

The Role of Context and the Addressee Factor in Expressing Emotions in English, Russian, and Uzbek: Pragmatic Interpretation and Speech Situation

ABDURAKHIMOVA NOILA ABDUXALILKIZI
National university of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the role of context and the addressee factor in the expression of emotions in English, Russian, and Uzbek from the perspective of pragmatic interpretation and speech situation. Drawing on advances in modern pragmatics, speech act theory, and cross-cultural communication, the author examines the situational and addressee-oriented features of emotional expression in the three languages. The pragmatic strategies of emotional expression, their contextual conditionality, and the influence of the addressee factor (social status, age, gender, degree of familiarity) on emotional expression are analyzed in a comparative-typological aspect. The article identifies cross-linguistic similarities and differences through the analysis of speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, and speech strategies.

Keywords: Emotional expression, context, addressee factor, pragmatic interpretation, speech situation, speech act theory, cross-cultural communication, implicature, presupposition, strategic competence

1. INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, the study of emotional expression through language has become a relevant research direction not only from

cognitive and semantic perspectives but also from pragmatic ones. The meaning and effect of emotional expressions largely depend on context and the addressee factor, and it is precisely this aspect that determines their pragmatic interpretation [1; 2; 3]. English, Russian, and Uzbek belong to different typological groups, and the expression of emotions in these languages, depending on context and the addressee, demonstrates both universal and culturally specific features [4; 5].

One of the main tasks of pragmatics is to study how linguistic units are used in speech situations, how they relate to context, and what impact they have on the addressee [6]. Emotional expressions are of particular interest from a pragmatic perspective because they not only convey information but also express the speaker's subjective attitude, influence the interlocutor, and regulate interpersonal relationships [7; 8]. Therefore, the pragmatic analysis of emotional expressions allows for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of their functioning in various communicative situations.

The main goal of this article is to conduct a comparative-typological analysis of the role of context and the addressee factor in expressing emotions in English, Russian, and Uzbek, as well as to identify universal and culturally specific pragmatic strategies for expressing emotions.

1.1. Theoretical foundations of the study: Pragmatics, context, and the addressee factor

Pragmatics, as a branch of linguistics, studies language use in real communication, focusing on the relationship between linguistic signs and their users [6]. In pragmatic theory, context is understood as a set of conditions that determine the choice and interpretation of linguistic units in communication [9]. Context includes the physical situation, social relationships between communicants, their background knowledge, and the communicative goals of the participants [6; 10].

The addressee factor is a key concept in pragmatics. The addressee is not merely a passive receiver of information but an active participant in communication whose characteristics influence the choice of linguistic and pragmatic means [7]. Key

characteristics of the addressee include: social status (superior, equal, subordinate), age, gender, degree of familiarity (friend, colleague, stranger), emotional state, and expectations [11].

Speech act theory, developed by Austin and Searle, provides a foundation for analyzing the pragmatic aspects of emotional expression [12; 13]. According to this theory, an utterance simultaneously performs three acts: locutionary (the act of saying something), illocutionary (the act of doing something — promising, requesting, apologizing, etc.), and perlocutionary (the act of influencing the addressee). Emotional expressions most often fulfill illocutionary functions of expressing feelings and perlocutionary functions of evoking an emotional response in the addressee [13; 14].

Grice's theory of implicature also plays a crucial role in analyzing emotional expression [15]. According to Grice, speakers follow the Cooperative Principle and its maxims (quantity, quality, relation, manner). However, speakers often flout these maxims to convey implied meanings — conversational implicatures. Emotional expressions frequently contain implicatures, as speakers may indirectly convey their emotional states, especially in situations where direct expression is considered inappropriate [15; 16].

Levinson's theory of presupposition is another important framework [17]. Presuppositions are background assumptions that speakers take for granted. In emotional expression, presuppositions often reflect the speaker's expectations, beliefs, and evaluations about the addressee and the situation. For example, the utterance "I'm sorry you had to go through that" presupposes that the addressee actually experienced something unpleasant [17].

2. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a comparative-typological methodology to analyze the pragmatic features of emotional expression across English, Russian, and Uzbek. The research draws on theoretical frameworks from modern pragmatics, speech act theory, cross-cultural communication studies, and politeness theory.

3. RESULTS

3.1. *Context and its role in emotional expression*

Context is one of the decisive factors in the pragmatic interpretation of emotional expressions. Depending on the context, the same linguistic unit can express different emotions or the same emotion with varying degrees of intensity [4, 18].

3.2. *Linguistic context*

It includes the words, phrases, and utterances surrounding an emotional expression. In English, the meaning of emotional words can vary depending on the co-occurring lexical units. For example, “I’m so angry” expresses direct anger, while “I’m a little upset” expresses a milder form of dissatisfaction. In Russian, similar distinctions exist: *Явжросту* (I’m furious) versus *Янемногорасстроен* (I’m a little upset). In Uzbek, gradation of emotional intensity is also expressed through linguistic context: *Jahlimchiqdi* (I got angry) versus *Birozranjidim* (I’m a little offended) [19, 20].

Collocations and phraseological units also depend on context. For example, English “boiling with rage” is used in intense situations, while “annoyed” is used in milder ones. Russian *кипетьотгнева* (to boil with anger) and Uzbek *g‘azabidanqaynamoq* (to boil with anger) are similarly intensity markers, but their usage frequency and contextual distribution differ across the languages [4, 21].

3.3. *Social context*

Includes the relationships between communicants, their social roles, and the communicative situation [6]. In English-speaking cultures, direct expression of negative emotions towards a superior is usually avoided, and more indirect strategies are preferred. For instance, instead of saying “I’m angry with you”, a subordinate might say “I’m a little disappointed” or “I was hoping for a different outcome” [22]. In Russian culture, expressing emotions to a superior also employs indirect strategies, but the use of diminutive forms and softened

expressions is more common: *Янемного расстроен* (I'm a little upset), *Мне немного обидно* (I'm a little offended) [23].

In Uzbek culture, social hierarchy plays a particularly significant role. When addressing a superior, an elder, or a respected person, expressing negative emotions directly is often avoided. Instead, indirect expressions with the component *ko'ngil* (heart/soul) are used: *Ko'nglimog'riyapti* (My heart hurts), *Ko'nglimgategdi* (It touched my heart – meaning I'm offended). These forms express discontent or resentment in a more softened, culturally appropriate manner [21; 24].

3.4. Cultural context

Includes cultural norms, values, traditions, and etiquette rules that regulate emotional expression [5; 25]. In English-speaking cultures, individualism and the value of personal space often lead to the expectation of direct, albeit polite, expression of emotions. The American cultural script, for example, encourages expressing positive emotions openly and negative ones constructively, with a focus on solving problems [26].

In Russian culture, a higher degree of emotional expressiveness is often observed. Russians may express emotions more directly, and sincerity in emotional expression is highly valued [23; 27]. The cultural concept of *dusha* (soul) plays a central role in Russian emotional expression. Emotions are often associated with the inner world and are expressed with greater intensity and depth. For example, Russian emotional expressions frequently use metaphors connected to the soul: *душа болит* (the soul aches), *на душе тяжело* (heavy on the soul) [3; 23].

In Uzbek culture, emotional expression is strongly regulated by collectivist values and norms of politeness [24; 28]. Direct expression of negative emotions, especially in public, is often considered inappropriate. Instead, emotional expression is frequently mediated through somatic (body-related) metaphors, particularly those involving the heart (*yurak*), liver (*jigar*), and soul/heart (*ko'ngil*). For example, *yuragimsiqildi* (my heart tightened – I felt sad), *jigarimkuydi* (my liver burned – I felt deep sorrow or compassion), *ko'nglimto'lmadi* (my heart was not full – I am dissatisfied) [21; 28]. These expressions allow speakers to

convey emotions in an indirect, culturally acceptable manner while still communicating their feelings.

