



DISCOURSE MARKERS IN CREATING TEXT COHESION

Sultonova Nilufar

2nd year, Master's Department, UzSWLU

Sc.Advisor: PhD, Associate professor

Bazarbayeva A.M.

Associate professor

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7631637>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 01-fevral 2023 yil

Ma'qullandi: 06-fevral 2023 yil

Nashr qilindi: 11-fevral 2023 yil

KEY WORDS

There are many linguistic devices that provide cohesive link in discourse. .

ABSTRACT

In today's contemporary world, the role of English is crucial as all spheres of communication require at least the basic level of competence in this language. The problem of creating coherent discourses for both native and non-native language users is of utmost importance.

In today's contemporary world, the role of English is crucial as all spheres of communication require at least the basic level of competence in this language. The problem of creating coherent discourses for both native and non-native language users is of utmost importance.

There are many linguistic devices that provide cohesive link in discourse. One of them is obviously so called "discourse markers", the topic that the current project attempts to investigate. The role of DMs in a language system is significant as they result the taxonomy of coherence relations.

With regard to history, "discourse markers" is one of the linguistic terms appeared during the late 20th century. As B. Fraser points out (1999, p.932), many scholars understood their meaning differently as well as called them with variety versions: cue phrases (Knott and Dale 1994), discourse connectives (Blakemore 1987, 1992), discourse operators (Redeker, 1990, 1991), discourse particles (Schorup, 1985), discourse signaling devices (Polanyi and Scha, 1983), phatic connectives (Bazanella, 1990), pragmatic connectives (van Dijk, 1979; Stubbs, 1983), pragmatic expressions (Erman, 1992), pragmatic formatives (Fraser, 1987), pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1988, 1990; Schiffrin, 1987) and etc. (B. Fraser, 1999:932)

Levinson was the first person who considered DMs to be worthy for investigation as they make a relationship between a current unit and the previous context. Although he did not name this linguistic phenomenon with an exact term, he mentioned some DMs such as *but, therefore, in conclusion, to the contrary, still, however, anyway, well, besides, actually, all in all, so, after all* to be presented in the text with the function of response, continuation or some proportion of the prior discourse. (Levinson, 1983:87-88)

According to Schiffrin DMs support "contextual coordinates for utterances". She suggested that these markers identify how what is being said is connected with what has been said before. In her book, she laid out eleven

markers (*and, because, but, I mean, now, oh, or, so, then, well, and y'know*) in detail as the builders of coherence in discourse, namely during interaction between speaker and hearer. (Schiffrin, 1987:31)

Within several decades there has been written perceptible number of articles, research papers on the topic of DMs, in spite of the fact that there has not been a final arrangement between scholars regarding their terminology, classification and functionality yet.

Discourse is a written or spoken form of the language that serve to present an idea or information. As Halliday and Hasan stated, it is not the simple sequence of sentences like bricks put one upon one, but it is a whole semantic unit which is connected logically and cohesively. This connection in the discourse is provided by some linguistic expressions, so called "discourse markers". DMs are words like "but", "and", "well" and others that provide coherence relations between utterances in both written or spoken discourse. Without suitable and adequate discourse marker the text would not seem logically constructed. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:226)

Halliday and Hasan mention five main cohesive devices in their book: reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion and conjunction. Among them conjunctions, or cohesive connectors that are regarded as DMs, blend sentences, clauses or paragraphs to each other. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:291)

Brown and Levinson deem that as a linguistic device, discourse markers are crucial factor for both formal and informal language of a native speaker. The mastery in utilizing them improves the level of fluency and conveys the high capacity of authentic material production and perception. (Brown and Levinson, 1987:35)

Discourse markers do not possess any independent meaning on their own like content words. They only present a grammatical function to relate the previous and the following utterance as well as indicate the speaker's attitude to what is being said. Therefore, they are grammatical-functioning words. (www.warwick.ac.uk)

We can classify DMs on the basis of their utilization in various occasions or their meaning. DMs may vary in spoken and written discourse. In other words, some markers are active in spoken language but are not used in the same function in a written text while others are used only in written form owing to being more formal.

There are some DMs that we use in spoken context: *anyway, like, right, you know, fine, now, so, I mean, good, oh, well, as I say, great, Okay, mind you, for a start...*

The following DMs are commonly utilized in a written discourse: *firstly, in addition, moreover, on the other hand, secondly, in conclusion, on the one hand, to begin with, thirdly, in sum...*

Despite their discrepancy in oral or written texts we can classify DMs in terms of their various cohesive functions:

1. DMs to order what we say (DMs are widely supported in the text to provide the coherence relations such as the sequence and order): *and, and then, first, firstly, for a start, in general, in the end, last of all, next, on top of that, second, secondly, so, lastly, thirdly, to sum up, what's more, well...*

2. DMs to indicate the cause and effect: *since, as, because, that is the reason why, owing to, due to, on account of, because of, so, therefore, consequently, as a result, hence, thus, resulting in,...*

3. DMs to give an example: *for example, for instance, to illustrate this, an example of this is, taking an example, such as, namely, like,...*

4. DMs to show a contrast: *but, whereas, while, however, although/though, nevertheless, nonetheless, in contrast, in comparison, yet, on the other hand, in spite of, despite, unlike, as opposed to,...*

5. DMs to draw conclusion: *to summarize, in conclusion, in sum, to conclude, to sum up, in summary,...*

6. DMs to add information: *and, not only...,but also, in addition, additionally, moreover, furthermore, too, as well as, plus, also,...*

In a nutshell, it is obvious that the study towards DMs never can be said to be completed. There are more and more uninvestigated sides of this topic, thus, the research is going to be continued. This is due to the fact that the role of DMs in creating discourse is overwhelming since it provides the link between fragments and parts, makes the meaning obvious and cohesive. Without correct use of DMs, both text production and perception process seems as unfinished or challenging. Therefore, we can conclude that as an important part of English grammar DMs are indispensable for creating semantic bonds of the text. The aforementioned study can be one more step for the deeper investigation of DMs and utilized in higher level English courses.

References:

1. Brown P. & Levinson S. Politeness. Some universals in language usage. –Cambridge University press: Cambridge, 1983. -p.35
 2. B. Fraser. What are discourse markers? Journal of Pragmatics 31, 1999.-p.932
 3. Halliday M. & Hasan R. Cohesion in English. –London: Longman, 1976. -p.291
 4. Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. -p.87-88
 5. Schiffrin D. Discourse markers. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. -p.31
- Internet sources
6. www.warwick.ac.uk