

opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 36, 2020, Especial N°

26

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

ISSN 1012-1537/ ISSN e: 2477-9385

Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas
Maracaibo - Venezuela

Conversational Exchange in English and Arabic Netspeak: A Pragmatic Contrastive Study

Asst. Prof. Kamal G. Nasir¹

¹Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences,
University of Thi-qar, Iraq

Email of the corresponding author: kamal.altamimi@gmail.com

Lect. Asst. Mohanned Jassim Dahkil Al-Ghizy²

²Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences,
University of Thi-qar, Iraq

Email of the corresponding author: mohannedjassim@yahoo.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Netspeak can be viewed as a novel medium combining spoken, written and electronic properties. As many linguists have investigated the normal type of conversation "face to face conversation" according to Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims, the analysis of netspeak conversations is not to suggest that we always behave exactly according to this principle. For example, people who lie or make false claims can be challenged; if they talk too much, they can be told to shut up; if they say something irrelevant, they can be asked to stick the point; and if they fail to make themselves clear, they can be requested to say it again. This means that we do all these things according to these maxims indirectly in mind, but in netspeak things are different, a part of the difficulty arises out of the anonymity inherent in the electronic medium.

Some participants change their names and identities when the multiple interactions are taking place under pressure. This indicates that the cooperative principle may be broken. So, when someone notices online utterance, he/she does not know how to take it because he/she does not know what set of conversational principles it obeys and this may lead to the violated conversational maxims in netspeak's exchange (Crystal, 2006).

There may be a direct causal link between the lack of coherence in synchronous online communication and its propensity for language play. Thus, some suggestions of the previous studies were the motives beyond this paper , such as: a- Synchronous online communication is associated with a reduction of coherence, disruption of turn adjacency and phantom turn adjacency; b- In synchronous online communication, there is a difficulty in interpreting messages in their sequential context. This difficulty arises from the fact that turn sequencing is partly user-controlled and partly system-controlled. This leads to disrupted turn adjacency pairs as other stands of conversation get inserted between adjacency pair parts (Herring, 1999 cited in Vandergiff, 2010). Crystal (2006) will be adopted as a model in this study which answers the research questions: What are netspeak 'maxims', 'turn-takings' and 'adjacency pairs' in English and Arabic? Are they violated in synchronous conversations?

This study hypothesizes that netspeak cooperative principle in English and Arabic with its maxims, turns and adjacency pairs are violated in synchronous conversations. It will be limited to focus on synchronous online conversations in English and Arabic, how they are

uttered by first speaker and responded by next speaker in terms of cooperative principle with its maxims, turn-takings and adjacency pairs.

Netspeak is a term used to describe the type of distinctive language found on the internet (Crystal, 2004). This term serves as an alternative to "Weblish, Netlish, Cyberspace, Internet language, Electronic language, Electronic discourse Interactive written discourse, CMC etc.". These idioms are used before netspeak existed and each idiom has a different collaboration, for example "Netlish and Weblish" are derived from English to make the internet more multilingual (Crystal, 2006). Crystal tells that netspeak is a modern medium of communication that does not arrive regularly in the history of the race. He uses the term "Netizen" to refer to those people who spend amount of time on the internet (ibid).

Moreover, Netspeak is an interesting form of communication because it depends on characteristics belonging to speech and writing. It displays the properties of both. It is better seen that netspeak as a written language is pulled some way in the direction of a speech than as a spoken language that is written down (Crystal, 2006). This interest of netspeak comes from its salient features which are taken from one of its situational manifestations. These manifestations are begun to be used outside of the situation of CMC even though the medium has become available to most people. So, the influence of netspeak affects vocabulary with graphology in some written varieties and everyday conversations (ibid). Thurlow et al. (2004) declare that netspeak is the social variable that invariably shapes online interaction and the best

place to recognize netspeak on the internet, is clearly in the channels of synchronous communication such as IM, chat, and MUDs. They also add that netspeak describes linguistic forms that are used on the internet and the ways people use language in online conversations (ibid).

Language of the internet can be viewed as a novel medium combining spoken, written and electronic properties (Crystal, 2006). Domains of netspeak differ in the degree of synchronicity of the message such as "protection, reception and response". So, this synchronicity leads some scholars like Herring (1999) and Werry (1996) to observe that interaction in netspeak thought of its textual nature, it is a kind of conversation (Markman, 2013).

Levinson (1983) (cited in Markman, 2013) tells that "conversation is clearly the prototypical type of language use" and this will provide insight into the most pragmatic phenomenon. So, the properties of the medium in text-based conversation that may alter the pragmatic phenomenon are manifested and some terms will lose their referents when visual cues are absent.

Grice considers communication as a restriction to what is called cooperative principle. Participants negotiate meaning in a given context in the process of communication. He (1975) proposes that participants should follow the cooperation in negotiating meaning to achieve the communicative goal. Grice's logic of conversation focuses on the idea that participants are rational factors and they should obey the principle of rationality which is called "cooperative principle" which is formulated as follows: "Make your conversational

contribution as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted direction or purpose of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975:45-6).

"The co-operative principle enables one participant in a conversation to communicate on the assumption that the other participant is being co-operative" (Leech, 1983: 82). Its function is to regulate what is said so that it contributes to some discursual goals (ibid). Grice introduces the co-operative principle and its maxims to explain the mechanics by which people interpret conversation implicature in "logic and conversation". Grice also claims that in conversational interaction, participants work on the assumption that a certain set of rules is in operation unless they receive indications to the contrary (Thomas, 1995).

To achieve the cooperative principle or successful communication, the speaker has to follow the maxims of conversation. These maxims are:

1-The maxim of quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange. Don't make your contribution more informative than is required.

2-The maxim of quality: Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3-The maxim of relevance (Relation): Make your contribution relevant (be relevant).

4-The maxim of manner: Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity. Be brief, and be orderly.

