BỘ GIÁO DỤC VÀ ĐÀO TẠO

TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC QUẢN LÝ VÀ CÔNG NGHỆ HẢI PHÒNG

KHÓA LUẬN TỐT NGHIỆP

CHUYÊN NGÀNH: NGÔN NGỮ ANH – ANH

SINH VIÊN: ĐẶNG NGỌC ANH

HẢI PHÒNG - 2025

BỘ GIÁO DỤC VÀ ĐẠO TẠO
TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC QUẢN LÝ VÀ CÔNG NGHỆ HẢI PHÒNG

A STUDY ON GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL FEATURES IN SHORT ENGLISH CONVERSATIONS

KHÓA LUẬN TỐT NGHIỆP ĐẠI HỌC HỆ CHÍNH QUY
CHUYÊN NGÀNH: Ngôn Ngữ Anh – Anh

Sinh viên: Đặng Ngọc Anh
Giảng viên hướng dẫn: TS. Trần Thị Ngọc Liên

HẢI PHÒNG – 2025

NHIỆM VỤ ĐỀ TÀI TỐT NGHIỆP

Sinh Viên: Đặng Ngọc Anh.   Mã Sinh Viên: 2212756024

Lớp: NA2601A

Chuyên ngành: Ngôn ngữ Anh – Anh

Tên đề tài: **A Study on Grammatical and Lexical Features in Short English Conversation**

NHIỆM VỤ ĐỀ TÀI

1. **Nội dung và các yêu cầu cần giải quyết trong nhiệm vụ đề tài tốt nghiệp**

   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………

   Các tài liệu, số liệu cần thiết

   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………

   Địa điểm thực tập tốt nghiệp

   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………

CÁN BỘ HƯỚNG DẪN ĐỀ TÀI TỐT NGHIỆP

Họ và tên   : Trần Thị Ngọc Liên

Học hàm, học vị   : Tiến sĩ

Cơ quan công tác   : Trường Đại học Quản lý và Công nghệ Hải Phòng

Nội dung hướng dẫn: A Study on Grammatical and Lexical Features in Short English Conversations

Đề tài tốt nghiệp được giao ngày 06 tháng 10 năm 2025

Yêu cầu phải hoàn thành xong trước ngày 27 tháng 12 năm 2025

Đã nhận nhiệm vụ ĐTTN

Sinh viên

Đã giao nhiệm vụ ĐTTN

Giảng viên hướng dẫn

Đặng Ngọc Anh

Trần Thị Ngọc Liên

Hải Phòng, ngày   tháng   năm 2025

XÁC NHẬN CỦA KHOA

PHIẾU NHẬN XÉT CỦA GIẢNG VIÊN HƯỚNG DẪN TỐT NGHIỆP

Họ và tên giảng viên: TS. Trần Thị Ngọc Liên

Đơn vị công tác: Trường Đại Học Quản lý và Công nghệ Hải Phòng

Họ và tên sinh viên: Đặng Ngọc Anh

Chuyên ngành: Ngôn ngữ anh

Nội dung hướng dẫn: A Study on Grammatical and Lexical Features in Short English Conversations

1. **Tinh thần thái độ của sinh viên trong quá trình làm đề tài tốt nghiệp**

……………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………….

2. **Đánh giá chất lượng của đồ án/khóa luận(so với nội dung yêu cầu đã đề ra trong nhiệm vụ Đ.T.T.N trên các mặt lý luận, thực tiễn, tính toán số liệu…)**

……………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………….

Ý kiến của giảng viên hướng dẫn tốt nghiệp

Được bảo vệ [ ]   Không được bảo vệ [ ]   Điểm hướng dẫn [ ]

Hải Phòng, ngày 27 tháng 12 năm 2025
Giảng viên hướng dẫn
(Ký và ghi rõ họ tên)

PHIẾU NHẬN XÉT CỦA GIẢNG VIÊN CHẤM PHẢN BIỆN

Họ và tên giảng viên: ....

Đơn vị công tác: Trường Đại Học Quản lý và Công nghệ Hải Phòng

Họ và tên sinh viên: Đặng Ngọc Anh

Chuyên ngành: Ngôn ngữ Anh – Anh

Nội dung hướng dẫn: A Study on Grammatical and Lexical Features in Short English Conversations

1. Phần nhận xét của giảng viên chấm phản biện

....

....

....

....

....

2. Những mặt còn hạn chế

....

....

....

....

....

3. Ý kiến của giảng viên chấm phản biện

Được bảo vệ [   ]   Không được bảo vệ [   ]   Điểm hướng dẫn [   ]

Hải Phòng, ngày 27 tháng 12 năm 2025

Giảng viên chấm phản biện

(Ký và ghi rõ tên)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those who supported and encouraged me during the completion of this graduation thesis.

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Tran Thi Ngoc Lien, my supervisor, for her dedicated guidance, valuable suggestions, and continuous support throughout the research process. Her professional knowledge, patience, and thoughtful feedback played an important role in helping me shape the direction of this study and improve the quality of the thesis. Without her careful supervision and encouragement, this research could not have been completed successfully.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation to my family for their constant encouragement, understanding, and emotional support during the time I worked on this thesis. Their care and motivation gave me the strength to overcome difficulties and stay focused on my study.

In addition, I am grateful to my friends for their encouragement and support. Their sharing and motivation helped me maintain a positive attitude and complete this graduation thesis.

Hai Phong, December, 2025

Student

Dang Ngoc Anh

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the grammatical and lexical features commonly found in short English conversations. The main aim of the research is to identify typical grammatical structures and lexical patterns used in brief spoken interactions, as well as to examine how these features contribute to effective communication in everyday contexts. The study focuses on short conversations occurring in natural spoken English, such as daily interactions, informal dialogues, and situational exchanges.

The data for this study were collected from a selected corpus of short English conversations obtained from authentic audio and video sources. A qualitative approach was employed to analyze grammatical features, including sentence types, tense usage, pronouns, ellipsis, and discourse markers. In addition, a quantitative analysis was conducted to examine lexical features such as high-frequency vocabulary, repetition, collocation, and formulaic expressions.

The findings indicate that short English conversations are characterized by simple grammatical structures, frequent use of ellipsis, pronouns, and discourse markers, which help maintain fluency and interactional coherence. Lexically, repetition and formulaic expressions play a significant role in ensuring clarity and naturalness in spoken communication. These features reflect the interactive and context-dependent nature of spoken English.

Overall, the study highlights the importance of grammatical and lexical features in shaping effective short conversations. The findings provide practical implications for English language teaching, particularly in improving learners' speaking and conversational skills.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

1. Rationale for the Study

English has become a global lingua franca, widely used in international communication, travel, business, and digital interaction. For English learners, particularly those studying it as a foreign language, mastering conversational skills is crucial not only for fluency but also for social integration and functional competence in real-life communication. Among various forms of spoken English, **short conversations play a central role in everyday interaction,** as they frequently occur in common contexts such as greetings, casual exchanges, service interactions, and informal chats. Despite their brevity, **short conversations are socially meaningful and linguistically demanding,** requiring speakers to use language efficiently and appropriately in real time. Therefore, investigating the linguistic characteristics of short conversations is essential for understanding natural spoken English.

