Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ISSN (Print) 2616-678X. ISSN (Online) 2663-1288

ЛИНГВИСТИКА / LINGUISTICS / ЛИНГВИСТИКА

DOI: https://doi org/10.32523/2616-678X-2025-153-4-62-74

IRSTI 16.01.11
Research article

A.M. Dossanova[1], A.M. Maral[2*], R.N. Sharshova[3]
[1,2] Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[3]International Information Technology University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
*(E-mail: [1]adossanova@gmail.com; [*2]maralqyzy.arailym@gmail.com; [3]r.sharshova@iitu.edu.kz)*

LINGUOPRAGMATIC FEATURES OF THE DISCOURSE MARKERS

Abstract. This article analyzes the linguopragmatic features of discourse markers based on the material of modern Kazakh-language podcasts. The relevance of the research is due to the rapid development of podcasts in Kazakh language, which reflect new trends in modern oral speech. The paper reveals the functions of discourse markers, including their role in the organization of speech, the formation of interaction between speaker and listener, as well as in the transmission of modality and emotional coloring of utterance. The research used methods of contextual and structural analysis, continuous sampling and observation. Transcribed audio recordings of podcasts were used as the main material. Discourse markers are classified as regulatory and organizing, and their pragmatic functions in media discourse are considered comprehensively. The results of the study show that discourse markers play an important role in ensuring the coherence of the text and effective communication in oral speech. The practical significance of the work lies in the possibility of using the data obtained to develop communication skills, improve linguopragmatic competence and analyze media texts. This study reveals the features of the functioning and classification of discourse markers in Kazakh language and can serve as a basis for further applied and theoretical research.

Keywords: discourse markers, linguopragmatic feature, language podcasts, media discourse, colloquial speech, communication.

Түсті: *22.05.2025; Жөнделді: 18.12.2025; Мақұлданды: 23.12.2025; Онлайн қолжетімді: 29.12.2025*

Introduction

Discourse markers are essential pragmatic units that enable the organization of speech, the maintenance of logical coherence, and the regulation of interaction between the speaker and the listener. They perform functions such as indicating the structure of an utterance, signaling topic shifts, clarifying information, expressing evaluative or emotional nuances, and conveying communicative intentions such as agreement, disagreement, doubt, or objection. Therefore, discourse markers are regarded as key indicators of discourse organization, textual cohesion, and the speaker's pragmatic strategies.

Although the issue of discourse markers has been widely explored in global linguistics through the works of scholars such as Schiffrin, Fraser, Blakemore, and Lenk, their classifications are predominantly based on the systems of English or Russian. In Kazakh linguistics, discourse markers have emerged as an independent field of study only in recent years. Researchers such as E. Zhanpeisov, G. Ersultanova, S. Mustafina, and A. Zhumagulova have examined various aspects of discourse markers, including modality, evaluation, textual coherence, and pragmatic intention. However, the manifestation of discourse markers in natural spoken Kazakh – particularly in new media formats such as podcasts–has not yet been thoroughly investigated.

In today's information and communication environment, podcasts represent a new model of authentic language interaction. They are characterized by dialogic speech, dynamic speaker interplay, and a clearly expressed emotional and pragmatic tone. Therefore, examining discourse markers in Kazakh-language podcasts provides valuable insight into the structure of natural spoken discourse, the pragmatic strategies used by speakers, and the communicative norms of contemporary Kazakh speech**.**

This study aims to analyze the linguopragmatic features of discourse markers in Kazakh-language podcasts. It identifies their types, frequency of use, and their functions in structuring discourse and regulating communication. The findings contribute to the study of media discourse in the Kazakh language, refine theoretical models of discourse markers through empirical data, and provide insights into the pragmatic potential of contemporary Kazakh.

Materials and Methods

As the research material, audio recordings of the *"Kitapal"* and *"Ulagat qory"* podcasts, which are widely popular in the contemporary Kazakh-speaking media space, were selected. The choice of these podcasts was not incidental: they target a modern Kazakh audience and contain naturally occurring linguistic patterns shaped within an informal communicative environment. This makes them a rich source for the frequent and functional use of discourse markers. Most episodes are structured in the form of free conversation or interviews, allowing for the identification of pragmatic elements such as agreement, disagreement, clarification, and attention-directing strategies. Moreover, the podcasts cover a wide range of topics–including literature, language, culture, education, and social issues–which enables a comprehensive analysis of the contextual features of discourse markers.