Crystal (2006) gives chat groups as an example of netspeak that resembles oral communication. He mentions that chat groups conversations are time-bound, which is a character of real life conversations. Paolillo & Zelenkauskaitė (2013) mention that in chat groups, the textual nature of information is conveyed non-verbally for example, facial expression, intonation and proxemics have to be represented as a text. So, in chat, paralinguistic features such as the repetition of letters for emphasis for example "nooooo!" emoticons such as: "☺", punctuation marks like "hey!!!!!" and abbreviations such as: "lol" 'laugh out loud' are used to convey the message non-verbally. Chat communication encourages informal, spontaneous communication. Its informal structure and the requirements for interaction, and the variety of its content and context make chat pragmatically complex (ibid). All these informal features draw inferences among users about the nature of these linguistic features (Baron, 2013).

So, to apply Grice's maxims on the internet situations, Crystal (2006) tells that when we see an internet utterance, we do not know how to take it because we do not know what set of conversational principles it obeys. For example:

The maxim of quality is undermined two circumstances: "spoofing" which is messages whose origin is suspect, and "trolling" which is the messages that are sent to cause irritation to others.

The maxim of quantity is also undermined netspeak situations in the extreme of "lurking" which is "a refusal to communicate" and "flaming" which is aggressive messages that are related to a specific

topic and directed at an individual recipient seems more infraction to the maxim of manner than quantity. The maxim of manner is also challenged in some internet situations "brevity is recognized in many netspeak interactions in terms of sentence length, the number of sentences in a turn or the amount of text on a screen". There are several signs of brevity in many situations where the principle is honoured more in the breach than observance (ibid).

In synchronous chat groups, the basic challenge is that all participants are speaking at once which makes a transcript of an interaction difficult to follow. Typing imposes a strong pressure on the sender to be selective in what is said particularly when someone is not very fast or competent typist. So, selected expressions may lead to all types of ambiguity (ibid).

The maxim of relevance is also violated in some situations, in that the internet exchange may have a purpose for example, a search for information or the desire to score points in a fantasy game. But in some cases, the purpose of the exchange like in some chat groups cannot be determined, there is no subject-matter or it can be irrelevant (ibid).

During the talk exchange, participants do not always follow these maxims. They may flout, violate or opt out a maxim (Grice, 1975). If a speaker flouts a maxim, the utterance conveys a conversational implicature or an implied meaning, while a hearer works out of conversational implicatures by taking into account the literal meaning of an utterance, the co-operative principle with its

maxims and the contextual factors of the communicative event (Brown and Yule, 1983).

A flout happens when a speaker fails to observe a maxim of what is said. In this case, the implicature is generated intentionally. So, flouting a maxim causes misleading or deceiving to the hearer and the hearer will look for a meaning which differs from the expressed meaning (Thomas, 1995). A speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by giving less or more information than is required. The maxim of quality flouts when the speaker mentions something false in which he/she lacks evidence. The maxim of relation flouts when the response is irrelevant to the topic. The maxim of manner flouts by giving incomplete or ambiguous information (ibid).

According to Cameron (2001) and Hutchby (2001) conversational analysis is a study of talk in interaction or the systematic analysis of the types of talk produced in everyday situations of social interaction. So, many theoretical studies have examined conversation as an interaction between individuals with conversation occurred as spoken communication. Hutchby (2001) argues that CA seeks to focus on the behavioural as opposed to cognitive or internal elements of talk in interaction. Nunamaker et al. (1993) declare that there is one primary feature of conversation which is fully interactive at least two individuals must participate in it and those individuals exchange messages in a real time. So, individuals take turns in exchanging these messages so that conversation is a sequential activity.

Sacks et al. (1974) as cited in Hutchby (2001) argue that there are three basic facts about conversation: turn taking occurs, one participant tends to talk at time and turns are taken with as little gap or overlap between them as possible. So, CA research aims to investigate how the technical aspects of turn taking are structured, socially organized resources by which individuals perform and arrange activities through talk-in-interaction. Conversation is treated as a vehicle for social action and as the vital implies by which social organization in individual interactions is developed and sustained (ibid). CA has strong links with pragmatics and social psychology and it adopts a different view on the nature and relevance of goals and strategies in everyday communication (ibid). CA is embedded with the theory of "turn-taking" and other aspects like "adjacency pairs" that provide a framework on which conversational analysts may rely (Sacks et al., 1978).

Tudini (2010) mentions that online chat interaction is considered as a textual form of socially oriented, naturally occurring talk that tends itself to the same kinds of analyses that have been applied to face-to-face talk. Though it is a written form of communication, chat shares many features with spoken interaction such as synchronous communication. So, in analyzing chat, no transcription of conversations is required as individuals collaborate and control their own written production of conversations.

Thus, Crystal (2006) proposes some differences between Netspeak and face-to-face conversation. First, is a function of the technology_ the lack of simultaneous feedback and messages sent via

a computer are complete and unidirectional. There is no way that a recipient can react to the messages while it is being typed and there is no way for a participant to get a sense of how successful a message is and there is no technical way of allowing the receiver to send the electronic equivalent or any other audio-visual reactions which play a role in face-to-face interaction. So, messages cannot overlap. Second, it also results from the technology which is the rhythm of the internet interaction, is very slower than in speech situation and disallows some of conversation's most salient properties.

Conversation is characterized by turn-taking in that one participant (A) talks and stops; another participant (B) starts and tops, and so on (Levinson, 1983). Sacks et al. (1974, 1978), cited in (Levinson, 1983), claim that the mechanism that governs turn-taking is a set of rules with ordered options that operates on a turn-by-turn basis and can be called "a local management system". One way about looking at these rules is a sharing device, operating over a scarce resource and an economy. This way is called "control of the floor". The allocational system requires minimal units which are the units that construct turns in conversation. These units are determined by different features of linguistic surface structure, they are syntactic units such as "sentences, clauses, phrases" (ibid). A speaker will initiate in one of these turn-construction units. The end of such a unit constitutes a point at which speakers may change, it is a transition relevance place "TRP". At a TRP the rules that govern the transition of speakers then come into play which does not mean that speakers will change at that point but they may do so (ibid).

Crystal (2006) argues that netspeak is characterized by unique features, one of these features is turn-taking. Jones et al. (2011) define utterance as an individual message sent with a stroke of the return key. They also define turn as a series of uninterrupted utterance by one speaker. Jenks (2014) mentions that turn-taking studies possess two analytic objectives: to understand the communicative features of online platform and to compare these features with face-to-face communication. Crystal (2006) says that short responses are one of the features of netspeak which differ from face-to-face conversation.

