



DISCOURSE MARKERS AND LOGICAL CONNECTORS AS MEANS OF TEXTUAL COHERENCE IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UZBEK JOURNALISM

Abdulloeva Shakhzoda Jamshedovna

The Master Student of the first course of SamSIFL

Scientific supervisor: Sarimsokov Sirojiddin Shoyzokovich

PhD, Acting Associate Professor of SamSIFL

Annotatsiya. Mazkur maqolada zamonaviy ingliz va o'zbek jurnalistik diskursida matnning yaxlitligi va mantiqiy izchilligini ta'minlovchi vosita sifatida diskurs markerlari va mantiqiy bog'lovchilarning qo'llanilishi hamda tarjimasi tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot sifat jihatidan qiyosiy metod asosida olib borilib, parallel jurnalistik matnlarda diskurs markerlarining tarjimada saqlanishi, almashtirilishi, tushirib qoldirilishi yoki qo'shimcha kiritilishi holatlari aniqlanadi. Natijalar ingliz va o'zbek tillari o'rtasidagi strukturaviy va pragmatik tafovutlar tarjima strategiyalariga bevosita ta'sir ko'rsatishini tasdiqlaydi. Tadqiqot matn kohesiyasini saqlashda funksional ekvivalentlik va diskurs darajasidagi moslashuv muhim ekanini ko'rsatadi.

Kalit so'zlar: diskurs markerlari, mantiqiy bog'lovchilar, matn kohesiyasi, jurnalistika, tarjima, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются дискурсивные маркеры и логические коннекторы как средства обеспечения текстовой связности в современной английской и узбекской журналистике. На основе качественного сопоставительного анализа параллельных публицистических текстов выявляются основные стратегии перевода дискурсивных маркеров: сохранение, замена, опущение и добавление. Результаты исследования показывают, что перевод данных единиц обусловлен структурными, стилистическими и культурными различиями между английским и узбекским языками. Делается вывод о необходимости функциональной эквивалентности и дискурсивной адаптации для сохранения связности и коммуникативной эффективности текста.

Ключевые слова: дискурсивные маркеры, логические коннекторы, текстовая связность, журналистика, перевод, английский язык, узбекский язык.

Annotation. This article investigates the use and translation of discourse markers and logical connectors as means of textual coherence in modern English and Uzbek journalism. Based on a qualitative comparative analysis of parallel journalistic texts, the study examines how discourse markers are rendered in translation and identifies major translation strategies, including retention, substitution, omission, and addition. The findings demonstrate that discourse markers undergo systematic modification due to structural, stylistic, and cultural differences between the two languages. The study highlights the importance of functional equivalence and discourse-level adaptation in achieving coherence and communicative effectiveness in media translation.

Key words: discourse markers, logical connectors, textual coherence, journalism, translation, English, Uzbek.



INTRODUCTION

Discourse markers (DMs) and logical connectors constitute essential linguistic devices that ensure textual coherence and logical continuity in modern journalistic discourse. In both English and Uzbek journalism, these units' function to organize information flow, signal logical relations between propositions, and guide readers through complex argumentative structures. Typical English discourse markers such as *however*, *therefore*, *meanwhile*, and *on the other hand* correspond to Uzbek equivalents like *ammo*, *shuning uchun*, *bu orada*, and *boshqa tomondan*, though their functional distribution and pragmatic load may vary across languages.

In journalistic texts, discourse markers play a crucial role in maintaining cohesion by linking sentences and paragraphs, emphasizing contrast, cause-effect relations, temporal sequencing, and argumentative shifts [4]. They contribute to the rational progression of ideas, enhance textual clarity, and support the persuasive and informative functions of media discourse. However, despite their apparent semantic equivalence, discourse markers often pose significant challenges in translation due to differences in discourse conventions, stylistic norms, and cultural expectations inherent in English and Uzbek media practices.

This article investigates the use and translation of discourse markers and logical connectors in modern English and Uzbek journalistic texts, with particular attention to linguistic, stylistic, and cultural factors influencing their selection and rendering [5]. The analysis focuses on how translators adapt discourse-organizing elements to preserve textual coherence and communicative effectiveness, while accommodating language-specific patterns of discourse organization. By examining parallel journalistic texts, the research aims to reveal strategies employed to achieve cohesion and logical consistency in cross-linguistic media translation.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The article employs a qualitative comparative methodology to investigate the role of discourse markers and logical connectors in ensuring textual coherence in modern English and Uzbek journalistic discourse. The research corpus consists of a range of non-literary journalistic texts, including news reports, analytical articles, editorials, and opinion pieces published in reputable English-language media outlets and their Uzbek translations.

The selected English source texts and Uzbek target texts were matched in terms of genre, communicative purpose, topical relevance and translation quality, ensuring comparability. Special attention was paid to discourse markers and logical connectors functioning at intersentential and interparagraph levels.



The analysis focuses on identifying the translation strategies applied to discourse markers, namely:

- literal (word-for-word) translation,
- functional substitution,
- omission, and
- paraphrasing or restructuring to achieve discourse-level equivalence [3].

To support systematic data collection, textual analysis software was used to extract and categorize discourse markers and logical connectors from the corpus. The automatically generated results were subsequently verified through manual contextual analysis, which allowed for the evaluation of pragmatic appropriateness and coherence-preserving functions in translation.