The total duration of the collected audio material exceeds five hours. All recordings were transcribed, and discourse markers were systematically extracted and analyzed.

Literature Review

In the *Dictionary of Sociolinguistic Terms*, discourse practice is defined as "various types of communicative activities within a particular context or sphere of interaction" (Aleumettik lingvistikalyq terminder sozdigi, 2020). Discourse markers, in turn, are linguistic units that play

an essential role in the pragmatic functioning of language by facilitating the optimal organization of communicative discourse.

In foreign linguistic studies (primarily in English), discourse markers are often classified as coordinating conjunctions (e.g., and, but, or), subordinating conjunctions (e.g., because, although), modal words, articles, and functional word clusters (Schiffrin, 1987). However, such classifications are specific to the grammatical system of English. Kazakh does not possess articles, and conjunctions and particles are not treated as independent parts of speech but rather as components of functional words (Orazbaeva, 2000). Therefore, classifying discourse markers in Kazakh based on the lexical and grammatical features of the national language is considered more appropriate.

According to A. A. Kibrik, discourse markers are special linguistic units that help structure discourse, reflect the speaker's cognitive processes, and regulate the addressee's perception. Thus, the researcher emphasizes the cognitive dimension when characterizing discourse markers (Kibrik, 2003).

According to Yu Lenk, "discourse markers are pragmatic units with structural and organizational functions" (Lenk, 1998). Furthermore, Lenk argues that "discourse markers are a subclass of communicative units associated with expressing politeness, indicating the speaker's attitude toward the utterance, and maintaining social prestige." From this perspective, they operate at the interpersonal level of discourse (Lenk, 2005). Redecker defines these linguistic units as "words or phrases that direct the listener's attention to how the subsequent utterance relates to the immediate discursive context" (Redecker, 1991).

He also notes that "any discourse–whether text, monologue, or dialogue–consists of micro-communicative units that organize the structure of discourse" (Redecker, 1991). One of the essential characteristics of discourse is its structural cohesion and connectivity. In this regard, discourse markers enhance cohesion between communicative elements and contribute to the grammatical and semantic integrity of discourse.

The first linguist to study discourse markers was Deborah Schiffrin. Her work Discourse Markers (1987) is considered one of the most influential studies in the field. She approached discourse markers as pragmatic tools that establish the logic of communication and link its elements (Schiffrin, 1987). Schiffrin classifies discourse markers into eleven types:

– Coordinating and subordinating conjunctions *(and, but, or, because)*
– Temporal and conjunctive adverbs (*now, then, so)*
– Fillers (*oh, well)*
– Parenthetical expressions (*you know, I mean)*

According to Schiffrin, the primary function of discourse markers is to ensure textual cohesion (formal connectivity). She notes that "discourse markers do not create the relationship between discourse segments but rather indicate it" (Schiffrin, 1987).

Fraser (1996), in his book Pragmatic Markers, provides a classification of discourse markers into four main groups:

– *Basic markers*
– *Commentary markers*
– *Parallel markers*
– *Discourse markers*

Basic markers include:

– Markers indicating the type of speech act
– Performatives: *I swear, I promise*

ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

– Pragmatic idioms: *Excuse me, may I ask…, If you have time, may I ask a question?*

Commentary markers include:

– Evaluative: f*ortunately*
– Evidential: *possibly*
– Source of information: *They say*
– Mitigating: *If I am not mistaken*

Parallel markers: Vocatives used to draw the listener's attention without formally entering the sentence structure, e.g., *My dear.*

– Discourse markers include:
– Topic shift: *by the way*
– Contrastive markers: *but, however, although*
– Additive markers*: so, in other words, also, more than that, particularly, and, or*

Conclusive markers: *that is why, accordingly* (Fraser, 1996).

Blakemore (2002) attempted to reveal discourse markers from a pragmatic perspective, emphasizing that their meaning and function can only be fully understood in the specific context of speech. She examined them within the framework of relevance theory, showing how they help identify what information is important and appropriate for the listener.

Bauer-Ramazani (2025), in his work English Discourse Markers, identifies four types of discourse markers necessary for constructing English sentences:

Coordinating conjunctions

Connectors

Subordinating conjunctions

Phrase linkers

Discourse markers have also been studied in Russian linguistics. Researchers emphasize their direct connection to discourse organization. According to Vinogradov (2010), these units lack denotative meaning and can only be described through actual usage. In Russian linguistics, the term "discourse markers" is not widely used; they are often categorized as modal words (Vinogradov, 1950).

