



SOCIOPRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN TEXTS RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

Oyshajon Boynazarkizi Rustamova ^{1,2}

Uzbekistan State World Languages University¹

General Education School No. 63, Yunusabad District, Tashkent city²

Abstract

This work is an attempt to clarify the importance of discourse markers in the educational process. Discourse markers, which have been studied under various labels such as discourse operators, pragmatic connectives, lemma, discourse connectives, and sentence connectives, are used in both spoken and written language to inform the structure of conversation. Widely used in research in this area shows how discourse markers are important in communication to mark discourse structure. The results show that discourse markers serve as useful manipulations for structuring and organizing texts relevant to educational processes.

Keywords: discourse markers, pragmatic connectives, discourse operators, teaching process.

I. INTRODUCTION

Discourse markers are expressions such as those in italics in the following sentences:

a. John was late. *So*, I decided to punish him

b. I can't drive a car. *And* Kim can't either.

c. Jane can speak three languages. *But* she has not been overseas.

Various names have been given by different groups of researchers, including keyphrases (Knott and Dale, 1994), discourse connectives (Blakemore, 1987, 1992), discourse operators (Redeker, 1990, 1991), and pragmatic connectives. Discourse markers (DM) (Van Dijk, 1979; Stubbs, 1983), pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1988, 1990; Schiffrin, 1987), and sentence associations (Halliday and Hasan, 1976), an article that has been the subject of linguistic research and appears every year.

DM is a linguistic device used by the speaker to signal how the next utterance unit or text relates to the current state of discourse (Schiffrin, 1987). For example, the DM can signal a change in discourse structure, such as “*by the way*” to mark the beginning of a digression or “*any way*” to mark the beginning of a digression. There are many DMs for task – oriented person – to – person interactions. This study does not claim to provide an in-depth examination of individual DMs. Our main concern here is to provide a broader and more diverse corpus-oriented.





II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

“Analysis of discourse markers is part of a broader analysis of discourse coherence – that is, how speakers and listeners collectively integrate form, meaning, and behavior to understand what is being said. You understand it” (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 49). Coherence relations, discourse relations, or rhetorical relations are different means of achieving discourse coherence. Although there are some similarities between rhetorical, discursive, and coherent relations, there are some differences between them, mainly in that rhetorical relations draw attention to the author’s intentions and the relation’s impact on the reader. There is a difference. An early reference to DM as part of discourse coherence and linguistic units was made by Labov and Fanshel (1977). Levinson (1983), in his book titled Pragmatics, considered DM as an independent class to study, but did not give it a title. In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the DM’s place in discourse, focusing on what it is, what it means, and how it functions. One of his most detailed attempts to examine elements that mark “sequentially dependent discourse units” was made by Schiffrin (1987), calling them “discourse markers”. Zwicky (1985) clearly shows an interest in discourse markers as a class, DM needs to be separated from other function words, they routinely appear at the beginning of sentences, and are prosodically autonomous. , is syntactically decoupled from the rest of the sentence.

They represent themselves and do not form unit changes with adjacent words. An utterance in this definition is an intentionally and structurally restricted, almost statutory entity (Redeker, 1991). As the owner of the same setting as Sanders et al. (1992), noting that coherence relations are aspects of the meaning of two or more discourse sentences that cannot be explained by sentence meaning alone, she proposes the following model of discourse coherence:

(a) **Ideationally**, When their utterances in a given context involve the speaker’s commitment to the existence of that relationship in the world the discourse portrays. For example, chronology, elaboration, cause, reason, and effect (Redeker, 1991, p. 1168).

(b) **Rhetorically**, The strongest relationship is not between the propositions expressed by the two units, but between the non – verbal intentions they convey. For example, Antithesis, Approval, Evidence, Justification, and Conclusion (Redeker, 1991, p. 1168).

(c) **Sequentially**, Paratactic relations (transitions between subjects or themes) or subordinate relations (comment, correction, paraphrase, aside, digression, or intermission clause) only between loosely related (or indirectly related) adjacent discourse clauses (Redeker, 1991, p. 1168).





A first obstacle in examining these markers that indicate coherence relationships concerns the precise definition of these markers. At Word Company, we can face: Discourse markers, discourse operators, discourse connectors, lexical markers, pragmatic connectors, lemmas, and various other terms coined and used by various researchers. Definitions are as varied as the terms used. Fraser (1999) argues that DM is a conjunction, adverb, and prepositional phrase that connects two phrases or phrases. Redeker (1990; 1991) suggests that DM links the current sentence or utterance to its immediate context, not just related sentences.

