



MIRZO ULUG'BEK NOMIDAGI
O'ZBEKISTON MILLIY UNIVERSITETI
JIZZAX FILIALI



**KOMPYUTER IMLARI VA
MUHANDISLIK TEXNOLOGIYALARI
XALQARO ILMIY-TEXNIK
ANJUMAN MATERIALLARI
TO'PLAMI
2-QISM**



26-27-SENTABR
2025-YIL



**O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TA'LIM, FAN VA
INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI**

**MIRZO ULUG'BEK NOMIDAGI O'ZBEKISTON MILLIY
UNIVERSITETINING JIZZAX FILIALI**



**KOMPYUTER IMLARI VA MUHANDISLIK
TEXNOLOGIYALARI**

mavzusidagi Xalqaro ilmiy-texnik anjuman materiallari to'plami
(2025-yil 26-27-sentabr)

2-QISM

JIZZAX-2025

Kompyuter ilmlari va muhandislik texnologiyalari. Xalqaro ilmiy-texnik anjuman materiallari to‘plami – Jizzax: O‘zMU Jizzax filiali, 2025-yil 26-27-sentabr. 368-bet.

Xalqaro miqyosidagi ilmiy-texnik anjuman materiallarida zamonaviy kompyuter ilmlari va muhandislik texnologiyalari sohasidagi innovatsion tadqiqotlar aks etgan.

Globallashuv sharoitida davlatimizni yanada barqaror va jadal sur’atlar bilan rivojlantirish bo‘yicha amalga oshirilayotgan islohotlar samarasini yaxshilash sohasidagi ilmiy-tadqiqot ishlariga alohida e’tibor qaratilgan. Zero iqtisodiyotning, ijtimoiy sohalarni qamrab olgan modernizatsiya jarayonlari, hayotning barcha sohalarini liberallashtirishni talab qilmoqda.

Ushbu ilmiy ma’ruza tezislari to‘plamida mamlakatimiz va xorijlik turli yo‘nalishlarda faoliyat olib borayotgan mutaxassislar, olimlar, professor-o‘qituvchilar, ilmiy tadqiqot institutlari va markazlarining ilmiy xodimlari, tadqiqotchilar, magistr va talabalarning ilmiy-tadqiqot ishlari natijalari mujassamlashgan.

Mas’ul muharrirlar: DSc.prof. Turakulov O.X., t.f.n., dots. Baboyev A.M.

Tahrir hay’ati a’zolari: p.f.d.(DSc), prof. Turakulov O.X., t.f.n., dots. Baboyev A.M., t.f.f.d.(PhD), prof. Abduraxmanov R.A., p.f.f.d.(PhD) Eshankulov B.S., p.f.n., dots. Alimov N.N., p.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Alibayev S.X., t.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Abdumalikov A.A, p.f.f.d.(PhD) Hafizov E.A., f.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Sindorov L.K., t.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Nasirov B.U., b.f.f.d. (PhD) O‘ralov A.I., p.f.n., dots. Aliqulov S.T., t.f.f.d.(PhD) Kuvandikov J.T., i.f.n., dots. Tsot M.P., Sharipova S.F., Jo‘rayev M.M.

Mazkur to‘plamga kiritilgan ma’ruza tezislarning mazmuni, undagi statistik ma’lumotlar va me’yoriy hujjatlarning to‘g‘riliqi hamda tanqidiy fikr-mulohazalar, keltirilgan takliflarga mualliflarning o‘zlari mas’uldirlar.

filtering. As a result, readers are prompted to consider the complexity of human nature, challenge moral dogma, and empathize with Sadie.

References:

1. Birch, D. (1989). Language, literature and critical practice: Ways of analysing text. Routledge.
2. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In Linguistics in the morning calm (pp. 111–137). Hanshin.
3. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
4. Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (2007). Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
5. Maugham, W. S. (1921). Rain and other stories. Heinemann.
6. Pratt, M. L. (1977). Toward a speech act theory of literary discourse. Indiana University Press.
7. Toolan, M. (2012). Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction. Routledge.
8. ZHANG Tong-tong. (2019). A Pragmatic-Stylistic Analysis of Fictional Dialogues in Kazuo Ishiguro’s Short Story “Come Rain or Come Shine.” In *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* (Vol. 9, Issue 5). David Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2019.05.004>
9. 978-1108-47548-8 — Language and Subjectivity, T. McNamara