Shmelev (2003) highlights that discourse words play a crucial role in conveying speaker evaluations and opinions. His study shows that these markers allow speakers to express their stance beyond merely delivering information and regulate the pragmatic connection with the listener (Shmelev, 2003).

Dobrovolsky (2000) extensively analyzes the role of discourse markers in text structure, noting that they organize the flow of speech logically, contribute to coherent idea development, and ensure internal textual integrity (Dobrovolsky, 2000). Kubryakova (2004) approaches discourse markers from a cognitive perspective, arguing that they play a significant role not only linguistically but also in the semantic structures of thought, reflecting cognitive processes. That is, discourse markers are not merely speech tools but indicators of human cognitive activity (Kubryakova, 2004).

Based on the works of Russian scholars such as Baranov, Karasik, and Babaeva, discourse markers can be characterized as follows: "Discourse words are not natural language units. Their features are not clearly defined and may include elements classified into different categories and sentences" (Baranov et al., 1993). Babaeva (2008) notes that, while discourse markers are not obligatory components of speech, they provide contextual cues that facilitate understanding and serve as pragmatic indicators regulating interaction between communicants. According to her,

discourse markers convey the speaker's attitude, intention, anticipation, and emotional tone, guiding the correct interpretation of the utterance. Thus, discourse words function as central linguistic tools in the pragmatic organization of communication (Babaeva, 2008).

Many words of this type also have non-discursive uses, which often bear no semantic connection with their discursive function. Consequently, researchers usually describe discursive functions separately from other usages. Determining the boundary between the meaning of discourse words and the context is a more complex process than for specific lexical items.

In Kazakh linguistics, the study of discourse markers has recently emerged as a distinct scientific field. However, its theoretical foundations were established much earlier. For example, Zhanpeisov (1981) analyzed the pragmatic function of modal words in speech acts, revealing their communicative role for the first time (Zhanpeisov, 1981). These studies provide a basis for understanding the formation of discourse markers in Kazakh and their pragmatic characteristics.

Ersultanova (2010) analyzes texts in the journalistic style to show how discourse markers contribute to conveying the author's stance and influencing the reader or listener. A key aspect of her study is "the attempt to uncover the pragmatic intent behind linguistic signs" (Ersultanova, 2010).

Mustafina (2006) demonstrates the role of discourse markers in maintaining logical structure and coherence within texts, arguing that they unify ideas and connect different parts of a text (Mustafina, 2006).

Recent studies continue discourse marker research from new methodological perspectives. In particular, Zhumagulova (2021) examines them from a linguosynergetic perspective, highlighting their complex function in organizing speech. She considers discourse words not only as tools for connecting texts but also as components conveying thought flow, emotion, pragmatic intent, and listener-oriented nuances. Zhumagulova emphasizes the dynamics of interaction between speaker and listener, illustrating the significance of discourse markers in this exchange. Her research provides new impetus for analyzing discourse words in Kazakh, allowing a deeper understanding of their pragmatic and cognitive nature (Zhumagulova, 2021).

In Kazakh, discourse markers can be categorized lexically and grammatically as follows:

Modal words – indicate speaker opinion, probability, or certainty *(arine, balkim, sira)*

Parenthetical and attention-directing components *(qaranyz, aityp oteyin, aitpaqshy)*

Fillers – convey emotional or relational meaning, often in interrogative or affirming constructions *(goi, ma, ba/be, gana, qoi, degendei)*

Deictics – indicate time, place, or person *(osy, anau, munda, sonda, sol, bul)*

Emphatics – reinforce ideas or indicate certainty *(arine, sozsiz, shynynda, kamil, aniq)*

Emotional-expressive elements *(massagan, uau, oibai, oipai-ai, ah, phuh)*

The changing means of communication have prompted reconsideration of the functions of discourse words. A modern type of media discourse, the podcast, presents a new model of interactive communication between listener and speaker. Suleimenova (2006) emphasizes: "Today, it is crucial to consider language in dynamic interaction with a rapidly changing world and the era of new technologies. This is directly connected to increased possibilities for individuals and society to receive, store, and disseminate information, the emergence of new text genres, and the renewal of existing genres and styles" (Suleimenova, 2006). These changes affect the nature and structure of discourse and necessitate a re-evaluation of the functions and scope of discourse markers.