Short conversations differ significantly from written or academic English in both grammatical and lexical aspects. Grammatically, these exchanges often feature reduced or elliptical structures, contractions, omissions of subjects or auxiliary verbs, and the use of simple present tense for near-future references. **These grammatical features are not random deviations but systematic characteristics of spoken interaction**, reflecting the need for speed, efficiency, and shared contextual understanding in spontaneous communication.

Lexically, short conversations typically rely on high-frequency words, colloquial expressions, discourse markers, vague language (e.g., *"stuff," "kind*

of"), and formulaic phrases such as *"How's it going?"* or *"I'm good, thanks."* **Such lexical choices play a crucial role in maintaining conversational flow and interpersonal relationships.** However, they may pose challenges for learners accustomed to more structured textbook language. Moreover, cultural references and idiomatic expressions embedded in short conversations can further create barriers to comprehension and production for non-native speakers.

Several prominent studies have emphasized the distinctive nature of spoken discourse and its implications for language learning. Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy (1997, 2006), in their seminal works on spoken English, highlighted the importance of real-life speech patterns, including ellipsis, vague language, and lexical chunks. Their *Cambridge Grammar of English* (2006), together with earlier research based on the CANCODE corpus, illustrates how natural spoken grammar systematically differs from written norms and how these differences should inform English language pedagogy.

Similarly, Douglas Biber and his collaborators (Biber et al., 1999) provided a comprehensive grammatical analysis of spoken versus written registers in *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Their corpus-based findings show that spoken interaction is characterized by grammatical compression, lexical repetition, and interpersonal markers, **all of which are particularly prominent in short conversational exchanges** and are crucial for effective conversational communication.

In addition, Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) introduced the concept of lexical phrases or prefabricated chunks—recurrent expressions that facilitate fluent communication in everyday conversational situations. Their work further

supports the view that **lexical features play a vital role in shaping short conversations.**

While these studies offer valuable insights, there remains a gap in detailed analysis focusing specifically on short, everyday English conversations. In particular, **the combined role of grammatical and lexical features in short conversations has not been sufficiently examined**. Most English language curricula still prioritize grammatical accuracy and structured forms over fluency and communicative naturalness, which highlights the need for further research into short English conversations.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the common grammatical structures and lexical patterns found in authentic short English conversations. By identifying and analyzing these features, the research seeks to bridge the gap between textbook English and actual spoken usage. Ultimately, the findings are intended to inform teaching practices and help learners enhance their communicative competence by equipping them with the tools needed to engage confidently and naturally in everyday English interactions.

2. Aims & objectives

2.1. Aims

The aim of this study is to explore and analyze the grammatical and lexical features commonly found in short English conversations, particularly in informal spoken interactions.

2.2. Objectives

- To identify the most frequent grammatical patterns used in short English conversations.

- To examine the typical vocabulary and expressions used in informal spoken contexts.

- To compare the features of spoken English with those of formal written English.

- To provide useful insights for English language learners to improve their speaking and listening skills.

3. Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

- What grammatical and lexical features characterize short English conversations?
- How are these features used in different everyday conversational contexts?

4. Scope of the Study

This study is limited to the analysis of **grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations** used in everyday communicative contexts. The data focuses on brief, informal spoken interactions occurring in common situations such as greetings, casual exchanges, and service encounters.

The scope of grammatical features includes **sentence structure, tense usage, sentence functions, and cohesive devices** commonly found in short conversations. Lexical features examined in this study consist of **high-frequency vocabulary, formulaic expressions, discourse markers, vague language, and informal expressions**.

This study does not aim to analyze pronunciation, intonation, or non-verbal communication, nor does it provide an in-depth comparison with formal written English. The findings are based solely on the selected conversational data and are intended to reflect typical patterns of everyday spoken English within the defined scope of the study.

5. Significance of the Study

This study is significant in both **theoretical** and **practical** aspects.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to a clearer understanding of **grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations,** a type of spoken discourse that has received less focused attention compared to written or academic English. By examining these features in authentic everyday interactions, the study helps highlight the distinctive characteristics of spoken English and supports existing research on conversational discourse.

From a practical perspective, the findings of this study may be useful for **English language teaching and learning**, particularly in the context of English as a foreign language. Understanding commonly used grammatical structures and lexical patterns in short conversations can help teachers design more effective speaking materials and classroom activities. For learners, the study provides insights into how English is actually used in daily communication, which may help them improve fluency and communicate more naturally and confidently.

Overall, this study aims to bridge the gap between **textbook English and real-life spoken English** by providing practical and accessible insights into everyday conversational language use.

6. Structure of the Study

This study consists of **four main chapters**, organized as follows.

The **Introduction** presents the background of the study, research aims and objectives, research questions, scope of the study, significance of the study, and the overall structure of the research.

Chapter 1: Literature Review reviews relevant theories and previous studies related to discourse analysis, spoken English, and grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations.

Chapter 2: Research Methodology describes the research design, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures employed in the study.

Chapter 3: Analysis of Grammatical and Lexical Features in English Short Conversations presents and discusses the main findings of the study based on the analysis of the collected data.

The **Conclusion** summarizes the key findings, discusses the limitations of the study, and provides recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. Definition of Disourse

1.1.1. What Is Discourse?

The term **discourse** refers to language in use, extending beyond isolated sentences to encompass connected stretches of language that occur in social and communicative contexts. Scholars have offered multiple definitions of discourse, reflecting its interdisciplinary nature.

According to **Halliday and Hasan (1976),** discourse is a semantic unit—a text—characterized by cohesion, rather than isolated grammatical structures. **Brown and Yule (1983)** define discourse as language that has meaning within context and is shaped by social and functional purposes. **Fairclough (1992)** views discourse as a form of social practice that reflects and constructs power relations, ideologies, and social identities. Meanwhile, **Gee (2014)** emphasizes that discourse is not only a linguistic phenomenon but a means of "enacting identities and activities" through situated language use.

For the purposes of this study, the definition most applicable is that of **discourse as language in use in authentic social interaction,** particularly **spoken conversational discourse.** This perspective highlights not just grammatical correctness but the communicative and pragmatic functions of language within context—a critical focus for analyzing short English conversations.

1.1.2. What Is Discourse Analysis?

Discourse Analysis (DA) is the study of how language functions in real communicative settings. It explores how speakers use language to **construct**

meaning, establish relationships, perform actions, and maintain coherence in both spoken and written texts. Unlike sentence-level grammar, discourse analysis concerns itself with **larger structures**—such as turn-taking, reference, cohesion, and text structure—as well as **social meaning and interaction.**

Brown and Yule (1983) emphasize that DA is particularly useful for examining **naturally occurring language,** such as spontaneous conversations, where speakers negotiate meaning dynamically. Discourse analysis thus provides the tools needed to examine not only **what is said,** but **how it is said, why,** and **in what context.**

In the context of this study, DA is used to investigate how **grammatical and lexical features function** within **short English conversations**, revealing patterns that are essential for achieving **fluency, clarity, and social appropriateness** in communication.

