

University "St.Kliment Ohridski"-Bitola

HORIZONS
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
Series A
Social Sciences and Humanities

Year XI

Volume 17

September 2015

Bitola

Publisher – University “St.Kliment Ohridski” – Bitola
For the publisher: Prof. Zlatko Zhoglev, PhD, Rector

International Editorial Board

Prof. Pere Aslimoski, PhD, University “St.Kliment Ohridski” – Bitola,
R. Macedonia
Prof. Taki Fiti, PhD, University “Ss. Cyril and Methodius” – Skopje,
R. Macedonia
Prof. Joaquim Verges, PhD, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,
Spain
Prof. Sebastian Kempgen, PhD, University of Bamberg, Federal
Republic of Germany
Prof. Maria Serafimova-Karapetkova, PhD, Southwestern University
Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad, R. Bulgaria
Prof. Zhelimir Keshetovik, University of Belgrade, R. Serbia
Prof. Bozidar Veljkovic, PhD, University of Maribor, R. Slovenia

Editorial Committee

Prof. Pere Aslimoski, PhD, vice-rector
Prof. Sasho Atanasoski, PhD, vice-rector
Prof. Nikola Krstanoski, PhD, vice-rector
Prof. Jovanka Tuteska, PhD, vice-rector

Ofelija Hristovska, MA, Secretary General

Editor: Elena Kitanovska-Ristoska, MA

ISSN 1857 -9884

Print by Grafoprom – Bitola, printing copies: 100

Dear readers,

With every new edition of the *Horizons* scientific journal, the academic public has become used to the expectation that it traces new pathways towards its further establishment in the international educational and scientific – research areas.

For the coming period, just as it did previously, *Horizons* will continue to respect the principles of scientific impartiality and editorial justness, and will be committed to stimulating the young researchers in particular, to select *Horizons* as a place to publish the results of their contemporary scientific and research work. This is also an opportunity for those, who through publishing their papers in international scientific journals such as *Horizons*, view their future carrier development in the realm of professorship and scientific-research profession.

The internationalization of our *Horizons* journal is not to be taken as the furthest accomplishment of our University publishing activity. Just as the scientific thought does not approve of limitations of exhaustive achievements, so is every newly registered success of the *Horizons* editions going to give rise to new “appetites” for further objectives to reach.

Last but not the least, we would like to express our sincere appreciation for the active part you all took in the process of designing, creating, final shaping and publishing the scientific journal. Finally, it is with your support that *Horizons* is on its way to attain its deserved, recognizable place where creative, innovative and intellectually autonomous scientific reflections and potentials will be granted affirmation, as well as an opportunity for a successful establishment in the global area of knowledge and science.

Sincerely,
Editorial Board

CONTENT

<i>Ljuben Tevdovski, PhD, Zoran Ilievski, PhD, French revolution, archaeology and their imprints in the contemporary French and European identity</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Marika Baseska Gorgieska, PhD, Blazo Zdravkov, MA, Implementation of marketing research methods for product sales forecast on the specific case study</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Zoran Janevski, PhD, Shtefan Bojnec, PhD, Uros Godnov, PhD, Tatjana Petkovska Mirchevska, PhD, Biljana Angelova, PhD, Monika Angeloska Dichovska, PhD, Improvement of business competitiveness through developing G2B e-services in Slovenia and Macedonia</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Mimoza Serafimova, PhD, Biljana Petrevska, PhD, Entrepreneurship and financing: the evidence of Macedonia</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Emilija Mateska, MSc, Snezana Obednikovska, PhD, Consumerism and consumer protection in the Republic of Macedonia</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Ajtene Avdullahi, PhD candidate, Obstacles to small and medium enterprises</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Besim Mustafa, PhD candidate, The impact of non-formal education on employee performance in SME's in Kosovo</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Elena Gjorevska, PhD candidate, Entrepreneurial perception of the ecosystem: spotlight on Republic of Macedonia</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>Viktorija Trajkov, PhD candidate, The role of advertising on the political campaigns in the Republic of Macedonia</i>	<i>109</i>
<i>Tina Satieva, PhD candidate, Event management in the context of integrated marketing communications</i>	<i>119</i>
<i>Vera Karadjova, PhD, Risk of off-balance sheet activities – measurement and management</i>	<i>129</i>
<i>Snezana Dichevska, PhD, Contemporary methods of measuring the credit risk in banking operations</i>	<i>139</i>
<i>Jagotka Strezovska PhD, Biljana Ivanovska, PhD, Viktorija Krstovska, The importance of the scientific research of the languages for special purposes</i>	<i>147</i>
<i>Jasminka Kocoska, PhD, The role of dramatization in acquiring life skills among students</i>	<i>157</i>
<i>Zoran Nikolovski, PhD, Language planning and language standardization</i>	<i>165</i>