Results and Discussion

The selection of Kazakh-language podcasts such as *Kitapal* and *Ulagat Qory* as research material was not incidental. These podcasts are widely popular among contemporary Kazakh-speaking audiences and provide communication patterns realized in authentic linguistic contexts. Since their content is based on genres such as interviews and discussions, it allows for the observation of the natural use of discourse markers and the analysis of their pragmatic functions. Audio recordings of the educational podcasts Kitapal and Ulagat Qory, each exceeding five hours, were transcribed, and discourse markers were identified and categorized into groups. The study revealed that discourse markers are widely used in these podcasts. These markers assist in regulating the interaction between the speaker and the listener, structuring the text, and conveying ideas clearly.

In this study, the classification of discourse markers was based on S. A. Andreeva's framework, distinguishing between regulative discourse markers and organizational discourse markers (Andreeva, 2005).

1. Regulative discourse markers are a type of discourse used to express the subjective opinions of participants in communication.

Table 1 – Types of Regulative Discourse Markers

Function	Type of Discourse Marker	Example
Markers indicating the truthfulness of the information	*arine, sozsiz, ras, shyn aitsam*	"*Arine*, mumkindik bolsa, nege korsetpeske?" "*Arine*, surandyzdar, quana zhwap beremin!" "*Shyn aitsam*, alghashqy bolimi onsha unamady, biraq keyin qyzikty bolyp ketti" "*Ras*, bul baylanis bar ekan. Endi ozingdi bagalauga qayta kelsek."
Markers clarifying the information	*tek, aitpakshy, tipti, tagy, odan bolek*	"Otbasymmen ***tek*** qazakhsha soilesemin" "Til ***tek*** soilesu quraly emes, ol senin kozkarasyngdy keneytedi" "***Aitpakshy*** bul taqyrip podcast-ta zhi koteriledi"
Markers expressing the author's personal stance	*meninshhe, menin oiyymsha, okinishke orai*	**"Meninshhe,** bul kitap kez kelgen oqyrman ushyn ozekti" **"Meninshhe**, zhapon tili, oiytkeni ieroglifter men grammatika ote erekshe" **"Okinishke karai,** biz bul sukhbattyng tolyq nusqasin jazyp ulgermedik"
Markers organizing and structuring information logically	*mysaly, aldymen, keyin, sonymen qatar, sonday-ak*	"*Mysaly*, zhapon tilinde soilegende ozimdi tartip-tirek sezinemin" "*Mysaly*, pizza, pasta, oneri – bari tartymdy" "*Aldymen* negizgi sozderdi zhattaymin: salem, rakhmet, qalaisyn degen siaqty"
Evaluative markers	*ashyghyn aityndanda, shynymen de*	**"*Shynymen de*,** bul taqyrip ote mahnymdy" ***Shynymen de*** biz kobirek konil boluimiz kerek"

Accentuating markers	*En bastysy, asirese, mahnymdysy*	"Qazaq tilin kitap oku arqyly damyttym, ***asirese*** adebi shygharmalar" "Frantsuz tilinin aityluwy qyiyn boldy, ***asirese*** 'r' dybysy" "Tilder arqashan mahnymdy bolady, ***asirese*** zhandanu kezinde"
Emotive markers	*uau, keremet, massagan*	"*Uau*, sen nagyz talantsyng goi!" "*Uau*, Madi, sen polyglotsyn dep estidik, 7 til bilesin" "Naruto ma? *Keremet* eken" Ia, "Itewon Klass" degen dramany usinamyn. Onda da tabandylyk pen arman turaly aitylady. *Keremet*, qarau kerek eken". "***Massagan***, buny estigende shok boldym"

2. Organizational discourse markers are markers that help structure discourse and establish logical connections between text fragments. They are linguistic units that ensure structural coherence in spoken or written language. They indicate the logical structure of the text, the sequential flow of ideas, and facilitate easier comprehension of information for the listener or reader.

These markers are further subdivided into three types:

Causal markers

Contrastive and clarifying markers

Referential and recall markers

Organizational markers facilitate discourse structuring and maintain logical cohesion between text fragments.