Baron (2008) argues that in conversational analysis, a 'turn' is the language used by a speaker while he/she holds the floor before ceding it or being interrupted. That turn may consist of one sentence, many sentences or just a sentence fragment such as 'Hmm'. Vandergiff (2010) mentions that the turn-taking system is different from face-to-face interaction for example, in FTF interaction an utterance produced after a request will be interpreted as a response to the request, i.e. a denial or a grant. In synchronous CMC, this interpretation may be wrong because participants don't have as much control over the sequencing of utterance as in FTF. On one hand, Crystal (2006) tells that many issues, such as turn-taking, make netspeak interaction differs from conversational speech and netspeak is unlike speech with respect to the formal properties of the medium that becomes difficult for participants to live up to the recommendation that they can write as they talk. On the other hand, Benwell & Stokoe (2006) mention that turn-taking in netspeak is different from face to face conversations. The notion of turn-taking is

compromised by the absence of non-textual features associated with face-to-face such as: falling intonation signally the end of a turn. The conversational coherence thought to be lacking in CMC and it is compensated by a variety of creative means. In certain forms of CMC, responses to a turn may be multiple and simultaneous and making a topic difficult to follow. While in real time conversational turn-taking, multiple responses get neglected to leave one participant speaking in the clear. So, netspeak is conventionally incoherent in terms of turn-taking (overlapping, exchanges, disrupted adjacency and topic decay) and users either adapt to or exploit these deficiencies.

Adjacency pairs are the type of paired utterances which are prototypical such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, offer-acceptance, apology-minimization, etc. Adjacency pairs are inter-related with turn-taking system as techniques for selecting a next speaker (Levinson, 1983). Couthard (1985) describes adjacency pairs as the basic structural units in conversation because they are used for opening and closing conversation, and because they operate turn-taking system in that a speaker produces the first part of utterance and the second part is being expected.

Adjacency pairs can be characterized by certain features:

- 1- It is composed of two turns.
- 2- By different speakers
- 3- Adjacently ordered one after the other.
- 4- These two ordered pairs are differentiated into first pair parts which are utterance kinds such as question, request, invitation, offer, announcement, etc. These types initiate some exchange, and second

pair parts of utterance are responsive to the action of a prior turn such as answer, accept, grant, reject, agree/disagree, decline, acknowledge, etc.

5- Pair-type related, in that adjacency pairs compose pair types which are types of exchange such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-accept/decline and so on (Schegloff, 2007), (Jacobs, 2002) and (Levinson, 1983). The basic rule of operation of adjacency pair: the first pair is produced to give the recognizable production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop, a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part of the same pair type. This rule can be represented in the diagram below:

- a. first pair part
- b. second pair part (Schegloff, 2007), (Jacobs, 2002) and (Levinson, 1983)

Levinson (1983) mentions some problems with the rule of adjacency pairs depending on Schegloff's "insertion sequences", the first problem is that there are embedded sequences with adjacency pairs such as "a question-answer pair" can be embedded within another. So, Levinson substitutes the notion of adjacency with the notion of "conditional relevance", in that given a first pair, a second pair is relevant and expectable. The second problem is related to the possible seconds of a first part. So, Levinson uses the term "preference organization" in that some choices of second pair parts are preferred and others are dispreferred to solve this problem.

A chat group is "a group of people who meet regularly at a particular internet site (chatroom) to discuss topics of common interest". Chat groups are of two types: synchronous which take place in real time, and asynchronous which take place in postponed time and messages can be posted at any time (Crystal, 2004). In synchronous chat groups, participants seek to exchange messages quickly to approximate real time face-to-face conversation and the modality of typewritten text. So, communication on the internet tends to represent a casual space for written language use (Sequires, 2010). In synchronous chat groups, electronic interactions take place in real time. Some systems allow communication between two participants only such as UNIX or "UNIX", in this system conversational exchange of texts are displayed as they are typed and participants are typing at the same time with input coming in simultaneously with output. The communication in this type is private "one to one" (Crystal, 2006).

While, other systems permit several participants to be in touch with each other like 'Internet Relay Chat'. In this type, participants connect to one of the IRC servers on a particular network and join to one of the channels "chatrooms". Each room is devoted to a particular topic and any participant can create new room and become its operator. Furthermore, this type allows either private communication between participants or public communication in that everyone can see what you type. So, in synchronous situation, sender and receiver must be logged on simultaneously in real time (Herring, 2007 cited in Bieswanger, 2016).

2. METHODOLOGY

The data used in this paper are a type of synchronous chat groups screenshots that are collected randomly from the internet. The source of the data is an online public English and Arabic chat groups. The reason for selecting this kind of data is that "chatrooms" include many participants from different ages, culture, education, backgrounds and regions who exchange online messages in real time. Another reason is that these chatrooms are open access and free with different topics. This means that the data will be a variety of formal and informal language. The data will have a value in collecting different styles and registers of netspeak. Participants in these chatrooms are looking to communicate with those who share the same interest and those who can collaborate with in creating an online dialogue and communicating information. The number of participants in each room varies according to the topics of discussion. Each participant has to choose a nickname before he/she enters the room, so that the researcher selects a random nick to enter the rooms and kept silent during collecting English data from the following addresses:

<https://www.chatroombazaar.com/room/1>

<https://www.321chat.com/teen/chat.php> teenage

<https://chat-strange.com/ChatRooms?type=languages&id=en>

<https://ukchat.com/chat/>

Whereas the Arabic data are collected in the same way of English data from the following addresses:

<https://www.arabic.chat/>

<https://www.3a-chat.com/chat/>

<https://araby.chat/>

The messages of synchronous chat groups tend to be short because all members are online and messages are sent and received from the same server. So, the sender does not need to wait for a long time for response because messages are not stored, and messages are arranged according to the time of occurrence from the newer to the older. This means messages are posted and transmitted in the real time in the forum. The norm that is used in this type of exchange is more informal as in the everyday speech in face-to-face communication because participants are of different ages, education, region and backgrounds. So, it is everyday language that is full of slang. The messages that are sent display immediately on the screen and topics of the rooms vary according to the room's name. Most participants have their own nicknames which are not real and sometimes they change their nicks during the conversation.

3. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

The data used in this study will be analyzed and categorized, as the findings of netspeak "synchronous chat groups" produced by online participants, into conversational maxims, turn-taking and adjacency pairs in English and Arabic. So, what is noticed that there is some difficulty in identifying the conversational exchange in synchronous chat groups because of the high number of participants

who exchange online real time messages and the screen is scrolling very quickly. Participants exchange messages by typing what they will say and reading what they like to listen. This means that participants in online chat type responses and use vocabulary that reflect how they speak rather than how they write. So, they use techniques to moralize their messages by using abbreviations, acronyms, creative punctuation marks and smileys. The use of these techniques is to compensate the lack of contextual factors that are found in face to face conversations. Thus, participants' exchange, in real time online conversations which is a written speech, does not have any rules because of the participants' freedom and the anonymity that they feel sometimes encourage them to overlook the rules that they should follow in the conversation.

Netspeak Maxims in English and Arabic Conversations:

As mentioned by Grice (1975), participants cooperate to achieve their communicative goals and obey the cooperative principle with its maxims to regulate what is said. So, Crystal (2006) discusses the terms (*trolling, spamming, lurking* and *flaming*) to show that online discourse has many constraints differ from speech. He discusses these terms according to Grice's maxims of conversations.

The maxim of quantity:

In chat groups, the failing to provide enough information during the exchange of messages is a result of an attempt to attract attention. So, the failure to observing the maxim of quantity occurs when someone gives incomplete information that makes another asks for more information and there are many examples will show this failure. Another case leads to violation in the maxim of quantity in chat groups

is "lurking" in that someone enters a chatroom without posting any message. Some participants are accessing a chatroom without contributing to the conversation or what Crystal (2006) calls "a refusal to communicate". So, there are many cases of such behaviour found in synchronous chat groups in that some participants appear online, but they do not post any message. In such case the maxim of quantity has been violated "make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)". Thus, any participant enters a chatroom without contributing is failing to be as informative as is required. Lurkers maybe not have any information about the exchange or they may want to know about the conventions that exchange between participants.

The following examples show the maxim of quantity in English:

In this example, a participant asks another participant to give him his account key and identification without explaining the reason behind that or for what. So, this incomplete information leads to imbiguity.

- Tani-shahh: metalskateboarder: give me your account key and id
- Metalskateboarder: tani-shahh: my account key and id? For what?

In following example shows that one of the participants uses the words "quark cheese" without explaining what are they and this makes another participant asks about the meaning of these two words.

- RoyalLeathering: Mmmm quark cheese is gorgeous
- Hakan: what is quark cheese?

The example below shows that a participant sends a message to a specific participant without addressing his nickname and this leads another participant to ask to whom he/she sent.

- Guest-Olaf: ilu2 mate
- I-love-u: was that 2 me?
- Guest-Olaf: yes
- I-love-u: hi then
- Guest-Olaf: hi

4-In the following conversation, one of the chatters asks about "water fasting" without giving more information and this makes other participants ask him/her to clarify what he/she means.

- Guest-3findiaLost: has anyone tried water fasting on here?
- I-love-u: water what?
- Guest-3findiaLost: I did 10 days water fast it was awesome u should try it complete body detox.
- I-love-u: what's water fasting? Or is it just fast moving!
- CroyalLeathering: can body go 10 days without water?
- Guest-3findiaLost: No water fasting means taking only water no solid food or juice.

In the example below, one participant uses the abbreviated form "nz" which is ambiguous to others and makes them ask what it means.

- Recklessman: say nz
- Recklessman: nz?
- Recklessman: what does that mean?
- Colderthancocacola: New Zealand

Whereas the following examples show the maxim of quantity in Arabic:

In following example one participant whose name is "Wisam" asks another participant whose name is "Laith" a question which is "did you watch the match today?" So, Wisam's question is incomplete and makes "Laith" to ask for more information.

• Wisam: Laith, did you watch the match today?
وسام: ليث هل شاهدت المباراة اليوم؟

• Laith: which match
ليث: أي مباراة

• Wisam: Iraq and Qatar
وسام: العراق و قطر

7-In the example below, one participant addresses information to another participant without saying these information about whom. So, these incomplete information make the addressee saying "I don't understand".

• Ahly10: Sinorita, Ahmed 20 years old from Asyut

اهلي10: سنورتا, احمد 20 سنة من اسويوط

• Sinorita: Ahly10, I do not understand

سنورتا:اهلي10 , ما فهمت

• Ahly10: Sinorita, I mean I'm Ahmed 20 years old from Asyut

اهلي10: سنورتا,

اقول لك انا احمد 20 سنة من اسويط

• Sinorita: blooming, I'm from Morocco
سنورتا: اهلي10, منور وانا من المغرب

Some participants ask a question without giving more information about their questions. So, in the following example, one participant asks a question about "how can he put a photo" without saying which or where? This leads another participant asks him "which photo".

• Ginwa: how can I put a photo
غنوة: شلون اخلي الصورة ما اعرف

• Summer: Ginwa, which photo
سمر: غنوة, صورة ايه

• Ginwa:summer, my profile photo
غنوة: سمر, صورة للبروفایل

The maxim of quality:

In chat groups, the maxim of quality is violated in the case of "trolling" which is posting messages that cause irritation to others because the other participant is asking for more information to those who produce a "troll". So, a troll includes false information or lacks evidence and this leads to violation in the maxim of quality. Another case in chat groups leads to violation in the maxim of quality which is "spoofing" "messages whose origin is suspect" and there is not any example in the data about such case.

The example below shows that one participant tries to irritate another participant in the same chatroom either by giving false information or he/she does not have evidence to support his/her claim.

- Ali: Knight: Guest is talking to u
- Knight: Don't hurt my feeling
- Ali: messaged me on my id

In this example, the same participant tries to draw others attention by causing irritation to them from time to time.