<i>Jovanka Denkova, PhD</i> , The epistolarity as a genre in the modern Macedonian literature for children (“Shareni pisma” – coloured letters by Violeta Tancheva-Zlateva)	177
<i>Valentina Ilieva, PhD, Jovanka Denkova, PhD, Simona Monavcheva, MA, Kristina Ilieva</i> , The importance of listening and comprehension skills in listening exercises in German language classes	187
<i>Silvana Neshkovska, PhD</i> , Discourse connective <i>and</i> and its Macedonian equivalents <i>a</i> and <i>u</i>	199
<i>Violeta Janusheva, PhD</i> , Substitution of international words with domestic words in the Macedonian standard language	209
<i>Stela Bosilkovska, MCI, Daniela Andonovska Trajkovska, PhD</i> , Sound alternation in connected speech	219
<i>Valentina Nikolovska, MA</i> , The influence of the assessment criteria on the students’ success	233

DISCOURSE CONNECTIVE *AND* AND ITS MACEDONIAN EQUIVALENTS *A* AND *U*¹⁸⁷

Silvana Neshkovska, PhD

Vasko Karangelevski, bb, 7000 Bitola, Faculty of Education, Bitola, R.
Macedonia, silvanakolevska@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper attempts to analyze discourse connectives *a* and *u* in the Macedonian language which are equivalent to the English discourse connective *and*. The analysis is based on Deborah Schiffrin's in depth analysis of discourse markers in the English language.

The focus of attention of this study is to investigate the various positions of these discourse connectives in the discourse structure; as well as the pragmatic functions they perform.

Key words: discourse markers, connectives, Macedonian, English

INTRODUCTION

Discourse connectives, as a special sub-group of discourse markers¹⁸⁸, however unnoticeable and insignificant may seem, compared to the rest of the elements in the discourse structure, do contribute greatly to the meaning of the talk units (Schiffrin, 1987).

This paper deals with the English discourse connective *and* and its Macedonian counterparts *a* and *u*. The aim of the paper is to investigate whether the same syntactic and pragmatic principles guide their usage in spoken discourse. More precisely, the comparison, in fact, relies heavily on Schiffrin's (1987) findings with regard to the discourse connective *and* in English.

¹⁸⁷ original scientific paper

¹⁸⁸ During the past ten years, the study of DMs has turned into a growth industry in linguistics, with dozens of articles appearing yearly. Unfortunately, the term has different meanings for different groups of researchers, and we find work on DMs done under a variety of labels including, but not limited to discourse connectives, discourse operators, discourse particles etc. (Frazer, 1999)

In the first section of the paper some theoretical background pertaining to discourse markers is provided. In other words, this section presents some of the most important definitions of discourse markers, as well as their importance from both syntactic and pragmatic perspective. After that, the research methodology is briefly discussed, and, consequently, the subsequent section offers a discussion of the results of the analysis, followed by the concluding remarks in the last section.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Some words and phrases help to develop ideas and relate them to one another. These kinds of words and phrases are often called discourse markers. At first glance, the term discourse markers, seems quite ambiguous and fuzzy, but once a language analyst starts to deal with discourse analysis, it soon becomes obvious that this term is an indispensable part of it. Namely, as Schiffrin (1987: 49) herself states the analysis of discourse markers is part of the more general analysis of discourse - how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meanings and actions to make overall sense out of what is said.