Multi grammaticality

From a grammatical point of view, DM is different. DM is diverse in terms of the heterogeneity of its categories (Bazzanella and Morra, 2000). They originate from various grammatical and vocabulary catalogs *rather than* forming a single well-defined grammatical class. By way of illustration, *yet, nor, for, and so*, etc. are coordinating conjunctions; *however, moreover, still*, etc. are conjunctive adverbs; *as soon as, although, until*, etc. are subordinating conjunctions; by way of illustration, *in the end, by the way*, etc. are prepositional phrases; *certainly, absolutely, surely*, etc. are adverbs; *this is the point, in other words*, and other expressions like those are meta – expressions. Not all of the above language elements are considered DMs. The functionality provided by DM is context sensitive. In other words, the DM's status is referenced contextually. For example, this can present a summary or clarification result, depending on the context in which it is used.

Indexicality

The DM serves as an indicator representation of the connections between upcoming discourse and current discourse. That is, assign logical connections to discourse units. DM is conceptless. Well etc.; partly conceptual, e.g. meaning “cause”; Frankly, it's the third most conceptually rich.

Optionality

Optionality is another key distinguishing factor of DM. They are both grammatically and semantically optional. That is, their use has nothing to do with the truth value of the statement. You can even omit them without confusing the syntax or changing the meaning. However, readers and listeners lack sufficient cues to successfully comprehend the relationships between discourses.

Finish your work, and *then* you can leave home, *whereas* others can not finish their work.





If your presentation is ready to present *then* you may call me, *whereas* some minor problems.

None of the above parameters are sufficient as a basis for determining whether a language element is DM. DM is therefore given practical importance.

Referential category

Working at the text level, DM shows the relationships between previous and subsequent activities in the course of discourse. Many relationships are indicated by conjunctions. For example, both *and* denote coordination and thus effect (cause), and *conversely* denote contrast, digression, or disjunction.

Structural category

DMs in this class mark links and transitions between topics. For example, a DM like *now, well, ok* indicates the beginning or end of a topic, but *second, third, next* is used to indicate order and is used to indicate a change of topic. DM indicates ongoing discourse. From an international perspective, the DM can affect turn-taking distribution. At this level, DMs can also indicate continuation of a particular topic (*yes*) and also serve as a means of summarizing ideas.

Cognitive category

At the text level, the DM is an informant about the author's cognitive state. Cognitive DM lets the reader form a mental picture of the ongoing discourse. *I think* the DM *I mean* shows the thought process.

III. RESULTS

A. Referential

In written language, conjunctions are used many times at the referential level to mark connections between existing and future discourse units. This level of DM reveals how discourse units are ordered and coordinated. It also shows causality (*because*), contrast (*while but, but*), consequentiality (*consequently*), and disjunction (*or*). As an example, you can use this type of reference marker to display discourse links.

Indicating causal relationship

DM helps show causality. Words like *because* can be used in discourse to indicate this type of relationship.

<1> He is preparing her scientific work *because* he wants to finish *since* april.

<2> John understands all topics *because of* teacher's explanation briefly



At the reference level, DM is used many times to indicate the relationship between existing utterances and previous utterances. DMs such as *but*, *although*, *however*, *though*, *yet*, *whilst*, *while*, and *and* are frequently used in teaching process to designate contrastive relationships amongst units of discourse.

<1> Theme is not teach understandable way. *However*, students can acquire main notes for themselves.

<2> *Although* data on topics are not good, teacher try to explain to pupils.

Indicating Comparison

Another feature DMs exploit to signal is to display comparisons.

<1> Just water these plants twice a week, and *likewise* the ones in the classroom.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this study, we propose a central functional paradigm for DM and examine different uses of DM in texts relevant to education. Also, because DM research is in its early stages, until there is greater agreement on the function of individual elements, their importance, their relevance to educational contexts, and their calculated values as actual numbers, marker It is too early to build a complete taxonomy for true category. At the reference level, the DM specifies the relationships between texts before and after the DM. These textual relationships include causes, contrasts, adjustments, separations, consequences, digressions, comparisons, etc., DMs are called upon to organize ongoing discourse and provide connections such as transitions between topics to gestures, e.g. to indicate turns, change topics, and form opinions. Cognitively, they help label the speaker's thought process and mark modifications such as restating and elaborating. This result is consistent with evidence from a growing body of pragmatic research that pragmatics contributes to the management and development of discourse and plays an important textual function. Referential and structural markers such as *and*, *but*, *while*, *or*, and *but* tend to occur more frequently than such cognitive markers. Our analysis goes beyond just deepening our knowledge of DM. We hope that this will also affect teaching and learning, as improper use of DM can lead to misunderstandings, difficulties in coherent interpretation, and impairment of text relationships.

REFERENCES

1. Knott, A. and Dale, R. (1994). Using linguistic phenomena to motivate a set of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes* 18 (1), 35-62.
2. Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 367-381.





3. Davood Mashhadi Heidar and Reza Biria. (2011). Sociopragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers. in International Law Texts Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 1479-1487, ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland.
4. Redeker, G. (1991). Review article: Linguistic markers of linguistic structure. *Linguistics*, 29 (6), 1139-72.
5. Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Labov, W. and D. Fanshel. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
7. Zwicky, A. (1985). Clitics and particles. *Language*, 61, 283-305.