- Pandahumboldt707: nobody baby
- Pandahumboldt707: and who can do like me nobody
- Pandahumboldt707: and whoooo can do like meeee
- Pandahumboldt707: all day
- Pandahumboldt707: I am the best rapper in here
- Pandahumboldt707: hahaha twisted
- Pandahumboldt707: get em
- Pandahumboldt707: everything false
- Pandahumboldt707: not true

In the following example a participant addresses personal question that irritates the recipient.

- daRealYvette: danny2012: are u white?
- Danny2012: why what does that matter lol

Whereas the following examples show the maxim of quality in Arabic:

In the following example, a participant whose name is (Sami) asks another participant whose name is (Khoshaw) a personal question and this question irritates the recipient by saying "why".

• Sami: Khoshaw, are you Kurdish? سامي: خوشناو هل انت كوردي

• Khoshaw: Sami why this question, did you see me writing Kurdish?

خوشناو: سامي لم هذا السؤال هل شاهدتني اكتب كوردي

• Sami: sorry brother but I thought that from your name.
اسف اخي تصورت من اسمك

The exmple below shows that someone whose name is (wolf) asks another person whose name is (Ahmed) a question about his belonging to a terrorist organization by judging from his shape. This accusation lacks to evidence and irritates the other person by saying "why this question" and how do you judge from the shape.

• Wolf: Ahmed: Are you ISIS? الذئب: احمد: هل انت داعشي

• Ahmed: Why this question Wolf? احمد: لم هذا السؤال بالذئب؟

• Wolf: Your mustache and beard say you are ISIS hahah

الذئب:

شواربك ولحيتك تقول انك داعشي ههههه

• Ahmed: God damn you. How do you judge on human from his shape?
احمد: لعنة الله عليك كيف تحكم عالانسان من شكلة.

• Wolf: I'm sorry my brother. I'm just kidding.

Moreover, synchronous text-based conversation lacks the contextual factors that found in face to face conversation. Nicknames are considered the cue that participants identify in the channel and most participants do not use their real names and they create their own nicks according to their choices. In addition, they always change their nicks during the flow of conversation. This means that the information that participants give about themselves are incorrect. In this case Grice's maxim of quality has not been fulfilled in the conversation.

The maxim of manner:

Chat groups channel permits participants to write in a high speed and use few characters, words or expressions to flow the exchange. This makes participants have a tendency to use brevity. So, the limited amount of the words typed in chat groups may lead to many cases of obscurity, ambiguity and disorder and this leads to violation in the maxim of manner as in example (3, 5, 11, 14). Another way leads to violation the maxim of manner which is "flaming" "aggressive messages that are related to a specific topic and directed at an individual recipient" as in example (9).

Many examples in the data show the use of abbreviations because of several reasons such as the high number of chatter who are chatting at the same time, save time and effort, economy expressions and so on. These abbreviations can cause ambiguity or obscurity.

- DarkEye: Brb
- Meggomyeggo: it's funny when people try to flex their vocabulary but it just comes off as pretentious.

Whereas the following examples show the maxim of manner in Arabic:

Some previous examples such as (12, 13) show the violation of the manner maxim in Arabic. These examples are directed to an individual recipient and they are considered as aggressive messages.

Few cases in Arabic show the use of abbreviations by some participants especially in greeting such as:

- Laith: S. A.

ليث: س.ع

- Haider: W. S. A

حيدر: و.ع.س

The maxim of relation:

The maxim of relation is also violated in chat groups, in that the initial perception of several conversations displays the lack of structure or coherence. So, some responses seem to be irrelevant to the topics of discussion or to the previous discussion. So, Crystal (2006) argues that in chat groups "silence is ambiguous: it may reflect a deliberate withholding, a temporary inattention, or a physical absence (without signing off)". However, some participants feel they need to signal their presence by sending irrelevant messages as in examples (2, 4, 10, and 14).

So, in the case of spamming, a participant sends the same message several times in an attempt to force the message on other participants who do not choose to receive it. This leads to violate the maxim of quantity and also the maxim of relevance because such messages are not related to the topic.

- Rami: 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊
- 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊 :رامي
- Rami: 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊
- 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊 :رامي
- Rami: 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊
- 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊 :رامي
- Rami: 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊
- 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊 :رامي
- Rami: 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊
- 😊😊😊😊😊😊😊😊 :رامي

In the following example, the same sender repeated the question a lot without paying attention to the topic of discussion.

- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص
- Young 17: any madam, private شاب17: أي سيده خاص

In addition, most English and Arabic chat rooms lack to any specific topic because everyone writes what he/she feel, or what ideas in his/her mind. Another reason for that which is many new participants enter and many others left the conversation.

Turn-taking:

Turn-taking in synchronous chat groups is always violated and overlapped several times because chat groups involve multiple participants. So, turn-taking in online conversations does not occur in a chronological order as in face to face conversations. In online conversations, the contexts of the interpretation of a speaker's meaning and the development of the conversational topic are determined by the uptake and responses of the recipient of the speaker's message. The original speaker has no preferential means to select the timing of the next turn or to select the subsequent speaker and the choice of uptake lies with the response.

Thus, the samples of the data show that there is a lack in the organization of turns, most conversations overlap and a given turn is separated by unrelated turns for many reasons: first, chatrooms have a large number of participants and all those participants are writing at once in real time. Second, short responses are quickly distributed in the pressure of exchange. Third, writing is slower than speech. Fourth, the absence of paralinguistic features. Fifth, some participants frequently enter and leave the chat. So, the conversation proceeds in a mixture of sequence simultaneity and overlap. In addition, Crystal (2006) tells that when someone starts to send a reaction to someone else's utterance before it finishes, the reaction will take its turn in a non-overlapping series of utterance on the screen depending on the point at which the send signal is received at the host server. Messages are posted to a receiver's screen linearly in the order in which they are received by the system. So, in chat groups, messages are coming from different sources and with different lags. Thus, because of the packets of

information are sent electronically through different global between a sender and a receiver, it is possible for turn-taking reversals to take place and all types of unpredictable overlaps.