3.5. *The addressee factor in emotional expression*

The addressee factor significantly influences the choice of linguistic and pragmatic means for expressing emotions. The speaker considers the addressee's social status, age, gender, degree of familiarity, emotional state, and expectations [7; 11].

In all three languages, *the social status of the addressee* determines the form and intensity of emotional expression. When addressing a superior, direct emotional expression is usually avoided, and more neutral or indirect forms are preferred [22; 23].

- **In English:** A subordinate is likely to use indirect strategies such as hedging: "I'm afraid I'm a bit disappointed" or "I have to say I'm rather upset about this." The use of "I'm afraid" and "rather" softens the emotional impact. To a subordinate, a superior might express emotions more directly: "I'm angry about this report" or "I'm disappointed in your performance" [6; 22].
- **In Russian:** When addressing a superior, forms with *немного* (a little), *как-то* (somehow), and diminutive suffixes are used: *Якак-торасстроен* (I'm somehow upset), *Мненемногообидно* (I'm a little offended). To a subordinate, direct expressions such as *Янедоволен* (I'm dissatisfied) or *Меняэтозлит* (This makes me angry) are common [23; 27].
- **In Uzbek:** Addressing a superior requires the use of formal forms and softened emotional expressions: *Sizdanko 'nglimozginaog'ridi* (My heart hurt a little because of you – meaning I'm slightly offended). Addressing equals or subordinates allows more direct emotional expression: *Jahlimchiqdi* (I got angry), *Ranjiyman* (I'm offended) [21; 24, 28].

4. DISCUSSION

Age also influences the choice of emotional expressions. In all three languages, addressing elders involves more respectful and

indirect emotional expression, while addressing younger people allows more direct expression [11; 29].

Gender differences are also observed. Studies show that in English, women tend to use more expressive and emotive language, with a higher frequency of emotional intensifiers and hedges [30]. In Russian, similar patterns are observed, but women also use more diminutive forms when expressing emotions [23]. In Uzbek, gender differences are manifested through the use of culturally specific forms: women are more likely to use somatic metaphors involving *ko'ngil* and *yurak*, while men may use more direct expressions, though directness is still constrained by norms of politeness [21; 28].

Degree of familiarity significantly impacts emotional expression. To friends and family, speakers of all three languages express emotions more directly, using colloquial and sometimes intensified forms [6; 7].

- **In English:** "I'm so furious with you!" to a friend versus "I'm rather disappointed" to a colleague.
- **In Russian:** *Я просто в бешенстве!* (I'm simply furious!) to a friend versus *Я несколько огорчен* (I'm somewhat upset) to a colleague [23].
- **In Uzbek:** *Jahldano 'zimiyo 'qotayapman!* (I'm losing myself from anger!) to a friend versus *Ko'nglimozginaranjidi* (My heart was slightly offended) to a colleague or acquaintance [21; 28].

Building on the framework proposed by Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, the choice of pragmatic strategies for emotional expression depends on the perceived "face" of the addressee [31]. In face-threatening acts (such as expressing negative emotions), speakers employ various politeness strategies to mitigate the threat.

- **In English:** Positive politeness strategies (showing solidarity, using in-group markers) are used with friends and equals, while negative politeness strategies (hedging, apologizing, impersonalizing) are used with superiors and strangers [31].

- **In Russian:** Similar patterns exist, but Russian speakers often combine negative politeness with expressive forms that maintain sincerity [23, 27].
- **In Uzbek:** The cultural emphasis on respect (*hurmat*) and modesty (*kamtarlik*) leads to the frequent use of indirect and oblique strategies when expressing emotions to any addressee outside the immediate family, with a particularly rich system of somatic metaphors to encode emotional states indirectly [21, 24, 28].

4.1. *Comparative analysis of emotional expression in English, Russian, and Uzbek*

4.1.1. *Direct and indirect expression*

- **English** demonstrates a tendency towards direct expression of emotions, particularly in informal contexts and in cultures with a strong individualistic orientation (e.g., the United States) [26]. Direct emotional statements are accepted and often valued for their clarity. However, in formal contexts, indirect strategies are employed [22].
- **Russian** shows a higher degree of directness compared to English in informal contexts but still maintains indirect strategies in formal situations. Russian directness is often perceived as sincerity and honesty [23]. However, even in direct expressions, Russian emotional language is highly metaphorical and expressive [3].
- **Uzbek** exhibits a stronger tendency towards indirect expression of emotions, especially negative ones, across most social contexts. This indirectness is rooted in cultural values that prioritize social harmony and avoid conflict [24; 28]. Direct expression of negative emotions is often considered rude and aggressive, while indirect forms using somatic metaphors are preferred.

4.1.2. *Expressiveness and intensity*

- **English** emotional expressions vary widely in intensity, but the choice between lexical alternatives (e.g., “annoyed,” “angry,” “furious”) allows precise control. Intensifiers (“very,” “so,” “really”) are common.

- **Russian** emotional expressions are often characterized by high expressiveness. Diminutive forms, augmentatives, and emotionally charged vocabulary are frequently used. Russian speakers may express emotions with greater dramatic intensity [23; 27].
- **Uzbek** emotional expressions are often understated in direct lexical terms but carry deep emotional weight through somatic metaphors. The intensity is encoded not through intensifiers but through the specific somatic metaphor chosen and the context [21; 28].

4.1.3. *Somatic metaphors and embodied expression*

Somatic (body-related) metaphors are particularly prominent in Uzbek, where the liver (*jigar*), heart (*yurak*), and soul/heart (*ko'ngil*) serve as primary loci for emotional expression [21; 28; 32].

- **Jigar (liver)**: Associated with deep, often painful emotions. *Jigarimkuydi* (my liver burned – I felt deep sorrow or compassion), *Jigarimyorildi* (my liver split – I felt intense grief or pain), *Jigarxasta* (liver-weary – deeply exhausted or sad).
- **Yurak (heart)**: Associated with love, sadness, and fear. *Yuragimsiqildi* (my heart tightened – I felt sad or anxious), *Yuragimto'ldi* (my heart filled – I felt moved or overwhelmed), *Yuragimdanurdi* (it struck my heart – I was deeply affected).
- **Ko'ngil (soul/heart)**: The most versatile emotional concept, covering a wide range of emotions from happiness to sadness to dissatisfaction. *Ko'nglimyorug* (my soul is bright – I'm happy), *Ko'nglimg'ash* (my soul is uneasy – I'm discontented), *Ko'nglimgategdi* (it touched my soul – I'm offended), *Ko'nglimto'q* (my soul is full – I'm content).

Russian also uses somatic metaphors, though less extensively than Uzbek. The soul (*dusha*) is central: *душаболит* (the soul aches – I'm sad), *надушетсяжело* (heavy on the soul – I'm unhappy), *душа радуется* (the soul rejoices – I'm happy) [3; 23].

English uses somatic metaphors mainly in fixed expressions: "heartbroken" (very sad), "heartwarming" (emotionally moving), "broken-hearted," "sick with worry." The liver (*jigar*) plays no role in English emotional expression [4].

4.1.4. *Culture-specific emotional concepts and their pragmatic use*

Each language has emotion concepts that lack exact equivalents in the other two languages, and these concepts are used in context-specific pragmatic strategies [5; 25].

- **Uzbek:** *Hasrat* (deep, prolonged sorrow mixed with longing; often used in poetry and elevated speech), *G'am* (sadness, grief, often with a connotation of resignation or fatalism), *Ishq* (passionate, uncontrollable, often tragic love, derived from Arabic-Persian poetic tradition). These concepts carry culturally specific connotations and are used strategically in various speech situations. For example, expressing *hasrat* is a way of communicating deep emotional pain without direct confrontation, often in poetic or metaphorical language [21; 28].
- **Russian:** *Toska* (a deep, melancholic longing, often without a specific object; considered a uniquely Russian emotion), *Udovol'stviye* (pleasure, satisfaction, with connotations of refined enjoyment), *Skuka* (boredom mixed with sadness). *Toska* is often expressed indirectly, as its cultural meaning implies an ineffable, deep sadness that cannot be fully articulated [3; 23; 27].
- **English:** *Awe* (a feeling of reverential respect mixed with fear or wonder), *Eagerness* (enthusiastic interest or desire), *Grudge* (a persistent feeling of ill will). These concepts are used in specific pragmatic contexts, such as expressing admiration (*awe*), enthusiasm (*eagerness*), or long-term resentment (*grudge*) in ways that do not directly translate to the other languages [4; 26].

4.2. *Pragmatic interpretation of emotional expressions in speech situations*

4.2.1. *Classification of speech situations and emotional strategies*

Based on the nature of the emotional expression and the speech situation, several types of pragmatic strategies can be identified across the three languages [7; 8; 22]:

- **Expressive strategies:** Used to directly express the speaker's emotional state. In English: "I'm so happy!" In Russian: *Я так счастлив!* In Uzbek: *Juda xursandman!* (I am very happy).
- **Regulative strategies:** Used to influence the addressee's emotional state. In English: "Please don't be upset." In Russian: *Пожалуйста, не расстраивайся.* In Uzbek: *Itimos, xafabo 'lmang.*"
- **Protective strategies:** Used to protect the addressee's face. In English: "I'm sorry to have to say this, but..." In Russian: *Простите, что приходится говорить это, но...* In Uzbek: *Kechirasiz, buniyotishgato 'g'rikeladi, lekin...*
- **Concealment strategies:** Used to hide the true emotional state. In English: "I'm fine". In Russian: *Всё нормально.* In Uzbek: *Hammasiyaxshi.*

4.2.2. *The role of implicature in emotional expression*

Implicatures play a crucial role in the indirect expression of emotions, especially in contexts where direct expression is culturally inappropriate [15; 16].

- **In English:** "It's a bit chilly in here" may imply "I'm uncomfortable and annoyed" rather than being a literal statement about temperature. The speaker flouts the maxim of relation to convey emotional dissatisfaction indirectly.
- **In Russian:** *Удивительный день, не правда ли?* (Amazing day, isn't it?) spoken in bad weather implies irony, expressing the speaker's frustration or amusement [16; 23].

- **In Uzbek:** *Bugunhavojudayoqimliekan* (The weather is very pleasant today) when it is raining or cold implies the speaker's emotional discomfort or sarcasm, allowing the expression of negative emotion without direct confrontation [21; 28].

4.2.3. *Presuppositions in emotional expression*

Presuppositions in emotional expressions reflect the speaker's assumptions about the addressee and the situation [17; 29].

- **In English:** "I'm disappointed that you didn't call" presupposes that the addressee was expected to call and that the speaker had a positive expectation. It implies a relationship of mutual expectation and obligation.
- **In Russian:** *Я обиделась, что ты не пришёл* (I'm offended that you didn't come) presupposes that the addressee promised or was expected to come, and that the speaker had positive expectations.
- **In Uzbek:** *Ko'nglimranjidi, kelmadingiz* (My heart was offended, you didn't come) presupposes that the addressee was expected to come and that the speaker felt a personal connection. The use of *ko'ngil* further presupposes a relationship of emotional intimacy and expectation.

4.2.4. *Methodological synthesis and comparative results*

The above analysis shows that the role of context and the addressee factor in emotional expression in English, Russian, and Uzbek reveals three types of relationships [2; 4; 5; 18; 21]:

- **Universal pragmatic strategies:** Strategies such as using indirectness when addressing superiors, employing hedges and mitigators in formal contexts, and using more direct expression in informal contexts are found in all three languages. This supports the universal nature of politeness and face-saving strategies [31].
- **Partial similarities:** For example, English and Russian both use metaphorical expressions related to the soul/heart for

emotional expression, though the frequency and cultural weight differ. Russian and Uzbek both place greater emphasis on collectivist and relational aspects of emotional expression, while English is more individualistic [4; 5; 23].

- **Culture-specific features:** Uzbek's extensive use of *jigar* (liver) metaphors, Russian's central concept of *dusha* (soul) and *toska*, and English's direct, individualistic orientation represent distinct cultural-pragmatic systems. Uzbek has a richer system of somatic metaphors than the other two languages. Russian's *dusha* concept carries unique cultural and emotional connotations not fully parallel to English "soul" or Uzbek *ko'ngil*. English's "awe" and "eagerness" have no exact equivalents in Russian or Uzbek [3; 5; 21; 25; 28].

5. CONCLUSION

The comparative-typological analysis of the role of context and the addressee factor in expressing emotions in English, Russian, and Uzbek leads to the following conclusions:

1. Emotional expression is a complex process determined by the interaction of linguistic, cognitive, and pragmatic factors. Context – linguistic, social, and cultural – and the addressee factor – social status, age, gender, and degree of familiarity – are decisive in choosing pragmatic strategies for emotional expression [2; 6; 7].
2. English, Russian, and Uzbek demonstrate both universal and culture-specific features in the pragmatic expression of emotions. Universal features include indirectness when addressing superiors, the use of politeness strategies to protect the addressee's face, and the use of implicatures for indirect expression [15; 31].
3. Culture-specific features include: English individualism and directness, with a focus on constructive problem-solving; Russian high expressiveness, sincerity, and the central role of the *dusha* concept; and Uzbek indirectness, collectivist

- values, and an extensive system of somatic metaphors involving *ko'ngil*, *yurak*, and *jigar* [3; 4; 21; 23; 24; 28].
4. The addressee factor is crucial in all three languages but manifests differently. English speakers use negative politeness more extensively with superiors; Russian speakers use expressive forms even when addressing superiors, maintaining sincerity while respecting hierarchy; Uzbek speakers use a more elaborate system of indirect and somatic expressions to maintain respect and social harmony [21; 22; 23; 31].
 5. Understanding the pragmatic features of emotional expression is essential for effective cross-cultural communication and for teaching foreign languages. The ability to appropriately express and interpret emotions in different languages and cultures is a key component of pragmatic and strategic competence [22; 28; 33].
 6. Promising methodological directions for future research include the integration of corpus linguistics, experimental pragmatics, and intercultural communication studies. In particular, quantitative corpus-based studies of the pragmatic features of emotional expression in Uzbek are still insufficient, and this area offers significant opportunities for future research [33; 34].

REFERENCES

1. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2. Kövecses, Z. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Wierzbicka, A. 1999. *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Sharifian, F. 2017. *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
5. Goddard, C. 2010. Universals and variation in the lexicon of mental state concepts. *Words and the Mind: How Words Capture Human Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

7. Verschueren, J. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
8. Mey, J. L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
9. Levinson, S. C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. Holmes, J. 2013. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 4th ed. London: Routledge.
12. Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
16. Mey, J. L. 2007. Pragmatics and emotion. *Emotion in Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
17. Levinson, S.C. 2000. *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
18. Fillmore, Ch. J. 1982. Frame semantics. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
19. Bąk, H. & Altarriba, J. 2025. Similar, not universal: the cognitive dimensions of conceptual prototypes of basic emotions in English and in Polish. *Cognition and Emotion*, 39/2, 261-281.
20. Wilson, P. A., Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. 2019. Cognitive structure and conceptual clusters of emotion terms. *Filozofiai Nauka*, 7, 89-112.
21. Rahmatullayev, Sh. 2005. *O'zbektiliningizohlifrazeologiklug'ati. Toshkent: O'zbekistonmilliyensiklopediyasi*.
22. Brown, P., Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ABDURAKHIMOVA NOILA ABDUXALILKIZI
 LECTURER, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN,
 MIRZO ULUGBEK, TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.
 E-MAIL: <NELLYNELLY9160@GMAIL.COM>