Redeker (1990: 34) presents another similar definition claiming that discourse markers are linguistic expressions used to signal the relation of an utterance to its immediate context, with the primary function of bringing to the listener's attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate context.

These language devices play a significant role in language usage from both syntactic and pragmatic perspective. Thus, syntactically they belong to different grammatical categories (word classes) that have various functions such as: adverbials (e.g. then, now, actually, first, anyway), coordinating conjuncts (e.g. and, or, but), interjections (e.g. oh, well, hm, mm) etc. From pragmatic perspective they are all subsumed under the common term "discourse markers" that serve as cohesive devices or interpretative links between different parts of discourse structure. In other words, although they do not themselves create meaning, they are clues used by speakers and hearers to find the meaning of utterances. Thus, Schiffrin (1987), who have investigated the occurrences of discourse markers in spoken language, i.e. in argumentative discourse (monologues and dialogues) came to a conclusion that discourse markers neither have strict positions nor perform just one function in the discourse structure itself.

The starting point for this research is Schiffrin's (1987: 128) claim that the English discourse connective *and* has two roles in talk: it coordinates idea units and it continues a speaker's action. According to Schiffrin (1987: 128)

and is by far the most frequently used mode of connection in English. She backs this claim up by providing empirical evidence based on her own research in which “1002 clause-sized idea units were prefaced by *and*, compared to 440 by *but*, 206 by *so* and only 53 by *or*”.

In Macedonian, as it can be confirmed by English–Macedonian dictionaries and vice versa¹⁸⁹, there are two discourse connectives, *u* and *a* which act as counterparts of the English *and*.

METHODOLOGY

As this paper focuses on analyzing the discourse connectives *a* and *u* in Macedonian, based on the scientific insights into their English counterpart *and* (Schiffrin, 1987) we opted for compiling a corpus which consists of one hour of recorded authentic monologues and dialogues of Macedonian native speakers.

The analyzed speech, in fact, came from two different sources: a) recorded authentic informal conversations between friends and colleagues of the author of this paper, and b) recorded formal conversations presented on television.

Initially, the analysis focused on locating the positions of these discourse connectives in the discourse structure; after which, their pragmatic functions were given some serious deliberation.

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

Although discourse connectives at first glance may seem as the most insignificant elements compared to the rest of the linguistic elements used in discourse structures, the analysis below will provide sufficient evidence in favor of the claim that these elements play an important role in discourse. Actually they contribute greatly to the existence of diverse meanings in units of conversation and without them a great number of nuances of meaning would be lost.

¹⁸⁹Big English-Macedonian Dictionary (Second Edition, 2001). Published in Macedonia; Big Macedonian-English Dictionary (Third edition, 2006). Skopje: Cobiss

In this research, also, the number of occurrences of *u* and *a*, has significantly outnumbered the rest of the discourse connectives. However, it seems that in Macedonian *u* is a far more commonly used discourse connective of these two because it prevails in all of the recorded and analyzed conversations.

In addition, the analysis focused on determining: a) the positions of *u* and *a* in discourse structure, and b) their pragmatic functions in discourse structure as well.

With regard to their positions as discourse connectives we base our analysis on Schiffrin's (1987: 131) claim that arguments, i.e. 'discourse through which speakers support disputable positions', generally, consist of *position* and *support*. Schiffrin purports that the discourse connective *and*, in particular can work at different levels of discourse structure. First of all, it can work at the most local levels of discourse structure connecting events within the *position* and the *support*.