Within regulative markers, the following subgroups were identified:

Table 2 – Types of Organizational Discourse Markers

Function	Type of Discourse Marker	Example
Causal connection	sondyqtan, sol sebepti, oiytkeni, demek	"Men bul kitapty oqydym, ***sondyqtan*** oz kozkarasym ozgerdi" "Men bul sheshimdi qabyldadym, ***oiytkeni*** ol komanda ushyn tiimdi boldy" "Biz barlıq talabtardy oryndadyq, ***demek***, jobany saıtty ayaqtadyq".
Contrastive and clarifying markers	degenmen, biraq, alayda, yagni, naqtyraq	"**Yagni**, bul tek gylymi emes, sonymen qatar aleumettik masale" "Jobamyz saıtty otti, **degenmen** keibir qiyndyqtar boldy" "Biz barlıq nusqaulardy oryndadyq, **alayda** natije kutkenimizdey bolmady"
Referential and recall markers	zhogaryda aitqanymızday, bugan deyin, aldyngy bolimde, aityp otkendey	**"Bugan deyin** biz bul avtor turaly aitqan bolatybyz" **"Zhogaryda aitqanymizday**, bul adis tiimdiligin daleldedi" **"Aldyngy bolimde** biz bul maseleni qarastyrdyq"

ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

Based on the results of the study, more than 200 discourse markers were identified in Kazakh-language podcasts such as Kitapal and Ulagat Qory, with a total audio length exceeding five hours. According to their functional-semantic characteristics, the markers were classified into two main groups following S. A. Andreeva's framework: regulative and organizational discourse markers (Andreeva, 2005). Based on the analysis, the most frequently used types of discourse markers were determined (see Table 3).

Table 3 – Usage of Discourse Markers

No.	Type of Discourse Marker	Examples	Frequency
1	Truth-indicating	*arine, sozsiz, ras, shyn aitsam*	28
2	Clarifying markers	*tek, aitpakshy, tipti*	24
3	Authorial stance	*meninshhe, menin oiyymsha, bizdin oiyymyzsha, okinishke orai*	31
4	Organizational / logical structuring	*mysaly, aldymen, keyin, sonymen qatar, sonday-ak*	36
5	Evaluative	*basqasha aityndanda, ashyghyn aityndanda, shynymen de*	19
6	Accentuating	*En bastysy, asirese*	14
7	Emotive	*uau, keremet, massagan*	22
8	Logical sequencing	*endi, sondyqtan, biraq, demek, yagni, sonymen, songyndan*	46
		Total	203

Analyzing the regulative discourse markers:

Truth-indicating markers: The markers arine, sozsiz, ras, shyn aitsam appeared 28 times, accounting for 14% of all markers. These markers were frequently used in contexts where the interviewees emphasized the reliability of the information conveyed.

Clarifying markers: The markers tek, aitpakshy, tipti were recorded 24 times, representing 12% of the total markers.

Authorial stance markers: The markers meninshe, menin oiymsha, bizdin oiymyzsha, men oiylaymyn, okinishke orai appeared 31 times, comprising 15.5% of the total. These markers played a significant role in expressing personal opinions and emotional evaluations of the speakers.

Organizational and logical structuring markers: The markers mysaly, aldymen, keyin, sonymen qatar, sonday-ak were used 36 times, accounting for 18% of the total. These markers were important for presenting ideas in a sequential and coherent manner.

Evaluative markers: The markers basqasha aityndanda, ashyghyn aitqanda, shynymen de appeared 19 times, representing 9.5%.

Accentuating markers: The markers en bastysy, asirese were used 14 times, accounting for 7%. These markers allowed speakers to highlight specific points.

Emotive markers: The markers uau, keremet, massagan appeared 22 times, representing 11%. These markers added emotional authenticity to the speech and facilitated informal interaction.

Regarding organizational discourse markers, including all subgroups:

Discourse segmentation markers: endi, keleside, sonymen, sonynda - 12 occurrences.

Causal connection markers: sondyqtan, sol sebepti, oiytkeni, demek - 9 occurrences.

Contrastive and clarifying markers: degenmen, biraq, alayda, yagni, naqtyraq aitsak - 25 occurrences.

In total, organizational markers amounted to 46 occurrences, accounting for 23% of all identified discourse markers.

Conclusion

The results of this study comprehensively demonstrate the linguo-pragmatic features of discourse markers and their significant role in communication within contemporary Kazakh-language podcasts. Discourse markers facilitate the organization of speech texts, ensure interaction and understanding between the speaker and the listener, and convey the modality and emotional tone of utterances. In the informal linguistic environment of podcasts, the use of these markers enables pragmatic functions such as drawing listeners' attention, signaling agreement, providing clarification, and expressing opinions, thereby supporting effective communication.

