

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I attempt to describe three aspects of spoken discourse. Those are turn-taking, discourse markers, and Grice's cooperative maxims. The thesis was designed as an investigation of the similarities and differences in spoken discourse that takes place in face-to-face informal conversations, Internet public chatroom conversations, and dialogues in written texts (plays) with respect to those three aspects of spoken discourse. The data consists of tape recordings of dialogues among people talking in an informal way, extracts of conversations from Internet public chatrooms, and extracts of dialogues from modern plays. The analysis was done in three parts:

1. Turn-taking: the three types of discourse are compared with respect to the following factors: interruption, overlapping, styles of utterances, preferred or dispreferred responses of adjacency pairs, and floor holding.
2. Discourse markers: the three types of discourse are compared with respect to the following factors: formal and informal styles of discourse markers, locations of discourse markers and the singling abilities of discourse markers.
3. Grice's cooperative maxims: the three types of discourse are compared with respect to Grice's four cooperative maxims.

When analyzing the texts with respect to turn-taking, the several interrupting features were in both the face-to-face informal conversation and the Internet public chatroom texts, whereas no interrupting effects were in the dramatic dialogue texts. There were no overlapping features discovered in either the dramatic dialogue texts or the Internet public chatroom texts. However, there were a lot of overlapping features in the face-to-face informal conversation texts. The styles of the utterances in the dramatic conversation texts were performed as completed utterances, in the correct grammatical form, and a total lack of spelling errors. There were some fragment utterances in the face-to-face informal

conversation texts. The styles of utterances in the Internet chatroom conversation texts were very short with many fragment utterances, a lot grammatical mistakes, spelling mistakes, and many abbreviations and graphical images. The uses of preferred or dispreferred responses were quite easy to see in both the dramatic texts and the face-to-face informal conversation texts. Alternatively, the use of preferred or dispreferred responses was not easy to see in the Internet public chatroom conversations texts. It is quite clear to see the person who is holding the floors in both the dramatic dialogue texts and the face-to-face informal conversation texts. But, it was impossible that a person could visibly hold the floor in the Internet public chatroom texts.

When analyzing the texts with the respect to discourse markers, the formal styles of discourse markers and the informal styles of discourse markers were in the face-to-face informal conversation texts and Internet public chatroom conversation texts. But only the formal styles of discourse markers were found in the dramatic texts. The discourse markers appeared in the initial, middle and final positions of the utterances in the face-to-face informal conversation texts. Similarly, the locations of the discourse markers in the Internet public chatroom conversation texts were found in the initial and final positions in the utterances. But in the discourse markers of the dramatic texts were only found in the initial positions in the utterances. The discourse markers of the dramatic texts, the face-to-face informal conversation texts and the Internet public chatroom conversation texts were similar to each other in terms of signaling abilities.

When analyzing the texts with the respect to Grice's cooperative maxims, the maxim of quantity was not broken easily in either the dramatic texts or the Internet public chatroom conversation texts, in contrast to the face-to-face informal conversation texts, in which the maxim of quantity was flouted easily. Likewise, the Internet public chatroom conversations did not break the maxim of quantity. However, in the face-to-face informal conversation

texts, the speakers can easily break the maxim of quality. The maxim of quality was easily flouted in all three different texts. The maxim of relation was not easy to violate in all three texts. The maxim of manner was easy to break in both the dramatic texts and the Internet public chatroom conversation texts, whereas the maxim of manner was very difficult to flout in the face-to-face informal conversation texts. Additionally, this thesis concludes with the limitations of the study and the recommendations for further research.