Investigating the 'behavior' of *u* and *a* in Macedonian with respect to their allocation within discourse structure of an argument, it is easily discernable that they can also be found within the two aforementioned basic structure units, namely the *position* and the *support*.

Example (1) illustrates the function of *u* used to join events within the *position*. This extract has been taken from a television debate on the moral decadence of young people in our society. In the example that follows, a Macedonian priest first sets his *position* that young people who have certain misunderstandings with their parents or face other problems could always turn to the church for advice and help. Then, he continues with his *support* (which is not presented here since at this point it is not relevant) by singling out some instances when the church was very helpful to young people in need.

(1)

Priest: *The church is available for the young people as much as it could be by means of the influence of its priests **and** what young people could not trust their parents with, they could always confess it to a priest because priests cannot betray the confessor's trust even when they face capital punishment (position).....*

(Свештеник: Црквата е достапна за младииот човек онолку колку ишио може да биде преку влијанието на парохискиот свештеник, **и** она ишио младиие не можат да го кажат на родителот слободно можат да го кажат на свештеникот преку исповед затоа ишио свештеникот по

цена на смртна казна не смее да ја проневери довербаа на исповедничкој...)

In the next example (2), *u* is used in the *position* of the argument presented by a family friend. In fact, she is describing a robbery that has happened recently in the local grocery store and after a lengthy description of what actually happened which serves as a support for her initial position she finishes her description by re-establishing the *position* once again at the end of her talk ('...and they took all the money from the counter').

(2)

Friend: ... **and they took all the money from the counter.**

(Пријателка: ... **и сите пари ги зеле од касата.**)

Furthermore, *u* could be found in the support of the argument. In (3) the presence of *u* can be witnessed within the support joining two or more events together. A colleague at work first states her *position* ('It depends... it depends on what one expects') and then she provides *support* for her statement ('For example I often hear people commenting...') by joining the events within the *support* with *u*.

(3)

Me: *Is nightlife successful in Bitola?*

Friend: *It depends ... it depends on what one expects (position). For example, I often hear people commenting "We were here and there" and the other one asks "What's up there?" and the first one replies "Nothing special"(support)*

(Јас: Дали е успешен ноќниот живот во Битола?)

Пријателка: *Зависи... зависи од тоа кој Шго очекува. На пример доста често слушам муабет од типот 'Бевме таму и таму' и другиот вика „И Шго има? и овој вика „И ни Шго нема"*

I and *a*, just like *and* in English could also be found at a higher level of discourse structure of an argument, namely, they can connect two pieces of *support* (Schiffrin, 1987: 135). To be more specific, the second *support* is preceded by *and* and its sole function is to elaborate further on the first *support*. What follows is an extract from an interview with a former Prime Minister of R. Macedonia, broadcast by a local television station. The issue that he is discussing concerns foreign investments in Macedonia at the time when he was holding the office.

(4)

Prime Minister: *I wanted to have American and English investors. But ... I also wanted to have Bulgarian investors, but the Greeks were the most interested ones (**position**). But from what I know 1000 to 1500 Greek firms were interested in investing in Macedonia. And when the Social Democratic Party came to power these firms diverted their interest towards Bulgaria (**1st support**). **And** now if you look at the situation in Bulgaria they have 1500 Greek investors in the Republic of Bulgaria (**2nd support**).*

(Премиерот: Јас сакав да има американски и англиски инвеститори меѓутоа... сум сакал и бугарски инвеститори да има, меѓутоа Грците беа најзаинтересирани. Меѓутоа од она Што јас го знам, 1000 до 1500 грчки фирми најавуваа свој влез во македонската економијаи после доаѓањето на СДСМ тие се преорентираа во Бугарија. И сега ако ја гледате ситуацијата во Бугарија тие сега имаат влез на 1500 грчки фирми во Република Бугарија.)