Some participants enter a chat room at a random point and not knowing how many other people are involved, who they are, what they have been talking about. So, they may find themselves in the middle of a conversation. The examples below will show all the mentioned above:

The following example shows that the participant "Getupkid" addresses individual participant "Jenie" by his nickname to avoid ambiguity. Then, the reply comes after four lines "conversations" and also addresses by a nickname. This means that these turns are separated or unrelated to each other.

- Getupkid: Jenie happy mother's day!!!!
- Danny2012: says it ok to pm lol
- Metalskatboarder: Halle: so let me get this straight a lot of Philippines are brainwashed into believing what he is doing is alright?
- Danny2012: Halle idk about that but it says
- Danny2012: fuck politics
- Jenie: Getupkid: Ty Ty xoxo

In the example below, the same strategy used as in the previous example which is "the first participant addresses or selects the next participant by using his/her nickname", but the difference here another participant interrupts before the specific participant replies.

- Tani-shahh: metalskateboarder: give me your account key and id

- Danny2012: ha halle now that is a good one.
- Danny2012: make your own account lol
- Danny2012: you know tani
- Metalskateboarder: tani-shahh: my account key and id? For what?
- Danny2012: you could of done it by now lol

In this example, participants use the same strategy which is the addressing of specific nickname to help them making the conversation clear and easy, but the turns are interrupted from each other by another turns for the previous ones and this can be caused by some participants who have little experience, type slowly or less talkative. One of the participants replies with smileys to the whole participants to overcome the lack of paralinguistic cues found in face-to-face communication to express emotions or feelings.

- Mask man: Nettie u look cute
- TBF: Bye tc
- Cb4: Laila's very popular with the pink hotdog sect.
- Burak25: ☺☺
- Fact: Laila I missed u too
- Nettie-a2: ta Mask

Whereas the following examples show turn taking in Arabic:

In the following example one participant "mohammed" asks a question but he doesn't get any reply. In such case he may enter the chat and he found himself in the middle of the exchange or other participants have no answer to his question and they have to continue

their conversation with each other. This example also shows random or unrelated turns in Arabic chats.

• Sara19: Hi

سارة19: هاي

• Alya:

Ayad

welcome

عليا: اياد مرحبا

• Mohammed: is there any girl from Assuit?

محمد: عاوز بنت من اسيوط هنا

• Ahmed aliraqi: enlighten

احمد العراقي: منورين

• Yassir: Hiiiiiii

ياسر: هااااااي

• Ibrahim:

Byeeee

ابراهيم: باااااي

The example below shows the overlap and lack of coherence in Arabic chat. All this may be because of the high number of participant in each room, so, some participants addressed other participants by their nicks to avoid this overlap.

• Yara: I'm a girl 16 years old, is it normal to be with you or not?

يارا: انا بنت

16 عادي اكون معكم وله لا

• alhazeen: who has snapchat send me private. الحزين:الي عنده سناب

بيعث لي خاص

- Lolo: good evening لولو: مساء الخير

- Emad Omar: any girl private? عماد عمر: أي بنت خاص

- Yassmin: tota hiiiiii ياسمين: توتا: هالاي

- Mahmood: mahmood with you for treatment from magic by using the holly Qur'an
محمود: معكم محمود للعلاج بالقران من السحر

- Haneen: good evening حنين: مساء الخير

- Aliraqi: I want iraqi girl العراقي: اريد بنت عراقية

- The King: mahmood, are you spiritualist? الملك: محمود: انت روحاني؟

- Romeo: is there anyone from Giza for acquaintance and friendship?
روميو: هل من احد هنا نتعرق عليه من الجيزة للصدائة؟

- Ahlam: helloooo احلام: هلوووو

- Mahmood: the king: yes I treat with holy Qur'an. محمود: الملك: نعم انا اعالج بالقران

The following conversation shows that truns lack to organization, not ordered and separated with many conversations.

Anyone writes what's in his mind without paying any attention to other conversations. Many responses are related to previous conversations but the new participants who enter in middle of the exchange or those who left the exchange cause all this mess in the arrangement of the exchange.

- Ali Aloosh: reem can you accept friendship?

علي علوش: ريم ممكن تقبلي الصداقة

- Saad: alloo

سعد: الوووو

- Mustafa: anyone has a question or enquiry send me private

مصطفى: أي واحد عنده سؤال او استفسار يجي خاص

- Black king: good morning

الملك الاسود: صباح الخير

- Waleed: amamam amamam

وليد: امممم امممم

- Reem: ali aloosh: why?

ريم: علي علوش: ليه

- Sara: I want a name of a nice film

ساره: اريد اسم فلم حلوو

- Adan: good evening from Algeria

عدن: مساء الخير من الجزائر

- Faris: hi

all

فارس: مرحبا جميعا

- Lorena: good morning king

لورينا: صباح الخير ملك

- Ali aloosh: reem: if you like to be friends علي علوش: ريم نصير
اصدقاء لو تحبي
- Aliraqi aliraqi: hi Faris العراقي العراقي: مرحبا فارس
- Saad: helloooo
سعد: هلوووو
- Saif: hello Lorena
سف: هلا لورينا
- Rashid : any girl for friendship
راشد: أي بنت للصدائة
- Reem: ali aloosh: friends on public not pravite ريم: علي علوش
اصدقاء عالعام مو عالخاص
- Iraqi flower: anyone from Baghdad? الوردة العراقية: أي احد من بغداد
- Faris: hi iraqi flower
فارس: مرحبا وردة العراقية
- Zaid: zaid 20 years old with you
زيد: معكم زيد 20 سنة
- Ali aloosh: reem: as you like no problem. علي علوش: ريم مثل ما
تحبي مو مشكلة

Adjacency pairs

Adjacency pairs are important strategy to manage the conversational structure. In most chat groups' exchange, adjacency pairs are separated in a linear order from the previous ones by some responses. Crystal (2006) argues that in some conditions of chat groups, there can be no turn-taking and no adjacency pairs because the

time-frames of participants do not coincide for example when someone asks a question, the receiver receives it and sends an answer, but on the screen the answer sometimes is received before the question and vice versa. So, there is a confusion in that turn-taking and adjacency pairs are disputable or interruptable (ibid). The number of overlapping interaction means that a screen may display at any one time and increases depending on the number of participants and the random nature of the lags. In many cases, there is ignorance toward the first pair part either because the pressure of the number of participants or because the speaker of the first part is newer for the current conversation or he/she left the chat for a period of time. Thus, adjacency pairs are violated a lot in synchronous chat groups. The examples below will show all the mentioned above. In this example the two pairs are present. The first chatter asks a question then an appropriate answer produced by another chatter.