1.2. Discourse Analysis in Spoken English

Discourse analysis has been widely applied to the study of spoken English to examine how language is used in real communicative contexts. Unlike approaches that focus solely on sentence-level grammar, discourse analysis emphasizes interaction, context, and the functional use of language in communication.

In spoken English, discourse analysis is particularly useful for investigating features such as turn-taking, ellipsis, informal grammatical structures, and the use of formulaic expressions. These features reflect how speakers manage meaning and interpersonal relationships in spontaneous interaction.

By adopting a discourse-analytic perspective, this study examines grammatical and lexical features as they naturally occur in short English conversations. This approach allows for a more comprehensive understanding of everyday spoken English beyond isolated grammatical forms.

1.3. Types of Discourse

Discourse can be categorized based on function and context. Common types include:

- **Narrative discourse**: storytelling or recounting events

- **Expository discourse:** explaining or informing

- **Argumentative discourse**: persuading or debating

- **Descriptive discourse:** characterizing or portraying

- **Conversational discourse:** informal, real-time, interactive exchanges between speakers

This study focuses specifically on **conversational discourse,** which is spontaneous, informal, and often influenced by interpersonal dynamics. This type of discourse is prevalent in everyday settings such as greetings, shopping, small talk, and service interactions.

1.4. Spoken vs. Written Discourse

There are important distinctions between **spoken** and **written** discourse:

Feature	Spoken Discourse	Written Discourse
Structure	Informal, fragmented	Structured, organized
Grammar	Contractions, ellipsis, shifts	Full sentences, stable grammar

Interaction	Dynamic, interactive	One-way, reader-oriented
Vocabulary	Colloquial, vague, high-frequency	Precise, formal, academic
Support	Intonation, gestures	Punctuation, textual cohesion

Spoken discourse, the focus of this study, is shaped by **spontaneity, context, and interpersonal negotiation.** These qualities directly influence both **grammar** (e.g., sentence simplification, ellipsis) and **vocabulary** (e.g., vague language, discourse markers), making it distinct from formal written communication

1.5. Cohesion in Discourse

Cohesion refers to the linguistic resources that connect sentences and utterances, enabling speakers to produce unified and interpretable discourse. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is achieved through systematic grammatical and lexical relations that link elements within a text or interaction.

1.5.1. Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical cohesion involves structural mechanisms that create links between clauses and turns in discourse. In short spoken conversations, grammatical cohesion often appears in reduced and implicit forms due to shared context and the need for communicative efficiency. The main types of grammatical cohesion include:

- **Reference:** the use of personal pronouns and deictic expressions (e.g., *he, she, it, this, that*) to maintain topic continuity without repetition.

- **Substitution:** the replacement of an item with another form (e.g., *do so, one*) to avoid redundancy.
- **Ellipsis:** the omission of elements that can be inferred from context, which is especially common in spoken interaction (e.g., *"Want some?"* instead of *"Do you want some?"*).
- **Conjunctions:** the use of connectors such as *and, but, so,* and *because* to signal logical relationships between ideas.

These grammatical devices help speakers maintain coherence across conversational turns while keeping speech concise and natural.

1.5.2.Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to semantic relationships between lexical items in discourse. In short English conversations, lexical cohesion is typically realized through:

- **Repetition** of key words or phrases to reinforce meaning.
- **Synonymy and near-synonymy** to maintain continuity while varying expression.
- **Collocation,** where words commonly occur together in everyday speech.

Lexical cohesion plays a crucial role in sustaining topic focus and enhancing fluency, particularly in informal and spontaneous interactions.

Although cohesion has traditionally been associated with written texts, it is equally essential in spoken discourse. In short conversations, speakers rely heavily on shared situational context and implicit cohesive ties rather than explicit repetition. Understanding how grammatical and lexical cohesion operates in

spoken interaction is therefore fundamental to the analysis of short English conversations and provides a theoretical foundation for the grammatical and lexical analysis presented in subsequent chapters.

1.6. Overview of Grammatical and Lexical Features in English Short Conversations

Short English conversations are a common form of everyday spoken interaction, typically characterized by spontaneity, brevity, and a high degree of contextual dependence. These interactions often occur in informal settings such as greetings, casual exchanges, service encounters, and daily social communication. Due to time constraints and shared situational context, speakers tend to prioritize communicative efficiency over grammatical completeness.

From a discourse perspective, short conversations display distinctive features such as turn-taking, reduced syntactic structures, ellipsis, and the frequent use of formulaic expressions. Meaning is often constructed implicitly, relying on shared knowledge between speakers rather than explicit linguistic elaboration. As a result, grammatical and lexical choices in short conversations differ significantly from those found in written or formal English.

Against this background, short spoken interactions are marked by specific grammatical and lexical patterns that enable speakers to communicate quickly, efficiently, and in a socially appropriate manner. These features reflect not only linguistic structures but also the interactive and pragmatic functions of everyday speech. The following sections provide an overview of the key grammatical and

lexical features commonly found in short English conversations, which form the analytical framework for the present study.

1.6.1.Grammatical Features

In this study, the analysis of grammatical features in short English conversations focuses on four main aspects: (1) sentence composition, including simple, compound, and complex sentences; (2) tense usage, with particular attention to present, past, and future forms in spontaneous interaction; (3) sentence functions, namely statements, questions, commands, and exclamations; and (4) grammatical cohesive devices, such as reference, ellipsis, and substitution. These features are selected due to their high frequency and functional importance in everyday spoken discourse and form the analytical framework for the discussion in Chapter 3.

In short English conversations, grammatical structures tend to be simplified and flexible in order to support rapid and natural communication. Rather than adhering to fully elaborated sentence forms, speakers frequently employ reduced constructions that are sufficient for conveying meaning within a shared context.

Sentence composition in short conversations is predominantly simple or compound, while complex sentence structures occur less frequently due to processing demands and time constraints. Short clauses and sentence fragments are common, especially in responses and follow-up turns.

With regard to tense usage, speakers often rely on the present tense to refer to immediate actions or near-future events, while the past tense is used to recount experiences. Modal verbs such as *could* and *might* are frequently employed to express politeness, possibility, or uncertainty in interaction.

Short conversations also exhibit a range of sentence functions, including statements, questions, commands, and exclamations. These functions serve different communicative purposes, such as providing information, seeking clarification, prompting action, or expressing emotion.

In addition, grammatical cohesion plays an important role in maintaining coherence across conversational turns. Devices such as reference, ellipsis, and substitution are commonly used to avoid repetition and ensure smooth interaction. For example, pronouns and deictic expressions help maintain topic continuity, while ellipsis allows speakers to omit information that is recoverable from context.

Overall, these grammatical features contribute to efficiency, coherence, and interpersonal rapport, which are particularly important in short, dynamic spoken exchanges.