In sum, the Macedonian discourse connectives *a* and *u*, just like their English equivalent *and*, could be found in different positions in discourse structure. Namely, in local units joining events within the *support* and the *position*, as well as in the global units joining two pieces of *support* or *position* within one and the same discourse structure. These findings indicate that *and*, i.e. *u* and *a* do not have strict positions in the discourse structure and that they could freely move to different levels depending on the discourse goals.

Furthermore, the research was also intended to confirm that just like *and*, its Macedonian counterparts, *u* and *a*, also can perform a variety of pragmatic functions in discourse. Thus, for instance, *and* can be used in repeated attempts to continue an interaction which was threatened by an alternative talk. In other words, speakers use *and* to convey that they have more to say regardless of another alternatively proposed activity (Schiffrin, 1987: 143). To illustrate this pragmatic function of the discourse markers *a* and *u* in Macedonian, here again we will refer to the priest's interview since, at one point, the host of the debate wants to interrupt him and to divert the conversation into another direction, but the priest not being ready to relinquish the floor interrupts the host's question and continues his previous topic by using *u*.

(5)

Host: *I will interrupt you now. Let me ...*

Priest: *And ... let me just mention the institutional undertakings of the church. In Strumica there is a center for protection and rehabilitation of drug addicts ...*

(Водителот: *Јас ќе Ве прекинам сега, дозволете да...*

Свештеникот: *И ... само уште Шго институционално прави црквата... Во Струмица има центар за заштита и опоравување од дрога и норкоманија...)*

I and *a* are often used as fillers. Namely, when the speaker needs some more time to figure out what to say next or when he/she is uncertain how to shape his subsequent thought. But the interesting issue in such situations is that the hearer very often takes advantage of it in order to add his/her comments, which could be agreements or disagreements with the previous statement of the speaker (Schiffrin, 1987: 148). In Example (6) two Macedonian politicians are having a fierce debate about the recent changes introduced to the right to protest in Macedonia. The first politician at one point of his statement, namely, just after *u* shows some signs of reluctance how to finish his statement and at that point the second politician ‘attacks’ him swiftly, i.e. interrupts him with his comment which is basically a disagreement.

(6)

First politician: *No matter what, you should allow people to protest and ... (sometimes just try to listen to them ...)*

Second politician: *Who prevents them from protesting?*

(Политичар 1: *Без разлика на се дозволете им на луѓето да протестираат и (понекогаш побидете се да ги слушнете)*

Политичар 2: *Кoj им го брани тоа? Најдете ми го членот во кој тоа се забранува ...)*

When speakers express their views about a certain topic they seldom stick only to the relevant pieces of information that are in favor of their argument. In other words, they very often expand their statements with additional comments that do not contribute much to the point they are trying to make. By choosing to enrich their claims, they express their willingness to ‘cooperate’, or, simply, they cannot avoid doing all those digressions in the complex and simultaneous process of thinking and talking. Thus, by putting *and* in front of certain utterances they unconsciously emphasize the fact that they are delimiting the relevant parts of their statement from the less significant ones (Schiffrin, 1987: 142).

In (7) a popular talk show hostess converses with a fellow journalist-investigator who has recently visited a tribe in the Himalayas. The reason for

this visit was the recent scientific theory that these people are ancient relatives to Macedonian people. In this part of their conversation she is commenting on the video recordings they have made on their way to these 'distant relatives'.

(7)

Journalist: *I think that they have been completely isolated until 1978, then their first road was built, that's Karakorum Road built up the Karakorum Mountain, **and** then they made their first contacts with civilization **and** they cherished its benefits...*

(Новинарка: *Мислам Хунзите биле изолирани потполно до 1978 година, кога е направен првиот пат до кај нив тоа е Каракорум Роад по Каракорум планината **и** тогаш првпат кај нив е навлезена цивилизација **и** тие имаат попримено се Што е цивилизацијска придобивка*)

As we can see her initial comment refers to their utter seclusion up to 1978; then she proceeds with some additional information about their first road, actually their first link with the rest of the world providing some details about the construction of this road and she eventually returns to her initial point, i.e. their seclusion and first contacts with the civilized world. It is easily noticeable that she uses *u* right in front of the important bits and pieces of information.