In addition, native speakers of English and Uzbek were consulted to assess the naturalness, acceptability, and communicative effectiveness of translated discourse markers. Their judgments were used to determine whether the translated units successfully preserved logical relations, argumentative flow, and overall textual cohesion in journalistic discourse.

Contrastive discourse markers:

However, the government denied the allegations. → Ammo hukumat bu ayblovlarni rad etdi.

Cause–effect logical connectors:

Therefore, stricter regulations were introduced. → Shuning uchun qat'iyroq tartib-qoidalar joriy etildi.

Temporal discourse markers:

Meanwhile, negotiations continued behind closed doors. → Bu orada muzokaralar yopiq eshiklar ortida davom etdi.

Reformulation through paraphrasing:

On the other hand, experts warn of long-term risks. → Biroq mutaxassislar uzoq muddatli xavflar mavjudligini ta'kidlamoqda.

Omission with compensation:

So, the decision sparked public debate. → Bu qaror jamoatchilikda keng muhokamalarga sabab bo'ldi.

The methodological framework allows for a nuanced examination of how discourse markers and logical connectors function as key mechanisms of textual coherence in English and Uzbek journalism. By combining corpus-based tools, qualitative contextual analysis, and native-speaker evaluation, the study ensures a reliable assessment of how logical relations and discourse flow are preserved or transformed in translation [1].



RESULTS

The findings of the study demonstrate that discourse markers and logical connectors undergo systematic modification in translation from English into Uzbek journalistic texts. These transformations are not random but reflect language-specific discourse conventions, stylistic norms of journalism, and the need to maintain textual coherence and logical clarity in the target language. Four major translation patterns were identified: retention, substitution, omission, and addition [2].

Retention. In many cases, English discourse markers were retained through the use of direct functional equivalents in Uzbek. This strategy was particularly frequent when the logical relation expressed by the discourse marker is similarly grammaticalized and stylistically acceptable in both journalistic traditions.

Therefore, the reform was widely criticized. → Shuning uchun islohot keng tanqid qilindi.

Substitution. A significant number of discourse markers were translated through functional substitution, whereby the English marker was replaced with a more idiomatic or stylistically preferred Uzbek expression. This pattern reflects the tendency of Uzbek journalistic discourse to favor concise and culturally conventional connectors.

On the other hand, analysts remain skeptical. → Boshqa tomondan, tahlilchilar hanuz shubha bilan qaramoqda.

In less formal or opinion-based journalistic genres, the same marker was often rendered as: *Boshqa tarafdin, tahlilchilar ehtiyotkorlikka chaqirmoqda.*

Omission. The analysis also revealed cases where discourse markers were omitted in the Uzbek translation. This typically occurred when the logical or temporal relationship was already evident from sentence structure or contextual sequencing, making the explicit marker redundant.

Meanwhile, negotiations continued in the capital. → Muzokaralar poytaxtda davom etdi.

Addition. In some instances, translators introduced additional discourse markers in the Uzbek target text to strengthen logical relations that were only implicitly conveyed in the English source text. This strategy was mainly employed to enhance argumentative clarity and reader comprehension.

The data confirms the initial assumptions. → Demak, ma'lumotlar dastlabki taxminlarni tasdiqlaydi.

The findings suggest that discourse markers and logical connectors function as flexible yet essential tools of textual coherence in modern English and Uzbek



journalism. While direct equivalence is often possible, translators frequently rely on substitution, omission, or addition to align the discourse structure with the stylistic and pragmatic norms of Uzbek media texts. These strategies collectively ensure that logical relations, coherence, and communicative effectiveness are preserved across languages.

DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that such units are rarely transferred through rigid word-for-word correspondence; instead, they are frequently adjusted to conform to the structural, stylistic, and pragmatic norms of the target language. This supports the view that discourse markers operate not only as semantic units but also as discourse-regulating devices sensitive to language-specific conventions.

One of the most significant challenges identified in English–Uzbek translation is the structural asymmetry between the two languages. English journalistic discourse tends to rely heavily on explicit discourse markers to signal logical relations, such as contrast, cause–effect, or clarification. Uzbek journalism, by contrast, often achieves coherence through syntactic organization, contextual inference, and implicit logical sequencing, reducing the need for overt connectors. The discussion underscores that discourse markers and logical connectors are key instruments of textual coherence whose translation demands a balance between formal accuracy and functional adequacy. Successful translation in modern English and Uzbek journalism depends on the translator’s ability to interpret discourse-level meaning and adapt it in accordance with target-language norms and audience expectations.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined the role of discourse markers and logical connectors as key mechanisms of textual coherence in modern English and Uzbek journalism. The analysis demonstrates that discourse markers are not merely optional lexical elements, but function as crucial organizers of information flow, logical relations, and argumentative structure in media texts. Their presence or absence significantly influences textual clarity, readability, and communicative effectiveness.

The findings reveal that the translation of discourse markers from English into Uzbek is inherently dynamic and adaptive. Rather than relying on rigid word-for-word equivalence, translators employ a range of strategies including retention, substitution, omission, and addition to align discourse organization with the linguistic, stylistic, and cultural norms of Uzbek journalistic discourse. This variation reflects structural differences between the two languages, particularly



English's preference for explicit logical connectors and Uzbek's reliance on syntactic structure and implicit cohesion.

References:

1. Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931–952.
2. Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Baker, M. (2018). In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
4. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
5. Nord, C. (2005). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
6. Karimov, B. (2017). O'zbek publitsistik matnlarida matn bog'lanishi va diskurs vositalari. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 3, 45–52.