- Stanlake: who's Die?
- Creepygirl: someone stoned.

In the current example, the first chatter greets the room, but he gets no response. This ignorance of the first part may be because the producer of this part is new comer to the conversation.

- BabayGirlLani: Hello
- Douexplorer: qt9 nahh
- DarkEye: anyway I need food
- DarkEye: brb

The first parts in this example are separated by messages from another exchange or irrelevant messages, and this makes participants

face a problem of how to keep track of who is talking to whom in chat groups. Thus, the second parts are separated in a linear order from the previous ones.

- Brummie87: Evening
- Guest-30findiaLost: for some charity is worship
- Dreammaker4uonly: **Olaf** did you say something?
- Guest-Olaf: evening **Brummie**
- Normalish: has your finger got thrush RL??
- Guest-30findialost: it all takes us to the same path
- Cantona: Brummie87
- royalLeathering: it's called Onken Extra Creamy Firm Set
- guest-Olaf: yeah take your time
- brummie87: hi **Olaf**
- hakan: that was a vet heterosexual enquiry by Barmy
- brummie87: Cantona
- barmy: **Olaf** have u not melted yet
- guest-Olaf: discharge

The following example shows that adjacency pairs may operate turn-taking by enabling participants to specify some turns to the next participants by producing the first part. In other words, some participants produce the first part that requires an answer to be granted as a second part by pointing out a specific nickname.

- EmElle: hi
- royalLeathering: lol that's a bonus, Guest-30finaiLost xx
- royalLeathering: where have you been **Emelle**

• guest-30findiaLost: like how can they enjoy crunchy maggots no crickets on teir cheese

- royalLeathering: ewww
- barmy: whose gonna offer **Royal** dead Wilbur
- royalLeathering: lmao **Wilbur**????
- Guest-Olaf: **Emelle** where's Dann
- Barmy: Duplicate xx
- Normalish: I get the blame for everything
- EmElle: **RoyalLeathering**: I've been around dear!

In the current example, a participant points out a specific question "first part" to a specific participant and he gets no reply.

- Fact: **Laila**: why do u hate me?
- Mask man: u r queen for your partner
- Nettie-a2: I'm not queen she's over 90
- Citrusfruit: look at all those chickens
- Sarahbest: zzzz

In the this example, a participant points out a specific question "first part" about a specific participant and he gets different replies by different participants.

- Life17942: who is **Dat**?
- Davidishere: I don't know
- FollowTheSpiders: yeah he mods another room

In the following example, adjacency pairs are violated by producing the first part which is (question or greeting) by different

participants without getting a specific or suitable answer from other participants. So, the interaction can become fragmented or disrupted.

- Goldfish41: is there football on tonight?
- RoyalLeathering: who's Margot Kidder?
- Guest-Olaf: original lois lane
- Asl: well then should want fulham promoted so you can smash em

- royalLeathering: aww
- guest-Olaf: well 1978
- guest-Olaf: I'm waiting till2050 asl
- i-love-u: did I walk on football chat
- asl: no i-love-u you logged on
- blckm38: hi
- I-love-u: oh I see asl bloody hell man. Sorry
- guest-olaf: yes football

Whereas the following example shows adjacency pairs in Arabic:

33- The following conversation shows that most second parts of adjacency pairs in Arabic are not ordered and they are separated from the first parts with some other unrelated turns. The same conversation shows that many first parts such as (greetings or questions) get no responses. The reason may be because these greetings or questions are not addressed to a specific participant, but to the whole room.

- Afaf: hiii عفاف: مرحبا
- Hidy: I'm bored هايددي: ملل
- Private driver: anyone needs driver send me private سائق خاص
خاص: أي حدا محتاج سواقة بيعث خاص
- Very small: how are you? صغير جدا: كيفكم
- Zagzog: _____ afaf, _____ hiii
زقروق: عفاف مرحبا
- Fahad: anyone Saudi sends me private فهد: أي سعودي هنا يجي خاص
- Rasheed: peace be with you رشيد: السلام عليكم
- Abu haider: all of you are young ابو حيدر: كلکم شباب
- Hani: any girl can send me private هاني: أي بنت تجي خاص
- Zainab: hi afaf زينب: مرحبا عفاف

Similarities and Differences

1- Both English and Arabic chat groups violated a lot in the *quantity maxim*, in that most chatters do not give complete information during the discussion flow and this leads to other participants to ask about more information.

2- Both English and Arabic chat groups violated a lot the quality maxim, in that most participants give false or lack evidence information because the recipient asks about evidence.

3- Another similar thing between English and Arabic in the maxim of quality which is most chatters do not use their real names or do not give correct information about themselves or hide their identity in chat groups.

4- Most English and Arabic chat groups violated in the maxim of manner especially in the case of sending aggressive messages to a particular recipient.

5- Most English chatters have tendency to use abbreviations everywhere in chat groups for speed and to save time or as economy expressions, but unlike Arabic chatters who are rarely use abbreviations in chat groups and they use short phrases or short responses.

6- Both English and Arabic violated a lot in the maxim of relation, in that several chatters send messages that are not related to topic of the exchange or they just send what is in their minds to waste time or for entertainment.

7- In the case of turn taking, both English and Arabic chat groups violated a lot, in that many turns are overlapped and lacked to coherence, or they are separated with many unrelated conversations. So, in both languages many participants use the strategy of addressing participants by their nick names to avoid that overlap.

8- Most English and Arabic adjacency pairs are unrelated and they separated with each other with some other conversations. The

most popular parts used in English are (greetings) and (questions and answers), but in Arabic are (greetings).

9- It is also noticed that most English and Arabic chatters use informal language, different ages, sex, culture, education, etc.

4. CONCLUSION

The conclusions are based on the formulated research questions which are based on the summary of the findings.