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK YOUTH DIGITAL INTERACTION

Hamdamov Foziljon Rustamjon o‘g‘li

Jizzakh branch of National university of Uzbekistan

Rabbiyeva Ozoda Erkin qizi

Master’s student Jizzakh branch of National university of Uzbekistan

hamdamovfoziljon3@gmail.com

Abstract. This paper compares the use of discourse markers in English and Uzbek youth digital communication. The data consist of 200 chat excerpts (100 in English and 100 in Uzbek) collected from popular social media and messaging platforms. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were applied to examine their frequency and functions. The results show that while discourse markers in both languages serve similar purposes—structuring discourse, expressing stance, and maintaining solidarity—their forms differ. English youth most often use like, you know, and well, whereas Uzbek youth rely on ha, endi, and bilasanmi. The study also reveals cross-linguistic influence, as English markers such as ok and like appear frequently in Uzbek chats. The findings highlight that discourse markers are universal tools of interaction, yet also culture-specific, reflecting both global and local features of youth digital communication.

Key words: discourse markers, English, Uzbek, youth, digital communication, comparative study.

Introduction: In the digital age, digital communication has become the primary medium of interaction among young people worldwide. Social media platforms, instant messaging applications, and online communities provide spaces where language use is shaped by immediacy, informality, and creativity. One of the most salient features of online discourse is the frequent use of discourse markers, which serve to organize speech, indicate attitudes, and maintain interpersonal relations. While discourse markers have been widely studied in English, less attention has been given to their role in other languages, including Uzbek. Given the increasing globalization and the growing influence of English on digital interaction, a comparative study of discourse markers across different languages is timely and necessary. Such research may reveal both universal tendencies in youth communication and language-specific features shaped by cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The present study focuses on discourse markers used by English and Uzbek youth in digital interaction. It aims to identify similarities and differences in their frequency, functions, and pragmatic roles. By comparing these two linguistic communities, the study seeks to contribute to the understanding of how youth construct meaning, negotiate identity, and maintain solidarity in online communication across cultural boundaries.

Methodology: This study adopts a comparative qualitative and quantitative approach to analyze the use of discourse markers in English and Uzbek youth digital interaction. The data were collected from naturally occurring conversations on popular social media and messaging platforms, including Telegram, Instagram, and WhatsApp. A total of 200 chat excerpts (100 in English and 100 in Uzbek) produced by users aged 18–25 were selected for analysis. The selection of data was based on the following criteria:

1. The participants belonged to the youth category (18–25 years old).
2. The conversations were informal and spontaneous in nature.
3. The excerpts contained at least one discourse marker.

For the purpose of this study, discourse markers were defined following Schiffrin (1987), Fraser (1999), and Aijmer (2002) as lexical items that serve pragmatic functions such as organizing discourse, signaling speaker attitude, or managing interpersonal relations. Examples of English discourse markers considered include *like*, *well*, *you know*, *actually*, and *so*, while Uzbek counterparts include *ha*, *endi*, *bilasanmi*, *to 'g'risi*, and *demak*.

The analysis was carried out in two stages. First, the frequency of occurrence of discourse markers in both languages was measured to identify the most commonly used forms. Second, a qualitative analysis was conducted to determine their pragmatic functions in context. This comparative method made it possible to identify both universal tendencies and culture-specific features in youth digital discourse.

Results: The analysis of 200 chat excerpts revealed both similarities and differences in the use of discourse markers by English and Uzbek youth in digital communication.

1. Frequency of discourse markers

In English digital interaction, the most frequently occurring discourse markers were *like*, *you know*, *well*, *actually*, and *so*. Among these, *like* accounted for nearly 30% of all markers used, followed by *you know* (18%). In Uzbek conversations, the most common markers were *ha*, *endi*, *bilasanmi*, *to 'g'risci*, and *demak*. The marker *ha* was dominant, making up 25% of the total occurrences, while *endi* accounted for 20%.

2. Functional similarities

Both English and Uzbek youth employed discourse markers primarily for three functions:

Structuring the discourse (e.g., *so*, *demak*)

Expressing stance or attitude (e.g., *actually*, *to 'g'risci*)

Managing interpersonal relations (e.g., *like*, *ha*)

3. Culture-specific features

While English youth frequently used *like* to soften statements and maintain informality, Uzbek youth relied on *ha* and *endi* for similar functions. Interestingly, English markers such as *ok* and *lol* were also found in Uzbek chats, showing evidence of borrowing from English digital discourse. Conversely, Uzbek-specific markers (e.g., *bo 'pti*, *xo 'p*) had no direct English equivalents but carried strong cultural connotations of agreement and politeness.

4. Cross-linguistic influence

Code-switching was common in Uzbek youth communication, where English discourse markers like *like* and *well* were embedded within Uzbek sentences. This reflects the impact of globalization and the prestige of English in digital interaction. Overall, the findings demonstrate that discourse markers perform universal communicative functions, but their form, frequency, and stylistic value vary across English and Uzbek youth digital discourse.

Discussion: The findings of this study indicate that discourse markers are an integral part of youth digital communication in both English and Uzbek. While their primary functions -organizing discourse, expressing stance, and maintaining social relations - are universal, the specific forms and stylistic preferences reflect cultural and linguistic backgrounds. One of the most striking similarities between English and Uzbek youth discourse is the reliance on discourse markers to manage informality and interpersonal closeness. For example, English speakers frequently employ *like* and *you know* to soften statements and create solidarity, while Uzbek youth often use *ha* and *endi* for similar purposes. This demonstrates that although the lexical items differ, the pragmatic needs they fulfill are largely shared across languages.

At the same time, important differences were observed. English digital discourse shows a high frequency of filler-like markers (*like*, *well*), which serve to maintain fluency and signal hesitation. In contrast, Uzbek youth more frequently rely on agreement and confirmation markers (*ha*, *bo 'pti*, *xo 'p*), which emphasize politeness and collective orientation. These tendencies reflect broader cultural values: English youth communication highlights individual stance, whereas Uzbek discourse gives greater weight to agreement and social harmony.

Another notable finding is the evidence of cross-linguistic influence. Uzbek youth frequently insert English discourse markers such as *ok*, *like*, and *well* into their conversations. This borrowing suggests not only the prestige of English as a global

language but also the hybrid nature of youth digital interaction in multilingual contexts. Such instances of code-switching show how global and local linguistic practices interact in shaping online communication styles. Overall, the discussion highlights that discourse markers serve as both universal and culture-specific tools in youth digital communication. Their comparative analysis provides valuable insights into how young people negotiate identity, manage relationships, and adapt to the dynamics of online interaction in an increasingly globalized world.

Conclusion: This study compared discourse markers in English and Uzbek youth digital communication. The findings show that while both groups use discourse markers to organize discourse, express stance, and build solidarity, the forms and frequencies differ. English youth prefer markers such as *like*, *you know*, and *well*, whereas Uzbek youth often use *ha*, *endi*, and *bilasanmi*.

Despite these differences, the functions are largely similar, reflecting universal communicative needs. At the same time, the influence of English is evident in Uzbek digital discourse through frequent borrowing (ok, like, well), illustrating globalization's role in shaping online interaction. Overall, discourse markers function as both universal and culture-specific tools in youth communication.

References:

1. Aijmer, K. (2002). English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Crystal, D. (2006). Language and the Internet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931–952.
4. Herring, S. C. (2007). A faceted classification scheme for computer-mediated discourse. *Language@Internet*, 4(1), 1–37.
5. Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Trillo, J. (2002). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(6), 769–784.
7. Turakulov, O., Khalimov, U., Tagayev, O., & Hamdamov, F. (2024, November). Improving the process of training of competitive economists for the development of the national economy. In AIP Conference Proceedings (Vol. 3244, No. 1). AIP Publishing.

КЎХНА ҲАСРАТНИНГ ФАЛСАФИЙ ТАЛҚИНИ

Кирйигитова Нигора

Жиззах давлат педагогика университети тадқиқотчиси

Аннотация: Ушбу мақолада таниқли шоир Эркин Воҳидовнинг “Бу кўхна ҳасрат” шеърининг таҳлили мисолида шоир ижодидаги фалсафий тафаккурнинг бадиий ифодалаш ҳодисаси ўрганилган.