1.6.2. Lexical Features

Regarding lexical features, this study concentrates on a selected set of items that are frequently observed in short spoken interactions, including high-frequency vocabulary, formulaic expressions, discourse markers, vague language, slang and informal forms, and personal pronouns. These lexical features are chosen because they play a crucial role in facilitating fluency, interpersonal engagement, and context-dependent meaning in short English conversations, and they are examined in detail in Chapter 3.

Lexical choices in short English conversations are shaped by the need for immediacy, interpersonal engagement, and contextual efficiency. Rather than employing a wide range of low-frequency or specialized vocabulary, speakers tend

to rely on a limited set of lexical items that facilitate rapid understanding and smooth interaction.

In this study, the analysis focuses on a selected group of lexical features that are both frequently discussed in previous research and recurrently observed in short spoken interactions. These features are chosen due to their prominence in everyday conversation and their relevance to the analytical framework adopted in Chapter 3.

High-frequency vocabulary constitutes a core component of short conversations, with everyday words such as *go, get, good, okay,* and *yeah* occurring repeatedly. These items enable speakers to convey meaning quickly without placing excessive cognitive demands on interlocutors.

Formulaic expressions, including routine phrases such as *How are you?, See you later*, and *That's fine*, play an essential role in managing common interactional functions. Their predictable structure supports fluency and contributes to the natural flow of conversation.

1.7. Chapter Summary

Discourse analysis provides the ideal lens through which to investigate the **linguistic patterns** and **pragmatic functions** of short English conversations. By analyzing the **grammatical structures** (e.g., sentence types, tense, cohesion) and **lexical choices** (e.g., formulaic expressions, vague language, discourse markers), this study offers insights into how real-world communication operates in informal settings.

Understanding these features is essential for English language learners and teachers, as it bridges the gap between classroom grammar and authentic spoken interaction, enabling learners to develop **natural, context-sensitive communication skills** in English

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a **descriptive mixed-methods research design**, combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches to investigate grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations.

The qualitative component is employed to describe and interpret how grammatical and lexical features function in authentic short spoken interactions. Through close analysis of naturally occurring conversations, the study examines how speakers use language to achieve communicative purposes such as maintaining fluency, expressing informality, and managing interpersonal relationships. This approach allows for an in-depth understanding of language use beyond isolated sentences, emphasizing context and interaction.

The quantitative component supports the qualitative analysis by identifying the **frequency and distribution** of selected grammatical and lexical features within the data set. Features such as sentence types, tense usage, discourse markers, formulaic expressions, and high-frequency vocabulary are systematically counted and categorized to determine their relative prominence in short English conversations. The use of basic statistical measures, including percentages, helps provide empirical support for the qualitative findings.

This research design is chosen because it is well suited to the study of spoken discourse, where both functional interpretation and frequency patterns are essential for understanding language use. By integrating qualitative and quantitative perspectives, the study aims to provide a comprehensive and balanced analysis of grammatical and lexical features in everyday spoken English.

2.2. Data Collection

2.2.1. How to Collect

The data for this study was collected through a combination of **transcription** and **observation** of short English conversations. The collection process involved the following steps:

A total of 20 short, informal conversations were selected from a variety of everyday contexts, such as greetings, ordering food, shopping, and making plans. These conversations were sourced from real-life interactions, transcripts of media content (e.g., movies, TV shows, podcasts), and everyday scenarios that people commonly encounter.

The selected conversations were transcribed verbatim to ensure that all grammatical and lexical features were accurately captured. For each conversation, the transcription process involved noting not only the words spoken but also pauses, intonation markers, and informal structures.

During the transcription, specific **grammatical** (e.g., contractions, tag questions, ellipses) and **lexical** (e.g., common expressions, slang, polite phrases) features were carefully noted. These features were coded for further analysis.

2.2.2. What to Collect

This study focuses on collecting **linguistic data related to grammatical and lexical features** that occur in authentic short English conversations. The data collection is guided by the research aims, which seek to identify common language patterns used in everyday spoken interaction.

Grammatical Features

The grammatical features collected for analysis include:

- **Sentence composition**, examining whether sentences are simple, compound, or complex, and how coordination and subordination are employed in short spoken exchanges.
- **Tense usage**, with particular attention to the use of present, past, and future forms to express immediacy, intention, and habitual actions in spontaneous speech.
- **Sentence functions**, including statements, questions, commands, and exclamations, which reflect speakers' communicative purposes in interaction.
- **Grammatical cohesion**, such as reference (e.g., pronouns and deictic expressions), ellipsis, and substitution, which help maintain coherence across conversational turns without unnecessary repetition.

Lexical Features

The lexical features collected in this study include:

- **High-frequency vocabulary** commonly used in everyday spoken English.

- **Formulaic expressions** that perform routine interactional functions in short conversations.
- **Discourse markers and informal expressions** that assist in managing topic flow and interpersonal relations.
- **Politeness-related lexical items**, such as expressions of thanking, requesting, and apologizing.

Contextual Information

In addition to grammatical and lexical features, basic contextual information (e.g., setting and type of interaction) is recorded to support interpretation of how language choices are influenced by communicative context.

Overall, these categories define the scope of data collection and provide a clear framework for the subsequent analysis of grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations.

2.2.3. Data Selection Criteria

To ensure the reliability and relevance of the data, specific criteria were applied in selecting short English conversations for analysis in this study.

First, the conversations selected are **short in length**, typically consisting of brief exchanges rather than extended dialogues or monologues. This criterion ensures that the data accurately represent short conversational interactions commonly found in everyday communication.

Second, only conversations that are **interactional in nature** were included. The data involve at least two speakers engaging in direct spoken interaction,

allowing for the analysis of turn-taking, sentence functions, and interpersonal language use.

Third, the conversations are **authentic and naturally occurring**, rather than scripted or pedagogical materials designed for language teaching. This criterion helps capture genuine grammatical and lexical patterns used in real-life spoken English.

Fourth, the conversations are **clearly audible and intelligible**, ensuring accurate transcription and analysis of grammatical and lexical features.

Finally, the selected conversations reflect **informal or semi-informal contexts**, such as greetings, casual exchanges, or everyday service interactions. These contexts are particularly relevant to the study's focus on short English conversations.

By applying these criteria, the study ensures that the data set is appropriate for examining grammatical and lexical features characteristic of everyday spoken English.

2.3. Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis procedures of this study consist of two main stages: **qualitative analysis** and **quantitative analysis**. These complementary approaches are employed to provide a comprehensive examination of grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations.

2.3.1. Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis in this study focuses on examining how grammatical and lexical features are used in short English conversations. After the

conversations were transcribed, the data were carefully read and analyzed to identify recurring patterns of language use in natural spoken interaction.

For grammatical features, the analysis examines sentence types, tense usage, sentence functions, and cohesive devices such as reference, ellipsis, and substitution. For lexical features, attention is given to high-frequency vocabulary, formulaic expressions, discourse markers, vague language, and informal lexical items. These features are analyzed in relation to their communicative functions in short conversational exchanges, such as maintaining fluency, expressing informality, and managing interpersonal interaction.