1-The analysis of the data shows that cooperative principle is often violated in online communication in both English and Arabic either because of the lack of paralinguistic features found in face to face communication or because of the anonymity of the electronic medium. It also shows that participants in online communication often fail to fulfill cooperative principle with its maxims either because of the time pressure of the exchange or because the high number of participants that exchange messages at once or the screen scrolling quickly. The conversational maxims are also violated in some circumstances:

a- The maxim of quantity is violated in English and Arabic when some participants give incomplete information which leads other participants to ask about more information, and this causes failure in observing this maxim. Another case that causes failure in the maxim of quantity is "lurking". In that many participants are online but they do not contribute to the exchange either they do not have information

about exchange or they need to learn more information about how to exchange.

b- The maxim of quality is violated a lot in English and Arabic netspeak conversations. In that some participants send messages that cause irritation to others or what is called "trolling". Those participants try to pay other participants attention from time to time. Another case that violates the maxim of quality is a high number of participants who do not use their real names or do not give true information about themselves or change their nick names from time to time.

c- The maxim of manner is violated in English and Arabic netspeak in two cases: first, in the abbreviations, ambiguity can be occurred because some participants do not have time to write full words. Second, in the case of "flaming", some participants send aggressive messages to an individual recipient.

d- The maxim of relation is violated in the case of topic-shift, in that many English and Arabic netspeak conversations display the lack of coherence or the latest responses are not related to the previous ones. Another case of violation in the maxim of relation is the case of "spamming", in that some participants send the same message many times. These messages are not directed to a specific recipient and they are not related to the topic of the exchange.

2- Turn-taking is also violated in English and Arabic netspeak, there is a lack in the organization of turns and some turns are separated by unrelated turns in addition to overlapping. There are several factors lead to this violation such as (short responses, the high number of participants, speech is faster than writing, the absence of paralinguistic

cues, entering and leaving the chat, and screen scrolling). Moreover, in many cases there is no turn-taking.

3- Adjacency pairs are also violated in English and Arabic netspeak, in that the second pairs are separated by some responses from the previous ones. There are many factors cause this violation: first, the huge number of participants that speak at once. Second, the time-frames of participants do not coincide. Third, the ignorance of the first part may be because of the pressure of exchange or the speaker of the first part is newer to the conversation. Fourth, leaving and entering the conversations at any time.

REFERENCES

- BARON, N. S. (2013). "Instant Messaging". In Herring, S. C., Stein, D., and Virtanen, T. (eds.). **Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication**.
- BERLIN: DE GRUYTER. (2008). **Always On: Language in an Online and Mobile World**. Oxford: University Press.
- Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006). **Discourse and Identity**. Edinburgh: University Press.
- BIESWANGER, M. (2016). "Electronically-Mediated Englishes: Synchronicity Revisited". In Sequires, L. (Ed.). **English in Computer-mediated Communication: Variation, Representation, and Change**. Berlin: Mouto De Gruyter.
- BROWN, G., & YULE, G. (1983). **Discourse analysis**. Cambridge: University Press.

CAMERON, D. (2001). **Working With Spoken Discourse**. London: SAGE Publications.

COULTHARD, M. (1985). **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis**. London: Longman Group Ltd.

CRYSTAL, D. (2006). **Language and the Internet**. Cambridge: University Press.

----- (2004). **The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GRICE, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.). **Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3, Speech Acts**. New York: Academic Press.

HUTCHBY, I. (2001). **Conversation and Technology: From the Telephone to the Internet**. Cambridge: Polity Press.

JACOBS, S. (2002). "Language and Interpersonal Communication". In Knapp, M. L. & Daly, J. A. (Eds.). **Handbook of Interpersonal Communication**. London: Sage Publications.

JENKS, C. J. (2014). **Social Interaction in Second Language Chat Rooms**. Edinburgh: University Press.

JONES, G. M., SCHIEFFELIN, B. B. & SMITH, R. E. (2011). "When Friends Who Talk Together Stalk Together: Online Gossip as Metacommunication". In Thurlow, C. & Mroczek, K. (Eds.). **Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media**. Oxford: University Press.

LEECH, G. (1983). **Principles of Pragmatics**. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). **Pragmatics**. Cambridge: University Press.

Markman, K. M. (2013). "Conversational Coherence in Small Group Chat". In Herring, S. C., Stein, D., and Virtanen, T. (Eds.). **Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication**. Berlin: De Gruyter.

NUNAMAKER, J., DENNIS, R., VALACICH, S., VOGEL, D., AND GEORGE, J. (1993). "Electronic meeting systems to support group work", in R. Baecker (ed.), **Readings in groupware and computer-supported cooperative work, assisting human-human collaboration**. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, Inc.

PAOLILLO, J. C. AND ZELENKAUSKAITE, A. (2013). "Real-time Chat". In Herring, S. C., Stein, D., and Virtanen, T. (eds.). **Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication**. Berlin: De Gruyter.

SACKS, H., SCHEGLOFF, E., AND JEFFERSON, G. (1978): "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation", in Schenkein, J. (ed.), **Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction**. New York: Academic Press.

SCHEGLOFF, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SEQUIRES, L. (2010). "**Enregistering Internet Language**". Language in society. Available on: https://www.academia.edu/2391201/Enregistering_internet_language

THOMAS, J. (1995). **Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics**. London: Longman.

THURLOW, C., LENGEL, L. & TOMIC, A. (2004). **Computer-mediated Communication: Social Interaction and The Internet**. London: Sage.

TUDINI, V. (2010). **Online Second Language Acquisition: Conversation Analysis of Online Chat**. London: Continuum.

Vandergiff, I. (2010). "Humor and Play in CMC". In Taiwo, R. (Ed.). **Handbook of Research of Discourse Behavior and Digital Communication: Language Structures and Social Interaction**. New York, Hershey: Information Science Reference.

WALLACE P. (1999). **The Psychology of the Internet**. Cambridge: University Press.



**UNIVERSIDAD
DEL**

opción

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 36, N° 26, (2020)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.

Maracaibo - Venezuela

www.luz.edu.ve

www.serbi.luz.edu.ve

produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve