ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ДЕРИВАЦИИ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА) //Ученый XXI века. – 2016. – №. 2-4.

37. Шомуродова Ш. Ж. Теоретические предпосылки фразеологической деривации //Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. – 2010. – №. 22. – С. 148-150.

38. Suyunov B., Kobilova N., Suyunov J. GAMIFICATION AS A METHOD OF INCREASING MOTIVATION OF TUDENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE ON THE EXAMPLE OF ENGLISH //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. B2. – С. 41-45.

39. Malikova, D. G., and N. S. Qobilova. "ALTERATIONS OF TESTING SYSTEM IN THE PERIOD OF Z GENERATION." *Экономика и социум* 6-1 (97) (2022): 161-164.

40. KOBILOVA N. S., SUYUNOV B. S. O. G. L. I. METHODS OF USING GAME ACTIVITY IN TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN UZBEK PRIMARY CLASSES //THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука. – 2022. – №. 4. – С. 485-489.

41. Gayratovna, Malikova Dilnoza, and Qobilova Nodira Sanakulovna. "Changes in teaching content and test design for generation z in Uzbekistan." *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal* 12.3 (2022): 359-362.