This qualitative analysis aims to describe how grammatical and lexical choices contribute to effective communication in short, everyday English conversations.

2.3.2. Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative analysis is conducted to support the qualitative findings by examining how frequently selected grammatical and lexical features occur in the data. Identified features are counted and categorized to determine their distribution across the collected conversations.

The results are presented using basic numerical measures such as frequencies and percentages. This analysis helps highlight which grammatical structures and lexical items are most commonly used in short English conversations and provides empirical support for the descriptive analysis.

By combining qualitative description with quantitative frequency analysis, the study offers a clear and systematic account of grammatical and lexical features in everyday spoken English.

2.4. Reliability and Validity

To ensure the reliability and validity of the study, several measures were taken during the processes of data collection and analysis.

Reliability

Reliability is ensured through the use of clear and consistent analytical procedures. All conversations were transcribed carefully to avoid misinterpretation of grammatical structures and lexical items. The same criteria and categories were applied consistently across the entire data set when identifying and analyzing grammatical and lexical features.

In addition, the analysis focuses on observable and recurring language features in short English conversations, which reduces subjectivity in interpretation. The use of frequency counts in the quantitative analysis also contributes to the reliability of the findings by providing consistent and replicable results.

Validity

Validity is addressed by selecting authentic short English conversations that reflect real-life spoken interaction. The data are appropriate for the research objectives, as they represent everyday communicative situations in which grammatical and lexical features naturally occur.

The analytical categories used in this study are based on established linguistic research on spoken English and discourse analysis. This ensures that the features examined are relevant to the research focus. Furthermore, combining qualitative interpretation with quantitative frequency analysis helps strengthen the validity of the findings by supporting descriptive observations with empirical evidence.

Overall, these measures help ensure that the results of the study are both reliable and valid for examining grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations.

2.5. Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the research methodology adopted in the study of grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations. It has outlined the research design, data sources, data selection criteria, and the types of linguistic features collected for analysis.

The chapter has also described the procedures used to analyze the data through qualitative and quantitative methods, explaining how grammatical and lexical features were identified, categorized, and examined. In addition, issues of reliability and validity were addressed to ensure that the data and analytical processes are consistent and appropriate for the research objectives.

Overall, this chapter provides a clear methodological foundation for the analysis of grammatical and lexical features in short English conversations presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL FEATURES IN ENGLISH SHORT CONVERSATIONS

This chapter analyzes the grammatical and lexical features observed in the corpus of 20 authentic English short conversations. Each feature is examined both quantitatively, by frequency, and qualitatively, through in-context examples. The analysis further considers how discourse type (spoken), topic, and situational context influence linguistic choices.

3.1   Analysis of Grammatical Features

Grammatical features were analyzed across four dimensions: sentence composition, tense usage, sentence functions, and cohesive devices.

Grammatical Feature	Frequency	Example	Conversation
Sentence Composition (Simple)	**42**	I just moved in.	Conversation 19
Sentence Composition (Complex)	**8**	I thought they were gonna lose it.	Conversation 1
Tense (Present)	**30**	This the line for boarding?	Conversation 18
Tense (Past)	**10**	Took me an hour to get here.	Conversation 16
Tense (Future)	**4**	Let's do it on Saturday.	Conversation 15

Sentence Function (Statement)	**44**	You look exhausted.	Conversation 3
Sentence Function (Question)	**18**	Do you have this in a small?	Conversation 14
Sentence Function (Command)	**6**	Try the 400s section.	Conversation 8
Sentence Function (Exclamation)	**2**	Oh no, again?	Conversation 3
Reference (Pronouns, Deixis)	**28**	I think... 2017?	Conversation 7
Ellipsis	**14**	Just a sec... okay, yeah, what's up?	Conversation 5
Substitution	**6**	I think so.	Conversation 17

Table 1: Grammatical Features

3.1.1.   Simple Sentences

Simple sentences refer to utterances consisting of a single independent clause without complex syntactic embedding. In short English conversations, simple sentences are commonly used due to the need for quick and efficient communication.

According to the data presented in Table 1, simple sentences appeared **42 times**, making them the most frequent sentence type in the corpus. This high frequency indicates a clear preference for syntactically simple structures in everyday spoken interaction, especially when speakers need to convey$ information quickly and clearly.

Compared to complex sentences, which require greater planning and processing effort, simple sentences allow speakers to respond immediately and maintain conversational flow. For example, in Conversation 19, the utterance *"I just moved in."* delivers complete and sufficient information in a concise form, enabling smooth turn-taking without overloading the listener.

The dominance of simple sentences can be explained by the spontaneous and informal nature of short conversations. In real-time interaction, speakers tend to prioritize speed, clarity, and immediacy over grammatical complexity. As a result, simple sentence structures are favored over complex constructions, which are used less frequently and typically only when additional explanation or elaboration is required. This pattern reflects the functional demands of everyday spoken English.

3.1.2. Complex Sentences

Complex sentences refer to sentence structures containing one independent clause and at least one dependent clause. In short English conversations, complex sentences appear less frequently due to the spontaneous and time-pressured nature of spoken interaction.

As shown in Table 1, complex sentences occurred **8 times** in the data set. One example can be found in Conversation 1: *"I thought they were gonna lose it."* This utterance includes a dependent clause and reflects a more elaborated grammatical structure compared to simple sentences.

The use of complex sentences in short conversations often serves specific communicative purposes, such as expressing thoughts, opinions, or explanations that require additional information. However, their relatively low frequency suggests that speakers tend to avoid syntactic complexity unless it is necessary to convey meaning accurately.

This limited use can be explained by the need for rapid response and ease of processing in everyday interaction. In spontaneous dialogue, speakers generally favor simpler structures that allow for efficient communication, while complex sentences are used selectively when the communicative context demands more detailed expression.

3.1.3. Tense (Present)

The present tense refers to verb forms used to describe current states, habitual actions, or near-future events. In short English conversations, the present tense is frequently used to reflect immediacy and shared situational context.

According to Table 1, present tense forms appeared **30 times**, making them the most common tense used in the corpus. For example, in Conversation 18, the utterance *"This the line for boarding?"* illustrates the use of the present tense to inquire about an immediate situation.

The frequent use of the present tense plays an important role in short conversations, as it allows speakers to focus on the here-and-now of the interaction. It supports quick exchanges, facilitates mutual understanding, and aligns with the informal nature of everyday spoken English.

The dominance of the present tense can be attributed to the situational and context-dependent nature of short conversations, where speakers often discuss current actions or immediate concerns rather than narrating past events or planning distant future actions.

3.1.4. Tense (Past)

Past tense forms are used to refer to completed actions or events that occurred before the moment of speaking. In short English conversations, past tense usage is less frequent than present tense but remains important for sharing brief personal experiences.

In the data, past tense forms appeared **10 times**. An example is found in Conversation 16: *"Took me an hour to get here."* This utterance briefly recounts a past event while maintaining conversational brevity.

The use of the past tense in short conversations often serves to provide background information or explain a current situation. Speakers tend to keep past references concise, avoiding lengthy narratives in order to maintain conversational flow.

The relatively lower frequency of past tense usage reflects the focus of short conversations on immediate interaction rather than extended storytelling, which is more typical of longer spoken discourse.

3.1.5. Tense (Future)

Future tense refers to verb forms used to express intended or planned actions that take place after the moment of speaking. In short English conversations, future

tense is commonly realized through simple structures such as *will*, *going to*, or imperative-like suggestions indicating near-future actions.

According to the data presented in Table 1, future tense forms appeared **4 times**, making them the least frequent tense in the corpus. One representative example is found in Conversation 15: *"Let's do it on Saturday."* This utterance indicates a future plan while maintaining conversational brevity.

The use of future tense in short conversations serves a specific communicative function, namely coordinating plans and proposing actions without extended elaboration. Rather than providing detailed future narratives, speakers tend to express future intentions in concise and context-dependent ways.

The relatively low frequency of future tense can be explained by the nature of short conversations, which primarily focus on immediate situations and ongoing interaction. Future-oriented talk is usually brief and limited to near-future arrangements, while more complex planning is often reserved for longer or more formal discourse contexts.

3.1.6. Sentence Function (Statement)

Statements are declarative sentences used to provide information, describe situations, or express opinions in conversation. In short English conversations, statements typically appear in brief and direct forms to convey essential meaning efficiently.

Based on the data, statements occurred **44 times**, making them the most frequently used sentence function in the corpus. An example can be found in Conversation 3: *"You look exhausted."*

The primary role of statements in short conversations is to deliver information quickly while maintaining smooth turn-taking. Speakers often rely on statements to initiate interaction, respond to questions, or comment on observable situations without elaboration.

The high frequency of statements can be attributed to their functional flexibility. Since short conversations prioritize clarity and immediacy, declarative sentences allow speakers to communicate meaning effectively with minimal structural complexity.

3.1.7. Sentence Function (Question)

Questions are interrogative forms used to request information, seek clarification, or prompt interaction. In everyday spoken exchanges, questions often function as interactional tools rather than purely informational devices.

In the corpus, questions appeared **18 times**. A representative example is found in Conversation 14: *"Do you have this in a small?"*

Questions play a crucial role in sustaining interaction and guiding conversational flow. They enable speakers to elicit responses, negotiate meaning, and maintain engagement in short exchanges.

The moderate frequency of questions reflects the transactional nature of many short conversations, particularly in service encounters, where brief information-seeking questions are necessary but typically followed by short responses rather than extended discussion.

3.1.8. Sentence Function (Command)

Commands, or imperatives, are used to direct actions, make requests, or offer instructions. In spoken interaction, commands are often softened by context, tone, or shared understanding.

Commands occurred **6 times** in the data. One example is found in Conversation 8: *"Try the 400s section."*

The function of commands in short conversations is to facilitate immediate action, especially in practical or service-related contexts. Their concise form aligns well with the efficiency required in brief spoken exchanges.

The relatively low frequency of commands may be explained by politeness considerations. Speakers often prefer indirect forms or suggestions over direct imperatives, especially in casual or socially sensitive interactions.

3.1.9. Sentence Function (Exclamation)

Exclamations are expressive sentence forms used to convey emotion, surprise, or strong reactions. They often rely on intonation rather than complex syntax.

This feature appeared only **2 times** in the corpus. An illustrative example is found in Conversation 3: *"Oh no, again?"*

Exclamations serve an interpersonal function by expressing emotional stance and reinforcing shared understanding between speakers. Despite their expressive value, they are not essential to transactional communication.

The low frequency of exclamations suggests that short conversations tend to prioritize informational exchange over emotional expression, reserving exclamatory forms for moments of heightened reaction.

3.1.10. . Reference (Pronouns and Deixis)

Reference involves the use of pronouns and deictic expressions to maintain continuity across conversational turns. In spoken discourse, reference often depends heavily on shared context.

Reference appeared **28 times** in the conversations. An example is found in Conversation 7: *"I think... 2017?"*

The use of reference contributes to coherence by allowing speakers to avoid repetition while maintaining clarity. Pronouns such as *I*, *you*, and *they* are particularly common in short conversations.

The frequent occurrence of reference reflects the interactive nature of spoken discourse, where shared situational context enables speakers to rely on minimal linguistic forms to convey meaning.

3.1.11. . Ellipsis

Ellipsis refers to the omission of elements that are understood from context. This feature is characteristic of spoken interaction, where economy of expression is valued.

Ellipsis occurred **14 times** in the corpus. A clear example is found in Conversation 5: *"Just a sec... okay, yeah, what's up?"*

Ellipsis allows speakers to respond quickly and naturally without repeating predictable information. It supports conversational fluency and efficient turn-taking.

The relatively high frequency of ellipsis can be attributed to the spontaneous nature of short conversations, where speed and shared understanding outweigh grammatical completeness.

3.1.12.   Substitution

Substitution involves replacing a word or phrase with a pro-form to avoid repetition. In spoken English, substitution is often limited to simple forms.

This feature appeared **6 times** in the data. An example is found in Conversation 17: *"I think so."*

Substitution functions to maintain coherence while keeping utterances brief. It allows speakers to respond efficiently without restating full propositions.

The low frequency of substitution suggests that short conversations rely more heavily on ellipsis and reference, which are cognitively less demanding and more immediate in spontaneous interaction.

Mini-conclusion for Grammatical Features in Short Conversations

Overall, the grammatical features identified in this study reflect the functional and time-sensitive nature of short English conversations. The dominance of simple sentence structures and present tense usage highlights speakers' preference for clarity, immediacy, and ease of processing in real-time interaction. Rather than constructing syntactically complex utterances, speakers

tend to rely on grammatically economical forms that allow them to convey essential meaning efficiently.

Sentence functions such as statements and questions play a central role in maintaining conversational flow. Statements are primarily used to provide information or comment on observable situations, while questions serve to initiate interaction, elicit responses, and guide turn-taking. Commands and exclamations occur less frequently, suggesting that short conversations prioritize information exchange and coordination over emotional expression or directive force.

In addition, cohesive devices such as reference, ellipsis, and substitution are crucial in sustaining coherence across conversational turns. These devices enable speakers to avoid unnecessary repetition and rely on shared situational context, thereby supporting fluency and naturalness in spoken interaction. Collectively, these grammatical features demonstrate how short conversations favor functional efficiency over structural complexity.

3.2. Analysis of Lexical Features

Lexical analysis focused on commonly used vocabulary, formulaic sequences, discourse markers, and vague or informal expressions.

Lexical Feature	Frequency	Example	Conversation
High-Frequency Vocabulary	50	Yeah, killer as always.	Conversation 11
Formulaic Expressions	18	Hi, I'm Jen.	Conversation 6

Discourse Markers	20	So... beach or mountains?	Conversation 15
Vague Language	12	They move stuff around all the time.	Conversation 10
Slang and Informal Language	10	Cool. Always get nervous flying.	Conversation 18
Personal Pronouns	36	I'm Nora.	Conversation 19

Table 2: Lexical Features

3.2.1.   High-Frequency Vocabulary

High-frequency vocabulary refers to commonly used everyday words that appear repeatedly across spoken interactions. In the present study, this feature occurred **50 times**, making it the most frequent lexical category in the corpus.

An example can be found in Conversation 11: *"Yeah, okay."* This utterance illustrates how basic, familiar words are used to signal agreement and maintain conversational flow without adding semantic complexity.

The frequent use of high-frequency vocabulary reflects the need for efficiency and mutual understanding in short conversations. Such words are easily processed by both speakers and listeners, allowing interaction to proceed smoothly and rapidly in spontaneous spoken contexts.

3.2.2.   Formulaic Expressions

Formulaic expressions are fixed or semi-fixed phrases commonly used in routine interactions. In this study, formulaic expressions appeared **18 times** in the corpus.

A representative example is found in Conversation 6: *"Hi, I'm Jen."* This utterance serves a conventional social function, namely self-introduction, and requires little cognitive effort from either speaker.

The use of formulaic expressions contributes to conversational fluency and social appropriateness. Their predictable structure allows speakers to manage interaction efficiently, particularly in brief encounters where establishing rapport quickly is essential.

3.2.3.   Discourse Markers

Discourse markers are words or phrases used to organize interaction, signal transitions, or manage conversational flow rather than contribute lexical meaning. In the present study, discourse markers appeared **20 times** in the corpus.

A representative example is found in Conversation 15: *"So… beach or mountains?"* The marker *so* functions to introduce a new topic while maintaining conversational continuity.

The use of discourse markers plays an important role in structuring short conversations. They help speakers initiate turns, shift topics, and soften utterances, making interaction smoother and more cooperative.

The relatively frequent occurrence of discourse markers reflects the interactive nature of spoken discourse, where speakers must continuously manage turn-taking and topic development in real time.

3.2.4. Vague Language

Vague language refers to non-specific expressions that allow speakers to generalize meaning without providing precise details. In this study, vague language occurred **12 times** in the corpus.

An example can be found in Conversation 10: *"They move stuff around all the time."* The word *stuff* functions as a vague lexical item that avoids explicit specification.

The use of vague language enables speakers to communicate efficiently when detailed information is unnecessary or unavailable. It also allows flexibility in interpretation and reduces the cognitive load in spontaneous interaction.

The moderate frequency of vague language suggests that speakers in short conversations prioritize communicative efficiency and shared understanding over accuracy or explicit detail.

3.2.5. Slang and Informal Language

Slang and informal language consist of non-standard lexical forms commonly used in casual spoken interaction. These expressions often signal familiarity and shared social identity between speakers.

This feature appeared **10 times** in the data. A clear example is found in Conversation 18: *"Cool. Always get nervous flying."*

The use of slang and informal language contributes to a relaxed conversational tone and strengthens interpersonal rapport. Such expressions are particularly common in informal contexts where social distance between speakers is minimal.

The relatively limited frequency of slang and informal language indicates that while informality is present in short conversations, speakers still tend to avoid highly marked or context-specific slang in favor of more widely understood expressions.

3.2.6. Personal Pronouns

Personal pronouns refer to words such as *I, you, we,* and *they*, which indicate speaker–listener relationships and participant roles in interaction. In this study, personal pronouns occurred **36 times** in the corpus.

A representative example is found in Conversation 19: *"I'm Nora."* The first-person pronoun *I* is used to establish speaker identity and initiate interpersonal connection.

The frequent use of personal pronouns reflects the interactive and participant-oriented nature of short spoken conversations. Pronouns allow speakers to refer directly to themselves and others without lexical repetition, contributing to efficiency and conversational flow.

In addition, the use of *you* and *I* reinforces speaker–listener alignment and supports interpersonal engagement, which is essential in brief, face-to-face interactions. The relatively high frequency of personal pronouns suggests that

short conversations are strongly grounded in immediate social relationships and shared communicative roles.

Mini-conclusion for Lexical Features in Short Conversations

The lexical features observed in the corpus further illustrate the interactive and context-dependent nature of short English conversations. High-frequency vocabulary and formulaic expressions dominate lexical choices, allowing speakers to communicate quickly and effectively without extensive lexical elaboration. These lexical items facilitate rapid comprehension and contribute to the smooth progression of conversational exchanges.

Discourse markers play an important role in managing interactional structure. They help speakers initiate topics, signal transitions, soften utterances, and maintain interpersonal rapport. Similarly, vague language provides flexibility and allows speakers to generalize or avoid unnecessary detail when precision is not required, which is particularly useful in informal and time-constrained interactions.

The use of slang, informal language, and personal pronouns reinforces the conversational tone and interpersonal orientation of short exchanges. These features signal familiarity, shared social context, and speaker involvement. Overall, the lexical patterns identified in this study highlight how spoken English in short conversations prioritizes efficiency, interpersonal connection, and contextual appropriateness over lexical sophistication.

3.3. Influence of Discourse Type, Topic, and Context

Although the grammatical and lexical features discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 can be identified and counted individually, their actual use in short English conversations is strongly influenced by discourse type, topic, and situational context. This section explains **why certain features occur more frequently than others** and **how communicative conditions shape language choice**.

Short spoken conversations are typically informal, spontaneous, and time-constrained. As a result, speakers tend to rely on simple sentence structures, present-tense verbs, personal pronouns, and high-frequency vocabulary to ensure clarity and efficiency. These characteristics help speakers respond quickly and maintain smooth interaction in real-time communication.

Topic also plays an important role in determining linguistic choices. For example, in Conversation 3 (a casual workplace exchange), the utterance *"Don't even ask. Baby was up all night."* demonstrates the use of ellipsis and high-frequency vocabulary. These features are motivated by the shared background knowledge between speakers and the personal nature of the topic, which reduces the need for explicit explanation.

Similarly, discourse type influences sentence function and lexical selection. In Conversation 14 (a service encounter at a clothing store), the question *"Do you have this in a small?"* reflects the transactional nature of the interaction. In this context, direct questions, simple sentence forms, and polite expressions are preferred to achieve communicative efficiency.

Across the corpus, differences in discourse type—such as casual social talk, service exchanges, or brief inquiries—result in varying distributions of

grammatical and lexical features. Contextual factors, including shared knowledge, physical setting, and speaker relationship, often reduce the need for explicit cohesion and encourage the use of ellipsis, vague language, and formulaic expressions. Therefore, the grammatical and lexical patterns identified in this study cannot be fully understood without considering the immediate communicative context in which they occur.

3.4. Summary of Findings

This chapter has examined the grammatical and lexical features present in a corpus of English short conversations through both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings reveal that short spoken interactions are characterized by a preference for linguistic forms that support efficiency, immediacy, and interpersonal engagement.