The study identified both regulative and organizational types of discourse markers, analyzing their pragmatic functions qualitatively and quantitatively. The findings confirm the importance of these markers in ensuring textual cohesion, developing communicative skills, and enhancing linguo-pragmatic competence.

Overall, the results presented in this article shed light on the functions and classification features of discourse markers in the Kazakh language. The research materials and methods can serve as a basis for future applied and theoretical studies. Furthermore, this work represents a valuable resource for the linguistic analysis of media texts, particularly podcasts.

Conflict of Interest, acknowledgements and funding information

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding this article.

Contribution of the authors. During the preparation of this research, **A.M. Dosanova** conceptualized the study, conducted the analysis of research materials, and wrote the main body of the article. **A. Maral** collected, organized, and analyzed the research materials and prepared the manuscript for publication. **R. N. Sharshova** compiled tables and contributed to the discussion sections of the article. All authors share equal responsibility for all aspects of the work, and the accuracy and integrity of the research data were mutually reviewed.

References

Андреева, С. В. (2005). Конструктивно-синтаксические единицы устной русской речи. Саратов: Изд-во Саратовского университета. 246 с.

Әлеуметтік лингвистикалық терминдер сөздігі. (2020). Өңделген 2-басылым. Алматы. 400 б.

Баранов, А. Н., Плунгян, В. А., & Рахилина, Е. В. (1993). Путеводитель по дискурсивным словам русского языка. Москва: Помовский и партнёры. 256 с.

Бабаева, Р. И. (2008). Незнаменательная лексика в немецком обиходном дискурсе (прагматический аспект) (дис. ... канд. филол. наук). Иваново.

Виноградов, В. В. (1950). О категориях модальности и модальных словах в русском языке. Труды института русского языка, 2, 142–165.

Добровольский, Д. О. (2000). О дискурсивных единицах в русском языке. Вопросы языкознания, (3), 40–56.

Ерсұлтанова, Г. Т. (2010). Тілдік тұлға публицистикалық дискурста (автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. ғыл.). Алматы: ҚазҰУ. 24 б.

Жанпейісов, Е. Н. (1981). Қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі модаль сөздер. Алматы: Ғылым. 128 б.

Жұмағұлова, А. М. (2021). Қазақ дискурсының лингвосинергетикасы. Қазтұтыну одағы Қарағанды университетінің Хабаршысы, (4)104, 76–81. https://vestnik.kgu.kz/index.php/kufil/article/view/220

Кибрик, А. А. (2003). Анализ дискурса в когнитивной перспективе (дис. д-ра филол. наук). Москва. 231 с.

Кубрякова, Е. С. (2004). Язык и знание. Москва: Языки славянской культуры. 180 с.

Макаров, М. Л. (2003). Основы теории дискурса. Москва: Гнозис. 352 с. (in Russian)

Мустафина, С. С. (2006). Қазақ тілінің мәтін түзуші құралдары (автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. ғыл.). Алматы. 22 б.

Оразбаева, Ф. (2000). Тілдік қатынас: теориясы және әдістемесі. Алматы: (s. n.). 208 б.

Сүлейменова, Э. Д. (2006). Дискурс в дискурсе казахстанской лингвистики. In Современные проблемы дискурса: теория и практика (pp. 64–66). Алматы.

Шмелев, А. Д. (2003). Дискурсивные слова как средство выражения авторской позиции. Вопросы языкознания, (2), 64–76.

Blakemore, D. (2002). Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers. Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Bauer-Ramazani, C. (2025). English discourse markers. Retrieved March 12,2025from http://academics.smcvt.edu/cbauerramazani/AEP/BU113/English/discmarkers

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. Pragmatics, 6(2), 167–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. Journal of Pragmatics, 30, 245–257.

Lenk, U. (2005). Discourse markers. In Handbook of Pragmatics (pp. 1–17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Redeker, G. (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. Linguistics, 29, 1139–1172.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841

А.М. Досанова [1], А. М. Марал [2*], Р. Н. Шаршова[3]

[1,2] Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

[3]Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Дискурсивті маркерлердің лингвопрагматикалық ерекшеліктері