Schiffrin (1987: 148) also discusses another pragmatic function of *and*, when the speaker uses it to end his statement and when he/she wants to ask his/her interlocutor to confirm the validity of his/her statement or when he simply invites him/her to state his/her opinion.

In the following example, a family member, is making ironic remarks about his efforts to give up smoking in the presence of a family friend. At the end of his talk he asks his friend to promise him that if he succeeds in quitting this bad habit he will buy him a treat. Since both of them are aware of the ironic tone of this comment, the friend's response to this request is also ironic and at the end is reinforced by *and* to signal his disbelief. Actually, thus, the family member is invited to dispel his friend's suspicion and to reveal his further intentions regarding his smoking cigarettes.

(8)

Friend: *Big deal, **and**...?*

(Пријател: Голема работа, и ... ?)

И and *a* in Macedonian could also be used at the beginning of a question for the same reason as when it is located at the end, namely, to encourage the interlocutor to go on talking and provide further information. A TV

presenter, in his talk show discusses the existence of non-identified flying objects with his guests. When one of his guests who witnessed such object describes his personal experience, the host is impatient to get some details and interrupts him with his question.

(9)

Host: **And** you saw it?
(Водител: **И** ти го виде тоа?)

The abovementioned position and function of *a* in questions is also illustrated by another local television hostess' question, addressed to her quest who is a plastic surgeon.

(10)

Hostess: **And** whose silicone breasts, in your opinion, are the best ... Choose among Pamela, Pamela, Pamela, Ceca?

(Весна: **А** Шго мисиШкои се најдобро направени силиконски гради □ од примерите Памела, Памела, Памела, Цеца?)

I could be used in questions when an interviewer has already asked two or more interlocutors the same question and all of them are expected to respond. Then in order not to repeat the entire question he would simply use a short version of the question implying that the other person is also expected to answer the same question. Example (11) is part of a discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of field and office work between two programmers. When the first programmer finished expressing his opinion I expected that the second programmer would immediately continue expressing her point of view but after a brief silence I reminded her that she was also expected to give her point of view by simply saying:

(11)

Interviewer: **And** you?
(Intervjuer: **А** ти?)

Very frequently *u* is the only member of the question issued by the hearer and it refers to the speaker's previous comment, requiring additional information. On the other hand, *u* being the sole member of the question can also indicate irony on the part of the speaker. For instance, while the first programmer mentioned in the previous example was expressing his point of view about computer programming, the second programmer, at one point, obviously making fun of his complete dedication to programming, invited him to finish his thought by posing an ironic *and-question*.

(12)

First programmer: *I see programming as solving problems and each problem is a challenge for me.*

Second programmer: **And?**

(Prv programer: *Jas programiraweto go gledam kako re{avawe na problemi, i sekoj problem za mene e predizvik.*

Vtor programer: *I?*)

On the basis of all of the above presented excerpts from the analyzed corpus, we are pretty confident to state that just like the English discourse connective *and*, its Macedonian counterparts, *u* and *a*, can also perform several different pragmatic functions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our small scale pilot research, based on Schiffrin's study of the English discourse connective *and*, reveals that the same rules apply to the Macedonian counterparts of *and*, *u* and *a*, in terms of their position and pragmatic functions in discourse structure.

This research, in fact, confirms the claim that although the language elements of this type are not the main bearer of the semantic meaning of utterances, yet, they greatly contribute to the creation of various nuances of meaning, which is of a paramount importance in people's interactions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Deborah Schiffrin, 1. *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Frazer Bruce, 2. What are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31. 1999, pp. 931-952.
Redeker Gisela, 3. Discourse markers as attentional cues at discourse transitions Running head: Discourse transitions (retrieved on 4th April, 2015 at <http://odur.let.rug.nl/redeker/DiscourseMarkers.pdf>)