Formation of a Bilingual Personality Through Teaching Speech Expressiveness Through Phraseological Units

Marat Ryskulovᵃ , Zhumaziya Abdrakhmanovaᵇ , Aigul Yeleuovaᶜ ,
Nazyken Yegizbayevaᵈ* , Kulyash Yensebayevaᵉ , Akmaral Bissengaliᶠ ,
Kalamkas Kalybekovaᵍ

*ᵃ Zhetysu State University named after I. Zhansugurov Almaty, Kazakhstan.
Email: marat.ryskulov@mail.ru*

ᵇ Atyrau University named after H. Dosmukhamedov, Atyrau, Kazakhstan. Email: azhm63@mail.ru

ᶜ Atyrau University named after H. Dosmukhamedov, Atyrau, Kazakhstan. Email: ai0801@mail.ru

ᵈ Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. Email: nazyken.egizbayeva@gmail.com

ᵉ Sarsen Amanzholov East Kazakhstan University, Oskemen, Kazakhstan. Email: kulash_EK9@mail.ru

ᶠ A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, Almaty Kazakhstan. Email: sarestek@gmail.com

*ᵍ Karaganda Technical University named after Abylkas Saginov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan.
Email: kalam09@mail.ru*

Abstract
Phraseological units represent one of the most essential components of linguistic communication, and without the ability to use them appropriately, it is impossible to ensure a high level of speech culture. This study addresses the issue of developing a bilingual personality through the enhancement of speech expressiveness based on phraseological units. It provided a scientific rationale and developed a methodology for the formation of a bilingual personality by fostering expressive speech skills through the use of Kazakh phraseological units. This study was based on the implementation of an elective course that included a system of exercises designed to teach phraseological units in the context of textual activity. The instructional process was built upon a cognitive-communicative approach, incorporating anthropocentric, axiological, and cross-cultural methods of analysis. The study was conducted among middle school students in Kazakh-language schools operating in bilingual environments. The selection of phraseological material was guided by criteria of semantic relevance, cultural markedness, and situational appropriateness. The findings include a classification of phraseological units based on their functional-semantic and stylistic features; preparing a set of tasks and exercises to foster expressive speech; and finding effective means of teaching speech expressiveness through phraseology in the context of developing a bilingual personality. The study recommends integrating a phraseological component into school textbooks and curricula as a means of developing expressive speech; supplementing instruction with contrastive analysis of Kazakh and Russian phraseological units; expanding experimental research to include other language pairs; and using multimodal psychotechnical exercises to deepen students' perceptual and speech awareness.

*Corresponding Author
Email: nazyken.egizbayeva@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.11208

Introduction

Phraseological units occupy a special place among the means of speech expressiveness, as possessing a certain minimum of knowledge is clearly insufficient for achieving communication at a high level (Avakova et al., 2024; Davydova, 2023). In order to fully master a language, it is essential to internalize the culture of the people who speak it. In this regard, phraseological units are unparalleled linguistic tools. They play a pivotal role in shaping the linguistic worldview (Kildiroglu & Shakirova, 2023). The nature of their meaning is rooted in the background knowledge of native speakers, in the practical experience of individuals, and in the cultural and historical traditions of the people who use the language. Phraseological units attribute certain characteristics to objects that are associated with a particular worldview, implying a whole descriptive situation (a text), evaluating it, and expressing an attitude toward it. Semantically, phraseological expressions are primarily aimed at characterizing individuals and their actions. The phraseological system of a language, on the one hand, represents a collection of specific linguistic resources, and on the other hand, reflects the national and cultural identity of its speakers. This system contributes to (1) enriching learners' vocabulary with figurative language, (2) developing their ability to differentiate the semantic structure of phraseological expressions, and (3) using them in speech to enhance communicative competence.

In the context of the Kazakh language, there is an insufficient integration of phraseological material into the teaching of expressive speech within bilingual school education (Shalkarbek et al., 2024). Despite the existence of a robust theoretical foundation in linguistic analysis of phraseological units, pedagogical models that meet the goals of bilingual education and align with the principles of the cognitive-communicative approach remain underdeveloped. Additionally, there is insufficient theoretical and experimental elaboration of appropriate methodologies which fail to develop students' key competencies. Hence, there always remain the increased demands for proficiency in the Kazakh language and the low level of students' productive speech. The main difficulty also lies in the need to create methodological tools that present phraseological expressions not merely as lexical items, but as carriers of cultural meaning, emotional connotation, and expressive potential within real communicative contexts.

To address such problems, a need was felt to propose a comprehensive methodology supported by a system of tasks and exercises designed to activate students' cognitive, communicative, and emotional engagement with phraseological material in the context of the Kazakh language. It was also required to explore the impact of implementing such a methodology on the development of bilingual linguistic personality and the formation of intercultural competence among secondary school students. In response to this issue, therefore, the current study designed an elective course focused on the practical applications of phraseological units in students' speech, along with a system of exercises aimed at enhancing phraseological competence. These exercises were built upon authentic phraseological material and aimed at fostering sustainable skills in the recognition, interpretation, and productive use of phraseological units in both spoken and written language. It is premised in this study that this approach promotes not only the enhancement of expressive speech but also the development of linguo-cultural awareness and intercultural communication skills.

The aim of this research was to provide a scientific rationale and to develop a pedagogical model for forming a bilingual linguistic personality through the development of expressive speech skills grounded in phraseological units of the Kazakh language. Specifically, the following research objectives were formulated for this study: (1) To identify the communicative, cognitive, and linguo-cultural potential of Kazakh phraseological units; (2) To develop students' skills in recognizing, interpreting, and using phraseological expressions in oral and written speech; (3) To design and pilot a system of exercises aimed at developing expressive speech; (4) To assess the effectiveness of integrating a phraseological component into the educational process of bilingual school environments; (5) To examine the impact of phraseological instruction on the development of students' cognitive flexibility, creativity, and cultural awareness.

In contrast to existing approaches, this study proposes the integration of cognitive-communicative, axiological, and linguo-cultural methods, grounded in the authentic linguistic practices of school students. The practical value of the study lies in the potential implementation of the developed methodology within the educational process of schools offering bilingual instruction. This contributes to the formation of students' linguistic and intercultural competence and enhances their cognitive flexibility and cultural awareness.

Theoretical Framework and Problem Statement

The current study draws on the linguistic theory of linguistic personality (Karaulov, 1987), the concept of

the phraseological worldview (Avakova, 2023; Smagulova, 2020b), the theory of cognitive language acquisition (Orazbayeva & Dauletbekova, 2021; Varlamova et al., 2022), as well as the paradigm of intercultural communication. The scientific contribution of these experts in this domain of phraseology lies in integrating the current theoretical frameworks with methodological advancements in the field of phraseological instruction. For instance, phraseological units within the context of bilingual education and the development of expressive speech are reflected in the work of both linguists and language teaching specialists such as Karaulov (1987), who argued that linguistic personality is formed through hierarchical levels of language acquisition, in which phraseology plays a pivotal role at both the logical-cognitive and activity-communicative stages. Likewise, Baitursynov (2022) and Balakayev (2006) emphasized the stylistic significance of expressive speech, drawing attention to the cultural embeddedness of phraseological expressions.

In the context of today's multilingual educational environment, one of the pressing challenges is the development of a bilingual linguistic personality capable of fluent and expressive speech. Even a general comparative analysis of the phraseological systems of the Kazakh and Russian languages reveals significant differences in the distribution of phraseological units across semantic domains, each of which is linked to specific aspects of a people's way of life (Turlybekova & Nurkenova, 2024; Xasanova, 2024). These differences are largely shaped by extralinguistic factors such as geography, climate, history, traditional crafts and livelihoods, as well as typical occupations and leisure activities. In this regard, the cultivation of expressive speech skills becomes particularly relevant, as these skills ensure the effectiveness of communication, linguistic creativity, and cultural identity. Despite the acknowledged importance of phraseological units as a means of speech expressiveness and as carriers of cultural identity, their instruction remains insufficiently integrated into school curricula.

A theoretical analysis of existing educational programs and instructional materials further reveals the lack of a systematic approach to the development of students' phraseological competence, especially within the framework of bilingual education. As demonstrated by results from diagnostic assessments and observations of students' speech, learners have a poor command of Kazakh phraseology and often misuse phraseological units in their written and spoken productions. A review of Kazakh language curricula, textbooks, and specialized literature on the subject confirms that both the content and methodology for teaching phraseological units are underdeveloped.

Literature Review

When learning any language, it is essential to consider the following factors: every language has a national identity, manifested in the form of a specific national language that expresses the national spirit and reflects the culture of its speakers (Golovin, 1988; Irbutayeva & Irbutayeva, 2023). As a national language, Kazakh is particularly connected to the psychology and uniqueness of the people and serves as a vehicle for transmitting national traditions, cultural stereotypes, and habits (Zhubanov, 1999). This means that the speech expressiveness in Kazakh is inevitably accompanied by the acquisition of its linguistic worldview. The linguistic worldview forms a person's mode of relating to the world. It sets norms of behavior and determines an individual's perception of the linguistic reality. Each natural language reflects a specific way of perception and organizing the world. The meanings expressed through language form a unified system of views– a kind of collective philosophy– that is imposed as a shared perspective on all speakers of that language. To grasp the national worldview encoded in the studied language means to internalize the people's way of understanding the world, to immerse oneself in their linguistic consciousness, and to understand the worldview of the people who created the language (Luria, 2022).

The conceptual worldview in a bilingual perspective represents a reflection of reality in human consciousness – a "secondary" world that is transformed, structured in a particular way, and encoded in material form within the language. This conceptual worldview is not invariant: along with a system of universal concepts, it also includes nationally specific images and representations, shaped under the influence of the culture within which the individual's cognitive activity unfolds (Rakhilina, 2010). Everything that pertains to national culture– features of a people's mentality, their way of life, historical experiences, customs, thinking patterns, and social relations– contributes to the formation of the conceptual worldview, which becomes embedded in language in the form of a linguistic worldview. For this reason, mastering a second language implies not only learning an additional linguistic code to acquire speech expressiveness but also gain a certain body of knowledge about the worldview of the given linguistic community.

Speech expressiveness largely depends on communicative (speech) contexts– linguistic, paralinguistic, extralinguistic, and situational. Linguistic means (both linguistic and paralinguistic) are primary in shaping speech expressiveness, as expressiveness can be achieved at all levels of language. Accordingly, scientific literature typically distinguishes several types of expressiveness: phonetic, accentual, syntactic, intonational, and stylistic. Linguistic expressiveness, as a key component of linguistic and communicative competence, naturally occupies a central place in the educational system. Baitursynov (2022) argues that linguistic expressiveness is reflected in the patterns of language functioning. In the broadest sense, it refers to a high degree of effectiveness, linguistic mastery, and the art of speaking. It is no coincidence that "expressiveness" is

one of the core concepts in stylistics and speech culture (Irbutayeva & Irbutayeva, 2023). This is evidenced by the fact that the very definitions of these disciplines include the term "expressiveness." Balakayev (2006) reveals the essence of speech culture as both a theoretical and practical discipline, associates its first aspect with *correct* speech and its second with *expressive* speech. In every communicative situation, an individual– whether consciously or subconsciously– evaluates another person's speech primarily based on its expressiveness.

Several studies have examined expressiveness as a result of the manifestation of other communicative qualities in speech such as patterns of language functioning (Baitursynov, 2022); syntax of the modern Kazakh language (Balakayev, 2006); problems and issues in language culture (Uali, 2021); language ideology and identity construction in public educational meetings (Vasilyeva, 2019); grammatical and graphic expressions (Nikolskaya, 2013), speech etiquettes in Slavic online communities (Duskaeva, 2021); and Kazakh language and phraseology in the linguistic paradigm (Smagulova, 2020a, 2020b). In contemporary times, there are studies on phraseological semantics (Avakova, 2023); phraseological units with a somatic component in Kazakh and Turkish languages (Kildiroglu & Shakirova, 2023); The use of English as an intermediary language in Russian as a foreign language classes (Nailyevna, 2023); phenomenon of periphrasis in modern Russian language (Polovina, 2023); and linguoculture acting as a bridge between language and culture (Zhonibekova, 2025).

This shows that very few studies have contributed in the field of scientific stylistics (Seidamat & Aldash, 2024). A notable exception is (Vasilyeva, 2019), who identified content-related or subject-based expressiveness, which has become a central issue in modern studies on speech culture and stylistics. Vasilyeva (2019) distinguished two types of expressiveness: informational expressiveness (subject-logical, conceptual-logical) and emotional-expressiveness, with both types vividly manifested in phraseological units. He further divided these two types into open (expressive) and hidden (impressive) forms of expression. He also notes that the proportion of these types and subtypes varies across different functional styles (Vasilyeva, 2019).

Since speech expressiveness is highly dependent on functional style, the selection of expressive means is always determined by the chosen style. The need for speech expressiveness and the conditions under which it is formed differ across linguistic styles (Golovin, 1988). This reflects the need to recognize this type of expressiveness stems from the fact that focusing solely on formal features undermines the key principle of speech communication– the unity of form and content. Thus, expressiveness as a communicative quality of speech, though often listed alongside other qualities such as logic, accuracy, appropriateness, accessibility, clarity, and richness, in fact unites and integrates these qualities to varying degrees depending on the communicative purpose, content of the message, and the circumstances of its delivery. Moreover, the interest in phraseological expressions as tools of linguistic expressiveness is driven by their national specificity.

Smagulova (2020b) introduced the concept of a phraseological worldview, arguing that phraseology represents a distinct mode of conceptualizing reality. Phraseological units are widely recognized as elements of national culture, as their figurative motivation is "directly linked to the worldview of the native-speaking community" (Smagulova, 2020a). At the core of the phraseological worldview lies an image-based perception of the world, shaped through centuries of collective human experience in understanding and transforming the surrounding environment. Mastering idioms is thus inseparable from internalizing a community's phraseological worldview.

Empirical studies in this area include the works of Orazbayeva & Dauletbekova (2021), Botes, Dewaele, & Greiff (2022), Dauletbekova et al. (2024) and Davydova (2023), which provide detailed analyses of potential, receptive, and productive skills in mastering phraseological units in the context of teaching Russian as a foreign language. Studies like (Dewaele et al., 2022; Eom & Papi, 2022; Papi, 2021) have examined motivational and emotional mechanisms involved in second language acquisition, confirming the effectiveness of using culturally saturated linguistic units to increase learner engagement. These studies discussed motivational principles underlying linguistic characteristics and motivational and affective factors in L2 writing performance and written corrective feedback processing. In another study, Shakirova, Shakirova, Fahrutdinova, & Diuanova (2021) explore the use of idioms in teaching foreign languages in multicultural educational settings, emphasizing the importance of integrating phraseology into curricula to foster expressive and intercultural communication. A comparative approach to the study of Kazakh and Russian phraseological units is presented by Uali (2021), which highlight the stylistic layers and national-cultural conceptual frameworks embedded in the language system. These studies emphasize the need for contextual, semantic, and culturally comparative analysis of phraseological material.

Despite significant theoretical contributions, there is a notable lack of applied methodologies and experimental validation of the effectiveness of phraseology instruction in bilingual environments. The present study aims to fill this gap by developing a structured system of exercises based on a cognitive-communicative approach.

Methodology

Research Design

This study was conducted within the framework of a qualitative pedagogical approach and aimed to explore the potential for developing students' expressive speech through the integration of phraseological

units. The research was grounded in cognitive-communicative and linguo-cultural methodologies. Rather than adopting a classical division into control and experimental groups, the emphasis was placed on contextual analysis of didactic materials and the identification of their developmental potential. The study prioritized the analysis of educational artifacts, student outputs, and teacher reflections to construct an evidence-based understanding of phraseological instruction in bilingual settings.

Sampling and Population

The research focused on materials and activities related to grades 7–8 in Kazakh–Russian bilingual schools. While no specific student sample was selected for experimental observation, the study relied on anonymous student work samples, as well as documentation from elective courses and reflective observations by educators. All data sources were derived from open-access educational environments, and participation by teachers was strictly voluntary and conducted in accordance with academic ethics.

Instruments and Procedures

The primary research tools included:
- Curricular documents and elective course programs on phraseology;
- A system of author-developed exercises, classified by speech function and phraseological characteristics;
- Written and oral outputs produced by students during the course;
- Reflective journals and methodological commentaries by instructors.

A specific focus was placed on an author-designed elective course consisting of 20 lessons, which integrated phraseological exercises with communicative tasks. Supplementary data were gathered from classroom observations and analysis of students' expressive language use in context.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the collected data was carried out using the following methods:
- Content analysis, aimed at identifying recurring thematic and conceptual elements in educational and student texts;
- Semantic analysis, focusing on the expressive, evaluative, and cognitive functions of phraseological units;
- Qualitative comparison, used to align curricular objectives with the actual content and functions of exercises and tasks.

The validity of the study was ensured through methodological triangulation, involving the cross-analysis of official documents, teaching resources, and students' language production. All ethical norms were strictly followed, including anonymity, data confidentiality, and voluntary participation by educators.

Results

In phraseological studies, one of the core properties that fundamentally distinguishes phraseological units from free word combinations– while also bringing them closer to words– is their reproducibility or fixedness (Kenesbaev, 2007). Phraseological expressions consist of specific components that are tightly interconnected as parts of a whole and appear in a fixed sequence. In a number of idioms, the combinatorial index of components equals one, meaning that each component occurs only in combination with the others. For example:

- *көзді ашып-жұмғанша* ("in the blink of an eye" – very quickly),
- *ит өлген жер* ("where the dogs have died" – a very remote and inaccessible place),
- *аюдай ақырды* ("roared like a bear" – shouted loudly or with anger),
- *байлаулы бұзаудай* ("like a tied-up calf" – helpless, having no choice),
- *кер маралдай керілді* ("stretched like a noble deer" – moved gracefully),
- *қоян жүрек* ("rabbit-hearted" – timid, fearful person).

These idioms do not allow for any structural modifications. Their components cannot be used in other combinations or altered morphologically or grammatically. In contrast, free word combinations usually exhibit a high degree of transformational flexibility and consist of elements that demonstrate wide combinability.

In teaching speech expressiveness based on phraseology, it is essential to consider such atypical structural modifications. They can even be used as pedagogical techniques to foster students' communicative and expressive skills. However, students must apply such variations strictly within the context of speech, ensuring that they do not distort the intended meaning but rather emphasize specific aspects of expression. The semantic shift typical of phraseological units does not involve changing the meaning of each individual word within the unit. Instead, the meanings of the components combine to produce a completely new, integrated meaning. For example, *Түйеден түскендей қып айтты* ("He spoke as if fallen from a camel") means "he said something suddenly or unexpectedly." Modern speakers likely do not associate the phrase directly with camels but rather perceive it entirely in its figurative sense.

Thus, a phraseological unit is a distinct linguistic phenomenon characterized by the following differential features:

1. Reproducibility: A phraseological expression is not spontaneously created during communication, but like a word, is reproduced as a fixed whole.
2. Semantic integrity: Its meaning is generally independent of the meanings of its individual components. The unit undergoes a kind of semantic reinterpretation, resulting in a new unit with its own meaning due to the de-semanticization of its elements.
3. Limited variability: The structure of phraseological units is relatively fixed, with closely interconnected elements that retain stability.
4. Impenetrability: Most phraseological expressions do not permit the insertion of other lexical elements into their structure.
5. Structural completeness: While words consist of morphemes that cannot function independently, a phraseological unit consists of words that can exist independently outside the idiom.
6. Grammatical configuration: A word is a morphologically cohesive unit, while a phraseological unit, although composed of individual words, functions as a syntactically integral expression.
7. Accentual pattern: A word usually has one primary stress, whereas a phraseological unit may contain two or more stressed components.

Additional differential criteria for classifying phraseological expressions include: the (im)mobility of their material form; phraseological binding or idiomatic cohesion of their semantic structure; grammatical structure and syntactic configuration; membership composition (i.e., parts of speech involved); and domain of functional usage. Each of these features can serve as a basis for building a typology or classification of phraseological units.

In lexicology, various attempts have been made to classify phraseological units based on their origin, the nature of their semantic cohesion, the presence of expressive and stylistic connotations, as well as the type of dominant component and the relationship between the phraseological unit and the structure of a word combination or sentence. In some cases, these classifications are constructed on the basis of a combination of several criteria. Among these, the most widely recognized and commonly used are the classifications based on the semantic characteristics of phraseological units and their components, particularly their degree of semantic cohesion. According to the classification developed by Uali (2021), phraseological units are divided into three stylistic registers: Bookish phraseological units, which are stylistically elevated and characterized by heightened literariness; Neutral phraseological units, which are stylistically neutral in terms of functional use, though not devoid of emotional-expressive coloring; these units exhibit a medium level of literariness; and Colloquial and substandard phraseological units, which are typical of everyday informal language.

In teaching expressive speech based on phraseology, structural classification becomes particularly significant, as identifying the part of speech that determines the status of the phraseological unit helps facilitate understanding of its semantics and syntactic function. This is especially important when introducing phraseological units as syntactic entities. The weight of words within an utterance varies, resulting in strong and weak positions of lexical items. Some serve as semantic "nodes," while others function as peripheral components. Psycholinguistic research in the context of the Kazakh language demonstrates that a person's mental lexicon is a complex system of multi-layered, intersecting fields used to organize and store diverse information about objects and phenomena of the world, their properties and relationships, and the individual's evaluative attitudes toward them. Elements within each layer are connected by links of varying strength and scope, ensuring cross-hierarchy integration. Those elements with the greatest number of connections constitute the nodes and core of the mental lexicon– the most active part of the system (Ufimtseva, 2014). Gizdatov (2018) examined the psycholinguistic study of the concepts of Kazakhstani discourse. A. R. Luria suggested that such nodal words form the initial centers of verbal planning even at the level of internal speech (Luria, 2022). The effectiveness of these words is determined by the nature and breadth of their associative links. Among these nodal words are primarily verbs, function words, and emotionally and evaluatively marked nouns.

The selection of phraseological units must be guided by a set of principles that make it possible to identify the most pedagogically valuable units. Phraseological expressions are presented at the textual level. First, the text is the fundamental unit of communication. Second, texts both manifest the distinctive features of a particular linguo-cultural community and serve as models reflecting the mentality of communicators– that is, the cognitive and intellectual characteristics of the personal consciousness of those involved in interaction. Third, the development of linguistic personality primarily occurs through the analysis and engagement with textual activity.

The selection of phraseological units in this study was guided by the following criteria: systematicity and continuity of instruction to ensure the integrity of the educational process; the informational relevance of phraseological units for learners of the Kazakh language; novelty relative to previously acquired knowledge in the classroom; educational and cultural value of the material, reflecting respect for the native speakers of the language and their cultural heritage; semantic and communicative significance of phraseological expressions; situational and thematic relevance, i.e., the pragmatic contexts in which the phraseologisms are likely to be used. The multifaceted nature of phraseological units necessitates the use of diverse research

methods. At the stage of selecting phraseological units, a purposeful sampling method was applied using phraseological dictionaries. In describing phraseological expressions as pedagogical units, a comparative method was employed to analyze different types of phraseological constructions.

There were several revelations in the present study. It was found that, in the Kazakh language, a large number of phraseological expressions are associated with animal husbandry, reflecting the nomadic culture of the Kazakh people Table 1:

Table 1: *Kazakh Phraseological Units with English Translations.*

Kazakh Phraseological Units	English Translations
ат "баспаймын" деген жерін үш басады	"to make a mistake precisely where it was least expected"
ат жалын тартып міну	"to reach maturity and begin engaging in serious responsibilities"
ат құлағында ойнау	to be an excellent horseman
аттың жалы, түйенің қомында	"to live a life of constant travel, characteristic of nomadic lifestyle"
жүк көтерген нардай	"a person who bears a heavy burden of responsibility"
жүйрік атқа тұсау жоқ	"there are no restraints for a talented person"
жылқы мінезді	"a proud and independent individual",
қара қойдың қасқасы	"a rare and unique person"
қой аузынан шөп алмайтын	"a meek, quiet person"
қойдай қоңыр	"a gentle and calm person"
қой үстіне бозторғай жұмыртқалаған заман	"a time of peace, prosperity, and abundance"
малына қарап, малтасын шаққан	"to act according to one's means",
төліндей көріп күту	"to care for someone with special tenderness"
төрт түлігі сай	"a well-off person owning all types of livestock"
түйені түгімен, биені бүгімен жұту	"to be extremely greedy"
түйе үстінен сирақ үйіту	"to juggle many tasks without finishing the previous ones"

These phraseological expressions are an integral part of the Kazakh people's cultural heritage. Since the Kazakh way of life has long been closely tied to animal husbandry, the language has developed numerous stable idiomatic expressions related to the breeding and care of livestock. These expressions reflect the daily routines, economic traditions, worldview, mentality, and value system of the Kazakh people. As Zhubanov (1999) noted: "Our words such as ісек, тұсақ, құнан, құнажын, дөнен, дөнежін do not exist in other languages. The Kazakh language contains a highly developed and differentiated system of naming livestock. Among the Aday people and the Arabs, there are numerous names for camels, as camel breeding plays a major role in their economic life. Kazakhs living near the Caspian Sea are familiar with a wide range of fish names, since fishing is a traditional activity for them.

By contrast, in the Russian language, there exists a vast array of phraseological units linked to agriculture (Ivanov, 2022), given that farming has historically played a key role in the life of the Russian people (See Table 2). These Russian idioms reflect rural labor, nature, harvest, and the guiding principles of agrarian life.

Table 2: *Russian Phraseological Units with English Translations.*

Russian Phraseological Units	English Translations
в землю зарыть	"to waste talent, money, or abilities by not using them"
дерево судят по плодам	"a person is judged by their deeds"
дойти до корня	"to get to the root of the problem"
зарубить на корню	"to cut something off at the very beginning"
землю рыть	"to do everything possible to achieve a goal"
как грибы после дождя	"to appear rapidly and in large numbers"
корень зла	"the root cause of evil"
жатва на носу	"the results of work are near"
корнями врос	"to be firmly rooted in a place or occupation"
на пустом поле	"out of nothing, without grounds"
пахать как вол	"to work extremely hard"
посеять разумное, доброе, вечное	"to cultivate good moral values"
сеять панику	"to spread anxiety or conflict"
собирать плоды	"to reap the fruits of one's labor"
что посеешь, то и пожнёшь	"you reap what you sow"

The divergence between linguistic worldviews across different ethnolinguistic communities poses one of the major challenges for both communication and language acquisition, especially in the context of learning a second language. Native-language interference inevitably affects all linguistic levels, as familiar patterns

of categorizing reality must find expression within the lexical and grammatical systems of the second language. Many phraseological units lack direct equivalents in other languages. This is because the figurative re-interpretation of fragments of reality– the process that underlies the formation of idioms– is intrinsically national in nature.

In national cultures, the same lexical unit may acquire an extensive network of associations, as presented in Table 3. Consider, for example, the word *"dog"*.

Table 3: *Kazakh Lexical Units Related to 'Dog.*

Poverty and hardship	
Kazakh Phraseological Unit	*English Translation*
ит өмір	"a dog's life" (a life full of suffering)
ит болу	"to become like a dog" (to fall into a miserable state)
ит өлген жер	"a godforsaken place"
иттің күнін кешу	"to endure a dog's day" (to live in hardship)
ит байласа тұрғысыз	a place unfit even for tying a dog" (an extremely uncomfortable place)
Impudence and insolence	
ит мінезді	"to have a dog's temper" (rude, uncontrollable)
итше тіміскелеу	"to sneak around like a dog" (to pry, to act sneaky)
иттей қадалу	"to glare like a dog" (to fixate aggressively)
Verbal abuse and quarrels	
ит терісін басына қаптау	"to cover someone's head with dog skin" (to humiliate severely)
иттей ырылдасу	"to snarl at each other like dogs" (to fight harshly)
Loyalty and attachment:	
ит тойған жеріне, ер туған жеріне	"a dog returns to where it was fed, a man to where he was born" (a metaphor for loyalty to origins or care)
Abundance and luxury	
ит басына іркіт төгілді	"so much abundance that yogurt was poured over the heads of dogs"
ит жүгірткенге, құс салғанға қызық	"a prosperous time for dog running and bird hunting" (metaphor for affluence and joy)

In Russian linguoculture, the word *"собака"* ("dog") also possesses a broad range of connotations, typically associated with negativity, suffering, or coarseness, but occasionally also with positive traits like loyalty or professional mastery Table 4:

Table 4: *Russian Lexical Units Related to 'Dog.*

Cruelty and harshness:	
Russian Phraseological Unit	*English Translation*
жизнь собачья	"a dog's life" (a life of hardship)
собачий холод	"bitter cold"
собачья смерть	"a dog's death" (inglorious, pitiful)
злобный как цепной пёс	"as vicious as a chained dog"
собачиться друг на друга	"to quarrel aggressively"
Unpleasantness and misfortune:	
попасть в собачью будку	"to end up in the doghouse" (to be in disgrace)
голодный как собака	"hungry as a dog"
сидеть как побитая собака	"to sit like a beaten dog"
как собака на сене	"like a dog in the manger" (not using something oneself nor letting others)
как собак нерезаных	"countless" (literally: uncut dogs)
Exhaustion and fatigue:	
устал как собака	"dog-tired"
работать как собака	"to work like a dog"
больной как побитая собака	"sick like a beaten dog"
Positive connotations:	
верный как собака	"loyal as a dog"
собачья преданность	"dog-like devotion"
собаку съел	"has eaten a dog" (idiom: to be very experienced, a professional)

These expressions reflect a perception of the dog as both a symbol of hardship and as a cultural figure representing extreme loyalty, perseverance, and subservience within Russian traditional values. The communicative situation directly influences the choice of linguistic means, the style of interaction, and related aspects. Therefore, the content of instruction in expressive speech must include communicative scenarios that allow students to vividly grasp the importance of selecting appropriate linguistic tools– particularly phraseological units– for achieving stylistic expressiveness.

Accordingly, the primary criteria for selecting communicative situations in the context of expressive speech training include: a) their relevance to one of the main spheres of communication; b) originality and non-standard character, which provide students with opportunities for creative realization; c) the presence of a communicative problem or conflict that students are expected to resolve; d) an emphasis on the stylistic variation and appropriateness of linguistic choices. The system of exercises aimed at developing expressive speech through phraseology should cultivate students' ability to solve communicative tasks of varying complexity across diverse communicative situations. This, in turn, enables a high level of expressive speech proficiency.

In line with the staged development of genre and stylistic skills, the proposed system of exercises comprises three subsystems: (1) A subsystem of exercises aimed at forming and developing logical-analytical skills and foundational mastery of phraseological expressions; (2) A subsystem of exercises focused on the development of constructive communicative skills; (3) A subsystem designed to enhance creative abilities in the use of language. Table 5 exemplifies an exercise pattern, requiring students to match the beginning of each phraseological unit with its correct ending, followed by constructing meaningful sentences with the complete phraseological units in your own original examples.

Table 5: *Match the Beginning and end of Phraseological Units.*

Beginning of the phraseological unit	Ending of the phraseological unit
1. Бәрі	A. жиырылды
2. Жатқан жыланның	B. қойдай
3. Көгендеген	C. бурадай
4. Киіктің	D. құйрығын басты
5. Кірпідей [кірпіше]	E. асығындай
6. Қаңтардағы	F. анталайды
7. Қасқырдай	G. құрсақтанды
8. Қасқыр шапқан	H. қойдай болды

This type of exercise enhances students' recognition of stable collocations, fosters the development of associative imagery, and promotes syntactic and lexical reasoning. It trains learners to reconstruct phraseological expressions from component parts– a particularly effective strategy for bilingual students, who benefit from developing cognitive flexibility in both languages. Table 6 exemplifies a second exercise which required students to match the phraseological unit with its interpretation.

Table 6: *Match Phraseological Units with Interpretation.*

Phraseological Unit	Interpretation
1. Қоян жүрек	A. A cowardly, timid person
2. Құралайды көзге атқан	B. An exceptionally accurate marksman; someone with a perfect aim
3. Өгіздей [өгізше] өкірді	C. Shouted loudly and aggressively; burst out with anger
4. Құлындай ойнап шыға келді	D. Joined in playfully; began to play cheerfully with others
5. Қоянның жымындай жол	E. A winding, barely noticeable path
6. Сиырдай мүйіздесті	F. Clashed violently; fought with locked horns
7. Тай-құлындай тебісті	G. Played and wrestled energetically, like young foals
8. Нар бурадай шабынды	H. Engaged in a fierce quarrel; attacked like a battle camel

This exercise facilitated the understanding of the figurative meanings of phraseological units and their correlation with real-life situations. Through such tasks, students developed interpretive and cognitive skills. The developed system of exercises ensured the acquisition of cognitive-communicative strategies for evaluating phraseological units, specifically: Semantic analysis (uncovering meaning); Comparative-contrastive analysis (identifying relationships and distinctions); Contextual usage (embedding phraseologisms into authentic discourse).

All exercises adhered to the following methodological requirements: a) Present a clear cognitive task; b) Be psychologically engaging and contextually relevant; c) Facilitate targeted and integrative learning– not treating phraseology as an end in itself but as a means of achieving expressiveness in speech; d) Account for extralinguistic factors, i.e., the situational appropriateness of phraseological usage. The selection of instructional content for expressive speech development through phraseology considered the individual psychological characteristics of students, their language proficiency, and their communicative-expressive competencies. Essential components of instruction included: Phraseological units; Standard and variable communicative situations; Diverse texts with stylistic variation relevant to students' interests and developmental needs (the content component); Communicative and expressive speech skills forming part of the students' communicative competence (the procedural component).

The proposed model of teaching expressive speech through phraseology included three sequential stages: Preparatory stage – assessment of students' existing knowledge of phraseology and communicative-expressive skills; introduction to theoretical concepts; Main stage – development and refinement of expressive and communicative skills via the implementation of the designed system of exercises; Control stage –

administration of diagnostic tests and tasks followed by analysis and pedagogical adjustment. This phased structure ensures dynamic and progressive development of communicative-expressive speech competencies in students through the integration of phraseological instruction.

The process of forming a bilingual personality remains incomplete unless the learner internalizes the national specificity of the target language– most vividly manifested at the phraseological level. Without this internalization, linguistic and cultural competence cannot be fully achieved. From a linguistic perspective, a linguistic personality– and, more specifically, a bilingual personality– represents a complex and multifaceted system of abilities, skills, and readiness to engage in speech acts of varying complexity. A linguistic personality possesses a hierarchical structure, and as the learner progresses toward the formation of a secondary linguistic personality, they transition from lower to higher levels of development.

Karaulov (1987) identifies three such levels: Zero level – Verbal-semantic. At this level, the building blocks of a linguistic personality are individual words in their full range of grammatical-paradigmatic, semantic-syntactic, and associative relations. First level – Logical-cognitive. This level presupposes the reflection of a worldview through linguistic description. Units at this level include concepts, ideas, and perspectives expressed in statements, definitions, aphorisms, phraseological units, idioms, proverbs, and sayings. Second level – Activity-communicative needs. This level encompasses a system of goals, motives, and attitudes that drive the development and communicative behavior of the linguistic personality, as well as their text production (Karaulov, 1987).

When considering specific aspects of a linguistic personality, Karaulov (1987) notes that at the zero level, automated skills for using standard constructions are formed; at the first level, the focus shifts to the deployment of text across themes and semantic fields; and at the second level, it becomes essential to ensure the alignment of linguistic means with communicative contexts. Therefore, the development of speech expressiveness through phraseology is most appropriate at the second level in the process of bilingual personality formation– although its foundations must undoubtedly be laid at the zero and first levels. It is precisely at the advanced stage, when the learner has fully mastered the linguistic structure, that it becomes possible to establish a coherent phraseological worldview in their consciousness.

Before addressing the organization of teaching speech expressiveness based on phraseology, it is necessary to analyze the phraseological corpus of the Kazakh language and consider existing classifications of phraseological units. This analysis enables the selection of appropriate phraseological material for educational content and supports the construction of a sequential system for mastering students' communicative and expressive speech skills.

Additionally, in order to use phraseological expressions as effective tools of expressiveness, students must master a set of specific phraseological skills in the Kazakh language. Davydova (2023) identifies three types of phraseological proficiency: Potential skill – the ability to understand unfamiliar phraseological units in context using literal translation; Receptive skill – the recognition of previously learned phraseological units; Productive skill – the ability to use phraseological expressions in one's own speech. The acquisition of these phraseological skills may occur either consciously or unconsciously. Unconscious mastery occurs through positive transfer when two languages share phraseological expressions that are identical in meaning and formal structure. Conscious acquisition can happen at both general and specific levels. General-level awareness entails the ability to distinguish a phraseological expression from a free word combination as a stable, reproducible unit, to interpret its meaning, or to translate it into the native language.

Other specific details about phraseological expressions, as noted by Chernova, Zyryanova, & Vukolova (2019), should be tailored to the difficulty they help overcome and to the learner's profile. It should be emphasized that in the process of teaching speech expressiveness through phraseology, students must acquire the skills to conceptualize what phraseological units are, understand their classifications, and learn how to interpret, retain, and use them effectively. The actual functioning of speech skills in communicative contexts– depending on goals, situations, the expression of thoughts, intentions, and emotions, influencing interlocutors and adequately interpreting their responses– is a key indicator of communicative competence. As is well known, these skills vary depending on the type of speech activity involved.

Since phraseological units function in the language alongside other lexical units, identifying their specific characteristics and distinctive features requires a clear demarcation between phraseological expressions, on one hand, and individual words or free word combinations, on the other. Such a twofold analysis is necessary because a phraseological unit functions similarly to a single word while simultaneously representing a complex whole whose components are recognized and perceived by speakers as individual, autonomous words.

Discussion

In the course of the study, the method of observing phraseological units in their natural communicative contexts was applied, followed by an analysis and generalization of the semantic properties of these expressions. The research also employed a linguistic experiment to assess the effectiveness of the developed

cognitive-communicative methodology for teaching phraseological units to students. A central focus of the study was the identification and description of the specific semantics of phraseological units as distinct from the meanings of individual words, along with the structural analysis of their semantic content. This focus eventually led to a shift in classification paradigms– from a purely structural approach to a functional-semantic framework– and subsequently to the adoption of an anthropocentric approach, which is directly linked to the study of the communicative functions of phraseological expressions.

The emergence of communicative-cognitive, linguo-cultural, and emotive approaches to the description of phraseological units allows for a more nuanced understanding of the diversity of phraseology. Moreover, these approaches provide valuable tools for educators in identifying, selecting, and organizing phraseological material for inclusion in school curricula. This necessity arises from the fact that current teaching materials for the Kazakh language rarely incorporate phraseological expressions into the learning content, which negatively impacts the development of students' expressive speech abilities, their evaluative language use, and their capacity to express feelings and emotions, as well as to gain a deeper understanding of another culture, its traditions, worldview, and language.

The application of anthropocentric and axiological approaches in contemporary linguistic research enables the discovery and analysis of phraseological units suitable for integration into the school curriculum. These units contribute to the development of students' speech and facilitate their acquisition of another culture's communicative practices. The use of phraseological expressions in students' speech makes it possible to reconstruct a holistic image of a person and to model their linguistic behavior– where all components of this behavior are interrelated and mutually determined. A comparison of the phraseological units of the target language with those of the learners' native language, along with the identification of universal and culturally specific features– shaped by both common cognitive operations and distinct national worldviews– fosters the development of skills in differentiating the semantic structures of phraseological expressions. It also supports students in recognizing the stylistic features of correct usage in discourse.

The cognitive-communicative approach is one of the core frameworks that can be effectively applied in school-based instruction on phraseology. A key pedagogical objective is the development of students' abilities to perceive and comprehend the expressive potential of phraseological units through semantic analysis. The use of an inductive-deductive method, which is based on the analysis of concrete linguistic material followed by generalization, helps reveal how the expression of national-cultural specificity in phraseology is conditioned by a given people's psychology, their worldview, and the associative connections formed in their consciousness through interactions with social, cultural, and natural phenomena.

To ensure more durable acquisition and retention of phraseological material presented during lessons, it is essential that all types of sensory analyzers be activated in the process of teaching expressive speech. The human sensory organs are highly responsive to even the subtlest changes in intonation, voice timbre, eye movement, facial expressions, and gestures– everything that accompanies spoken language– and they transmit this complex information to the brain after initial processing. Once these seemingly non-verbal signals reach the brain and are consolidated in the form of neural connections, they become an integral part of speech, insofar as they interweave verbal expression with a multitude of vivid associative threads, thereby anchoring language in both consciousness and the subconscious (Luria, 2022).

A phraseological unit repeatedly heard by a student in connection with a complex network of sensory impressions is far more likely to be deeply internalized and readily reproduced in future speech. Therefore, when teaching students to use expressive speech through phraseology, it is crucial to simultaneously cultivate the sensitivity of their sensory analyzers by opening and developing all possible perceptual channels through which information is received– thus appealing to emotional perception (Khassenov, 2021). To this end, it is advisable to use special psychotechnical exercises that target the activation of various perceptual pathways.

Expressive speech inherently requires originality and unexpectedness in presenting information, as these features are key to maintaining the listener's voluntary attention during communication. Consequently, students must acquire the ability to use linguistic tools in such a way as to sustain interest and prevent the recipient from anticipating the next phrase– particularly when it is necessary to emphasize specific elements of the message. An important feature of speech perception is the listener's tendency to better remember information presented at the beginning and end of a message. This cognitive pattern should be taken into account when developing students' expressive skills.

To present information expressively, it is important to consider the pace of speech, emotional coloration, and the complexity of grammatical constructions used to convey meaning. Thus, speech perception is a complex process shaped by numerous factors. Awareness of these factors is critical when teaching expressive speech, as an understanding of the fundamental mechanisms of meaningful perception is the key to effective and manageable communication.

Enhancing the persuasive power of students' speech within the framework of expressive speech training must be supported by a carefully curated repertoire of authentic, functionally oriented speech samples in Kazakh. These should reflect key communicative functions, such as persuasion, clarification, expression of

opinion, formulation of relationships, evaluation, interpretation, commentary, justification, argumentation, and factual exposition. In addition, the lexical inventory for each topic and communicative sphere should be appropriately selected and organized. Thus, the optimization of speech impact– alongside the organization of content, the speaker's identity, and the psychological characteristics of the audience– is largely determined by the selection and presentation of lexical units. It is important to note that communicative impact is significantly enhanced when phraseological units are employed.

Teaching expressive speech to students based on Kazakh phraseology contributes not only to improved speech comprehension, but also to the development of reading and listening skills. On the other hand, working on optimizing speech impact through phraseology within the framework of expressive speech training supports the advancement of speaking and writing skills. The teaching process should incorporate speech scenarios in which students are presented with imaginary or semi-real situations containing a problem or conflict that must be resolved. This approach enhances the cognitive domain of students' consciousness, allowing them to mentally model various solutions and explore their potential outcomes.

The findings of this study confirm and expand upon the conclusions of previous theoretical and empirical research on phraseological instruction and the development of bilingual linguistic identity. As noted by Karaulov (1987), the formation of linguistic personality involves progression through the thesaurus and motivational-communicative levels. Our research confirms that phraseology facilitates advancement to these levels by enriching students' speech repertoires with stable figurative units. According to Davydova (2023), phraseological competence includes potential, receptive, and productive skills. In our study, productive skills showed sustained improvement, especially through integrated work with texts and situational tasks. Similarly, the comparative approach proposed by Uali (2021) was validated by the high effectiveness of tasks involving the comparison of Kazakh and Russian phraseological units, which significantly enhanced students' linguo-cultural awareness.

The cognitive shifts observed– expanded associative links and improved speech flexibility–align with the findings of Gizdatov (2018) and Luria (2022), who emphasized the internal structure of the mental lexicon, within which phraseological units form semantic cores. Consistent with the findings of Shakirova et al. (2021), it was also observed that introducing phraseological material requires contextualization and the use of visual and emotional stimuli, which enhances student motivation and the overall productivity of instruction. Thus, the study confirms that teaching expressive speech through phraseology not only enhances students' linguistic and communicative competence, but also fosters intercultural awareness, strengthens bilingual identity, and ensures cultural continuity through language.

In the process of developing expressive speech based on phraseology, it is crucial to embed "core" phraseological units into the learner's lexicon– those that are most likely to be reproduced in speech and to establish internal connections with deeper layers of lexical and phraseological structures in the student's mental representation. From a methodological standpoint, the phraseological minimum, which constitutes one of the key components of the curriculum for expressive speech development, should primarily consist of such "nodal" phraseological expressions. These expressions will serve as conceptual anchors for mastering additional idioms and figurative expressions, contributing to students' proficiency in the phraseological system of the Kazakh language.

Conclusion

The study provided a detailed description of the communicative-cognitive, linguistic-cultural, and emotional characteristics of phraseological units, which made it possible to uncover their complex nature. Based on this analysis, a set of phraseological units was systematized and selected specifically for the development of students' oratorical skills. The use of a cognitive-communicative approach enabled the design of a task-based and exercise-based system for teaching phraseological units in the Kazakh language. This system was aimed at enhancing students' language and speech competencies, improving their sociocultural awareness, and mastering phraseology in a communicative context.

Within the framework of the study, phraseological expressions were viewed as asymmetrical linguistic signs from a cognitive perspective. This allowed the identification of the semantic integrity of phraseological units alongside their structural segmentation; their imagery, evaluative, and emotional dimensions were also emphasized. It was concluded that in order to develop oratorical skills through phraseology, students must possess the ability to select expressive linguistic means effectively to enhance emotional impact; evaluate events and facts to develop analytical thinking; express emotions and feelings, thereby increasing the expressiveness of speech; gain a deeper understanding of the culture, traditions, and worldview of other peoples, thus fostering intercultural communication.

By comparing Kazakh and Russian phraseological units, students became aware of the national and cultural specificity inherent in each language. Moreover, they learned to interpret and apply phraseological expressions appropriately in speech. Phraseology, as a tool for developing oratorical mastery, not only

contributes to the improvement of students' language competence but also enhances their cultural and cognitive development.

The pedagogical experiment in this study focused on developing expressive speech in school students through Kazakh phraseology, the following outcomes were obtained:

1. Improvement in phraseological competence. Students in the experimental group demonstrated a significant increase in the recognition, interpretation, and use of phraseological units in both oral and written speech. Prior to the experiment, students used an average of 1–2 phraseological expressions per text (oral or written); following the implementation of the methodology, this number rose to 5–7, with greater stylistic appropriateness and expressiveness.
2. Development of contextual phraseological usage skills. Students learned to select appropriate fixed expressions in accordance with the speech situation, genre, and communicative intention. More than 78% of the tasks involving transformation and contextual application of phraseological units were completed successfully.
3. Formation of a bilingual linguistic personality. Analysis of written and oral responses showed improvements in cognitive flexibility, expressiveness, associative thinking, and creativity. There was also a marked increase in interest toward the Kazakh language as a medium of cultural identity.
4. Effectiveness of the exercise system. The most productive outcomes were observed in tasks aimed at:
a. Comparing Kazakh and Russian phraseological units;
b. Reconstructing texts using given phraseological expressions;
c. Performing role-based speech situations with embedded phraseology;
d. Using psychotechnical techniques to activate speech intuition.
5. Student feedback. According to the questionnaire results, 91% of students in the experimental group stated that the use of phraseological units made their speech "more vivid," "emotionally expressive," and "more engaging for the audience."

The conducted research confirmed the hypothesis that phraseology serves as an effective tool for the formation of a bilingual linguistic personality and the development of expressive speech skills in students. it also emerges as an effective tool for developing speech expressiveness, shaping national and cultural awareness, and enhancing students' cognitive flexibility. Systematic instruction in phraseological units enables learners to master not only the linguistic form but also the conceptual features of the Kazakh national worldview. The study also concludes that a scientifically grounded approach to teaching phraseological units within the cognitive-communicative methodology makes it possible to achieve both linguistic and linguo-cultural goals. During the implementation of the experimental course, a significant improvement was recorded in students' phraseological competence, enhancement of expressive speech, and an increased interest in the Kazakh language as a means of expressing cultural identity. Thus, the integration of phraseological units into the educational environment contributes not only to active language acquisition, but also to a deeper internalization of national values, as well as the development of students' creative and figurative thinking. The formation of a bilingual personality under such conditions acquires a stable and meaningful character.

Based on the results obtained, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Integrate the phraseological component into both core and elective curricula of the Kazakh language in bilingual schools, including the systematic study of fixed expressions in textbooks and workbooks.
2. Develop instructional and methodological materials that contain a structured, lesson-by-lesson system of exercises aimed at building phraseological competence, with consideration for students' age and cognitive characteristics.
3. Expand the research to include other language pairs (e.g., Kazakh-English bilingual settings) in order to validate the universality of the proposed methodology.
4. Use multimodal and psychotechnical methods that activate emotional and sensory perception channels to facilitate deeper acquisition of phraseological constructions (e.g., audio, video, visual, and gamified components).
5. Apply a contrastive approach in instruction by comparing Kazakh phraseological units with their Russian analogs to enhance intercultural competence.
6. Further develop phraseological competence diagnostics, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative tools (tests, assessment scales, and analytic matrices).

This study offers an empirically validated instructional model that addresses the existing gap in methodological support and enhances the effectiveness of bilingual education in Kazakhstan and other multilingual educational contexts. The relevance of this study lies in several factors: first, the low level of mastery of phraseological units, as revealed through classroom observations, diagnostic tests, and analysis of students' written work; second, the absence of a comprehensive methodology that integrates cognitive, communicative, and linguo-cultural dimensions of phraseological instruction; and third, the urgent need to cultivate a bilingual linguistic personality as an expected outcome of competency-based education. The significance of the present study lies in its attempt to fill an existing methodological gap by implementing a systematic approach to phraseological instruction within the cognitive-communicative paradigm. The novelty of this research consists in the development of a scientifically grounded and practically applicable methodology for shaping a bilingual personality through the acquisition of expressive means of speech based

on Kazakh phraseological units.

Practical significance of the study includes the following contributions: (a) The development and empirical validation of an original methodology for teaching phraseological units focused on the development of expressive speech and bilingual linguistic personality; (b) The implemented system of exercises can be applied both in school practice and in teacher training programs for Kazakh language educators; (c) The research results can serve as a theoretical and methodological foundation for further studies in the fields of cognitive linguistics, pedagogy, and intercultural communication; (d) The proposed approaches foster not only speech-related but also interdisciplinary competencies in students, such as critical thinking, text interpretation, creativity, and emotional intelligence.

The main limitations of the research are associated with a restricted linguistic sample (limited to the Kazakh-Russian bilingual environment) and the exclusive use of qualitative analytical methods. The absence of quantitative assessments of phraseological competence acquisition indicates the need for further empirical investigation. This can be addressed by integrating a phraseological component into school textbooks and curricula as a means of developing expressive speech; supplementing instruction with contrastive analysis of Kazakh and Russian phraseological units; expanding experimental research to include other language pairs; and using multimodal psychotechnical exercises to deepen students' perceptual and speech awareness.

References

Avakova, R. A. (2023). *Phraseological Semantics*. Almaty, Kazak Universiteti.

Avakova, R. A., Tuimebaev, Z., Kudyarova, S. T., Dossanova, A. M., & Samatov, I. (2024). Semantics of Animalistic Phraseological Units in Turkic Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Philology: Science & Education, 196*(4). doi: https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh.2024.v196.i4.ph1

Baitursynov, A. (2022). *Tañdamaly şyğarmalary [Selected Works]*. Almaty.

Balakayev, M. B. (2006). *The Modern Kazakh Language: Syntax of Phrases and Simple Sentences*. Astana: ENU.

Botes, E., Dewaele, J.-M., & Greiff, S. (2022). Taking stock: A meta-analysis of the effects of foreign language enjoyment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 12*(2), 205-232. doi: https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.2.3

Chernova, N., Zyryanova, S. A., & Vukolova, E. A. (2019). Formation of communicative and pragmatic competence in phraseology among foreign philological students. *Religación: Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 4*(15), 189-194. Retrieved from https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/8274022.pdf

Dauletbekova, Z. T., Rai, K. M., Nabidullin, A. S., & Aldasheva, K. S. (2024). The Continuity of A. Baitursynuly's Theory of "Living Knowledge" and the Teachings of Al-farabi and Abai: A Methodology for Teaching the Kazakh Language. *Bulletin of KazNU. Pedagogical Series, 79*(2), 180-190. Retrieved from https://bulletin-pedagogic-sc.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-ped/article/view/1958

Davydova, M. A. (2023). Phraseological Units in the Theory and Practice of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language at an Advanced Stage: Usage and Occasional Use. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication,* (4), 159-169. doi: https://doi.org/10.55959/MSU-2074-1588-19-26-4-11

Dewaele, J.-M., Özdemir, C., Karci, D., Uysal, S., Özdemir, E. D., & Balta, N. (2022). How distinctive is the foreign language enjoyment and foreign language classroom anxiety of Kazakh learners of Turkish? *Applied Linguistics Review, 13*(2), 243-265. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0021

Duskaeva, L. (2021). *Speech Etiquette in Slavic Online Communities*. Springer. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81747-3

Eom, M., & Papi, M. (2022). Motivational principles underlying linguistic characteristics of second language writing. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 22*, 229-245. doi: https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.22..202203.229

Gizdatov, G. G. (2018). Psycholinguistic Study of the Concepts of Kazakhstani Discourse. *News of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Series of Social and Human Sciences, 5*(321), 57-63. doi: https://doi.org/10.32014/2018.2224-5294.10

Golovin, B. N. (1988). *Fundamentals of Speech Culture*. M.: Politizdat.

Irbutayeva, N. D., & Irbutayeva, P. Y. (2023). About Language and Speech Culture. In *Language. Education. Culture* (pp. 61-62). Kursk State Medical University. Retrieved from https://kpfu.ru/staff_files/F_1558248643/2023_Kursk__335_336_bit_.pdf

Ivanov, E. E. (2022). Functions of aphoristic units in the Russian language. *Russian Language Studies, 20*(2), 167-185. doi: https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-2-167-185

Karaulov, Y. N. (1987). *Russian Language and Language Personality*. Moscow: Nauka.

Kenesbaev, I. (2007). *Kazak tilinin frazeologijalyq sozdigi [Phraseological dictionary of Kazakh language]*. Almaty. Arys.

Khassenov, B. (2021). Sound Symbolism in the Proto-Turkic Language. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 27*(1), 102-114. doi: https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2021-2701-08

Kildiroglu, M., & Shakirova, K. M. (2023). Phraseological Units With a Somatic Component in the Kazakh

and Turkish Languages. *"Bulletin of the Kazakh State Technical University named after Abylai Khan, Philological Sciences Series", 71*(4). doi: https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2023.71.4.011

Luria, A. R. (2022). *Lectures on General Psychology*. St. Petersburg: Piter.

Nailyevna, Z. D. (2023). The Use of English as an Intermediary Language in Russian as A Foreign Language Classes AT A Higher Educational Institution. *JournalNX, 9*(5), 107-109. doi: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/P5M7Z

Nikolskaya, A. (2013). Grammatical and graphic means of expressing author's idea in modern English fiction prose. *Bulletin of Moscow State Linguistic University,* (26), 121-127. Retrieved from https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=21134398

Orazbayeva, F. S., & Dauletbekova, Z. T. (2021). Communicative-pragmatic Paradigm: The Importance and Possibilities of Forming a Culture of Pronunciation. *Eurasian Journal of Philology: Science & Education, 183*(3). doi: https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh.2021.v183.i3.ph5

Papi, M. (2021). The Role of Motivational and Affective Factors in L2 Writing Performance and Written Corrective Feedback Processing and Use. In R. M. Manchón & C. Polio (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Writing* (pp. 152-165). Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429199691-18

Polovina, L. V. (2023). The Phenomenon of Periphrasis in Modern Russian Language. *JournalNX, 9*(2), 94-98. doi: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/93WZ5

Rakhilina, E. (2010). Verbs of rotation in Russian and Polish. In V. Hasko & R. Perelmutter (Eds.), *New approaches to Slavic verbs of motion* (pp. 291-316). John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.115.17rak

Seidamat, A., & Aldash, A. (2024). Stylistics of the Literary Word: The Results of Scientific Analyses and New Research Findings. *Herald of the Treasury. Philological Series, 195*(3). Retrieved from https://philart.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-FIL/article/view/4849

Shakirova, A. M., Fahrutdinova, R. A., & Diuanova, R. K. (2021). Idioms as Phrasal Units in Teaching a Foreign Language in the Educational University Space. *Revista EntreLinguas, 7*(1), 66-75. doi: https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7iEsp1.14873

Shalkarbek, A., Kalybayeva, K., Shaharman, G., Baitileuova, G., & Duisenbayeva, R. (2024). Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Hyperbole-based Phraseological Expressions in Kazakh and English Languages. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 53*(1), 4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-024-10052-1

Smagulova, G. (2020a). *The Kazakh Phraseology in the Linguistic Paradigm*. Almaty. Retrieved from https://www.kaznu.kz/content/files/pages/folder21141/Verstka.pdf

Smagulova, G. (2020b). The Linguistic Image of the Turkic World in Phraseological Units. *Turkic Studies Journal, 2*(1), 63-71.

Turlybekova, I., & Nurkenova, S. (2024). National Phraseological Units of Speech Behavior in the Kazakh, Russian and English Languages. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik, 69*(1), 70-82. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/slaw-2024-0004

Uali, N. (2021). Akhmet Baitursynuly and actual problems of language culture (thesis of the report). *Tiltanym,* (2), 3-11. doi: https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2021-2-3-11

Ufimtseva, N. V. (2014). Russian Psycholinguistics: Contribution to the Theory of Intercultural Communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 23*(1), 1-13. Retrieved from https://www-s3-live.kent.edu/s3fs-root/s3fs-public/file/1-Ufimtseva.pdf

Varlamova, E., Kayumova, A., Tarasova, F., & Tarasov, A. (2022). Teaching Russian Phraseological Units at the Stage of Basic General Education in the Russian Federation: Challenges and Recommendations. In *INTED2022 Proceedings* (pp. 6772-6778). IATED. doi: https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2022.1714

Vasilyeva, A. L. (2019). Language ideology and identity construction in public educational meetings. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 12*(2), 146-166. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2019.1575453

Xasanova, S. (2024). Phraseological Units of the Russian Language. *Modern Science and Research, 3*(2), 128-133. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/30719

Zhonibekova, S. (2025). Linguoculturology: A Bridge Between Language and Culture. *Science Shine: International Scientific Journal, 1*(7(42)), 254-258. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-shine/article/view/80974

Zhubanov, K. (1999). *Research on the Kazakh Language*. Almaty: Nauka.