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада қазіргі қазақ тілді подкасттар негізіндегі дискурсивті маркерлердің лингвопрагматикалық ерекшеліктері кешенді түрде талданады. Зерттеу жұмысының өзектілігі қазақ тіліндегі подкасттардың жедел дамып, заманауи ауызекі сөйлеу мен коммуникациядағы жаңа үрдістерді анық көрсетуімен түсіндіріледі. Зерттеуде дискурсивті маркерлердің қызметтері, атап айтқанда сөйлеуді ұйымдастырудағы, сөйлеуші мен тыңдаушы арасындағы өзара әрекетті қалыптастырудағы, сондай-ақ айтылымның модальдылығы мен эмоционалды реңін жеткізудегі рөлінің маңыздылығы көрсетіледі. Зерттеу барысында контекстік және құрылымдық талдау, жаппай іріктеу мен бақылау әдістері қолданылған. Зерттеу материалының негізі ретінде транскрипцияланған қазақ тілді подкасттардың аудиожазбалары алынған. Дискурсивті маркерлердің регулятивті

және ұйымдастырушы болып жіктелуі беріліп, олардың медиадискурстағы, әсіресе подкаст жанрындағы прагматикалық функциялары жан-жақты қарастырылды. Зерттеу нәтижелері дискурсивті маркерлердің мәтіннің байланыстылығын қамтамасыз етуде және ауызекі сөйлеуде тиімді коммуникация орнатуда маңызды рөл атқаратынын көрсетеді. Жұмыстың практикалық маңыздылығы – алынған деректерді коммуникациялық дағдыларды дамытуға, лингвопрагматикалық құзыреттілікті жетілдіруге және медиа мәтіндерді талдауға қолдануға болатындығында. Бұл зерттеу қазақ тіліндегі дискурсивті маркерлердің қызметі мен жіктелу ерекшеліктерін ашып, болашақ қолданбалы және теориялық зерттеулерге негіз бола алады.

Түйін сөздер: дискурсивті маркерлер, лингвопрагматикалық ерекшелік, тілдік подкасттар, медиадискурс, ауызекі сөйлеу тілі, коммуникация.

А.М. Досанова[1], А.М. Марал [*2], Р.Н. Шаршова[3]

[1,2] Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

[3]Международный университет информационных технологий, Алматы, Казахстан

Лингвопрагматические особенности дискурсивных маркеров

Аннотация. В данной статье анализируются лингвопрагматические особенности дискурсивных маркеров на материале современных казахоязычных подкастов. Актуальность исследования обусловлена стремительным развитием подкастов на казахском языке, которые ярко отражают новые тенденции в современной устной речи и коммуникации. В работе раскрываются функции дискурсивных маркеров, в том числе их роль в организации речи, формирования взаимодействия между говорящим и слушателем, а также в передаче модальности и эмоциональной окраски высказывания. В ходе исследования применялись методы контекстуального и структурного анализа, сплошной выборки и наблюдения. В качестве основного материала использовались транскрибированные аудиозаписи казахоязычных подкастов. Дискурсивные маркеры классифицируются как регулятивные и организующие, их прагматические функции в медиа дискурсе, особенно в жанре подкаста, рассматриваются всесторонне. Результаты исследования показывают, что дискурсивные маркеры играют важную роль в обеспечении связности текста и эффективной коммуникации в устной речи. Практическая значимость работы заключается в возможности использования полученных данных для развития коммуникативных навыков совершенствования лингвопрагматической компетенции и анализа медиа текстов. Данное исследование раскрывает особенности функционирования и классификации дискурсивных маркеров в казахском языке и может послужить основой для дальнейших прикладных и теоретических исследований.

Ключевые слова: дискурсивные маркеры, лингвопрагматическая особенность, языковые подкасты, медиа дискурс, разговорная речь, коммуникация.

References

Aleumettik lingvistikalyk terminder sozdigi. (2020). [Dictionary of Social Linguistic Terms]. Almaty, Kazakhstan [in Kazakh]

Andreeva, S. V. (2005). Konstruktivno-sintaksicheskie edinitsy ustnoi russkoi rechi [Constructive-syntactic units of spoken Russian]. Saratov, Russia: Izdatelstvo Saratovskogo Universiteta. [in Russian]

Babaeva, R. I. (2008). Neznamenatelnaya leksika v nemetskom obikhodnom diskurse [Minor vocabulary in German colloquial discourse] (Candidate dissertation). Ivanovo, Russia. [in Russian]

Baranov, A.N., Plungyan, V.A., & Rakhilina, E.V. (1993). Putevoditel po diskursivnym slovam russkogo yazyka [Guide to discourse words in Russian]. Moscow, Russia: Pomovskii i Partnery. [in Russian]

Bauer-Ramazani, C. (2025). English discourse markers. Retrieved March 12, 2025, from http://academics.smcvt.edu/cbauerramazani/AEP/BU113/English/discmarkers.ht

Blakemore, D. (2002). Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers. Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Dobrovolskii, D. O. (2000). O diskursivnykh edinitsakh v russkom yazyke [On discourse units in Russian]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 3*, 40–56. [in Russian]

Ersultanova, G. T. (2010). Tildik tulga publicistikalik diskursta [Language personality in publicistic discourse] (Author's abstract of Candidate dissertation). Almaty, Kazakhstan. [in Kazakh]

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6(2), 167–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Kibrik, A. A. (2003). Analiz diskursa v kognitivnoi perspektive [Discourse analysis from a cognitive perspective] (Doctoral dissertation). Moscow, Russia [in Russian]

Kubryakova, E. S. (2004). Yazyk i znanie [Language and cognition]. Moscow, Russia: Yazyki Slavyanskoi Kultury. [in Russian]

Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. Journal of *Pragmatics*, 30, 245–257.

Lenk, U. (2005). Discourse markers. In *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Makarov, M. L. (2003). Osnovy teorii diskursa [Fundamentals of discourse theory]. Moscow, Russia: Gnozis. [in Russian]

Mustafina, S. S. (2006). Kazak tilinin matin tuzushi kuraldary [Tools for composing texts in the Kazakh language] (Author's abstract of Candidate dissertation). Almaty, Kazakhstan. [in Kazakh]

Orazbaeva, F. (2000). Tildik katynas: teoriyasy zhane adistemesi [Language interaction: Theory and methodology]. Almaty, Kazakhstan: s. n. [in Kazakh]

Redeker, G. (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics*, 29, 1139–1172.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Shmelev, A. D. (2003). Diskursivnye slova kak sredstvo vyrazheniya avtorskoi pozitsii [Discourse words as a means of expressing the author's stance]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 2*, 64–76. [in Russian]

Suleimenova, E. D. (2006). Diskurs v diskurse kazakhstanskoi lingvistiki [Discourse in the discourse of Kazakhstani linguistics]. In *Sovremennye problemy diskursa: teoriya i praktika* (pp. 64–66). Almaty, Kazakhstan. [in Russian]

Vinogradov, V. V. (1950). O kategoriyakh modalnosti i modalnykh slovakh v russkom yazyke [On categories of modality and modal words in Russian]. *Trudy Instituta Russkogo Yazyka, 2*, 142–165. [in Russian]

Zhanpeisov, E. N. (1981). Kazirgi qazaq tilindegi modal sozdar [Modal words in contemporary Kazakh]. Almaty, Kazakhstan: Gylym. [in Kazakh]

Zhumagulova, A. M. (2021). Kazak diskursynyn lingvosinergetikasy [Linguosynergetics of Kazakh discourse]. *Bulletin of Shokan Ualikhanov Kokshetau University. Philological Series*, *4*(104), 76–81. https://vestnik.kgu.kz/index.php/kufil/article/view/220 [in Kazakh]

Information about authors:

Dossanova Albina – PhD, Associate Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University Almaty, Kazakhstan, E-mail: adossanova@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8302-3982.

Maral Arailym – corresponding author, PhD student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-mail: maralqyzy.arailym@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3522-6590.

Sharshova Regina – Master of Humanities, Senior Lecturer, International Information Technology University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, E-mail: r.sharshova@iitu.edu.kz, ORCID: 0000-0002-7367-6007.

Досанова Альбина Маратхановна – PhD докторы, қауымдастырылған профессор, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: adossanova@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8302-3982.

Марал Арайлым Маралқызы – хат-хабар үшін автор, PhD докторанты, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: maralqyzy.arailym@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3522-65907

Шаршова Регина Николаевна – гуманитарлық ғылымдар магистрі, аға оқытушы, Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: r.sharshova@iitu.edu.kz, ORCID: 0000-0002-7367-6007.

Досанова Альбина Маратхановна – PhD, ассоц. профессор, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан. E-mail: adossanova@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8302-3982.

Марал Арайлым Маралкызы – автор для корреспонденции, докторант PhD, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан. E-mail: maralqyzy.arailym@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3522-6590.

Шаршова Регина Николаевна – магистр гуманитарных наук, старший преподаватель, Международный университет информационных технологий, Алматы, Казахстан. E-mail: r.sharshova@iitu.edu.kz, ORCID: 0000-0002-7367-6007.