In terms of grammatical features, simple sentence structures were found to occur more frequently than complex ones, reflecting the real-time and spontaneous nature of spoken discourse. Present tense verbs dominated the corpus, while past and future tenses appeared less often, typically when recounting experiences or making brief plans. Regarding sentence functions, statements and questions were the most common, indicating their central role in information exchange and interaction management. Commands and exclamations occurred less frequently but served important pragmatic functions, such as directing action or expressing emotion. Cohesive devices, particularly reference and ellipsis, were widely used to maintain coherence without unnecessary repetition.

With respect to lexical features, the analysis showed a high frequency of everyday vocabulary and personal pronouns, highlighting the interpersonal and

context-dependent nature of short conversations. Formulaic expressions and discourse markers played a key role in managing turn-taking, initiating topics, and maintaining conversational flow. Vague language and informal expressions, including slang, were also observed, especially in casual and socially close interactions.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that grammatical and lexical choices in English short conversations are closely shaped by discourse type, topic, and situational context. These features work together to facilitate smooth, natural, and socially appropriate communication. The results of this chapter provide a foundation for the discussion of pedagogical implications and conclusions presented in the following chapter.

CONCLUSION

1. Recapitulation of the Study

This study set out to investigate the grammatical and lexical features of English short conversations using a corpus of 20 authentic spoken interactions. Drawing on a discourse-analytic perspective, the research examined how language is structured and used in naturally occurring conversations, with particular attention to sentence composition, tense usage, sentence functions, and cohesive devices, as well as key lexical patterns such as vocabulary frequency, formulaic expressions, discourse markers, and informal language.

The quantitative analysis revealed a clear preference for simple sentence structures, present tense forms, and declarative statements, reflecting the time-sensitive and interaction-driven nature of spoken communication. In terms of lexis, high-frequency vocabulary, formulaic expressions, and personal pronouns were found to occur most frequently, indicating the importance of immediacy, familiarity, and interpersonal engagement in everyday spoken exchanges.

Qualitative analysis further demonstrated that these grammatical and lexical features are not used randomly but are closely shaped by discourse type, topic, and situational context. Speakers consistently adapted their language choices to communicative purposes such as maintaining fluency, managing turn-taking, expressing attitudes, and achieving social rapport. As a result, short English conversations rely heavily on context-dependent and interactional language rather than syntactic complexity.

Overall, the findings contribute to a clearer understanding of how English is used authentically in everyday spoken interactions and highlight notable

differences between real-life conversational English and the more formal, standardized models often presented in textbooks. These insights provide a useful foundation for pedagogical applications and further research into spoken discourse.

2. Implications of the Study

The findings of this study yield several pedagogical implications that are directly grounded in the grammatical and lexical patterns identified in English short conversations.

First, the dominance of **simple sentence structures, present tense forms,** and **declarative statements** suggests that spoken English prioritizes immediacy, clarity, and efficiency over syntactic complexity. This implies that English language teaching, particularly in speaking-focused courses, should not overemphasize complex sentence construction at early stages. Instead, learners should be encouraged to develop fluency through the effective use of simple structures that reflect authentic conversational usage.

Second, the frequent occurrence of **formulaic expressions, discourse markers,** and **high-frequency vocabulary** highlights their crucial role in maintaining interaction, managing turns, and building interpersonal rapport. From a pedagogical perspective, these findings indicate that teaching materials should explicitly introduce and practice such expressions as functional units rather than treating them as peripheral or informal language. Familiarity with these patterns can help learners sound more natural and confident in everyday communication.

Third, the extensive use of **personal pronouns** and **context-dependent expressions,** including vague language and ellipsis, underscores the interactive

and context-bound nature of spoken discourse. This suggests that classroom instruction should move beyond sentence-level accuracy and incorporate contextualized speaking activities that simulate real-life interaction, such as role-plays, service encounters, and informal dialogues.

Finally, the study implies that **assessment criteria for spoken English** may need reconsideration. Given that effective spoken communication relies heavily on fluency, appropriateness, and pragmatic competence, oral assessment should acknowledge the strategic use of conversational features—such as discourse markers, ellipsis, and informal expressions—rather than focusing solely on grammatical completeness or syntactic complexity.

Overall, these implications emphasize the importance of aligning English language teaching more closely with authentic spoken usage, thereby helping learners bridge the gap between textbook English and real-world conversational practice.

3. Limitations of the Study

Despite its contributions, the present study has several limitations that should be acknowledged.

First, the study is limited by the **size of the corpus**, which consists of only **20 English short conversations**. Although this dataset allows for detailed qualitative and quantitative analysis, the relatively small number of conversations restricts the generalizability of the findings. A larger corpus would provide more robust statistical evidence and allow for more comprehensive comparisons across different conversational contexts.

Second, the study focuses exclusively on **short, everyday spoken interactions**, such as casual talk and service encounters. As a result, other forms of spoken discourse—such as academic discussions, professional meetings, or formal interviews—are not represented. Therefore, the findings cannot be extended to all types of spoken English but are limited to informal, short conversational settings.

Third, the analysis primarily examines **surface grammatical and lexical features** (e.g., sentence types, tense usage, discourse markers, formulaic expressions) without incorporating prosodic features such as **intonation, stress, pauses, or speech rate**, which are also crucial in spoken discourse. The absence of these paralinguistic elements may limit a full understanding of how meaning and interactional functions are realized in conversation.

Finally, the study relies on **transcribed spoken data**, which may not capture all nuances of real-time interaction. Certain features of spoken language, including hesitation, overlap, and non-verbal cues, may be reduced or lost in transcription, potentially affecting the interpretation of some conversational features.

Recognizing these limitations helps to contextualize the findings and provides a basis for further research in the area of spoken discourse analysis.

4. Suggestions for Future Studies

Based on the findings and limitations of the present study, several directions for future research can be suggested.

First, future studies may expand the **size and diversity of the corpus** by including a larger number of short English conversations across a wider range of communicative settings. Incorporating conversations from different social contexts—such as educational environments, workplace interactions, or intercultural exchanges—would allow for broader generalization and deeper comparison of grammatical and lexical patterns in spoken discourse.

Second, further research could examine **comparative dimensions** of short conversations, for example by comparing native-speaker interactions with learner or non-native speaker conversations. Such comparisons would provide valuable insights into how grammatical and lexical features develop in second language use and which features pose particular challenges for language learners.

Third, future studies may integrate **prosodic and interactional features**—including intonation, pauses, turn-taking, overlap, and hesitation markers—into the analysis. Combining grammatical, lexical, and prosodic perspectives would offer a more comprehensive understanding of how meaning is constructed and negotiated in real-time spoken interaction.

Finally, future research could explore **pedagogical applications** more explicitly by designing teaching materials or classroom interventions based on corpus findings from short conversations. Investigating how exposure to authentic spoken features affects learners' speaking fluency, pragmatic competence, or interactional confidence would strengthen the link between discourse analysis and language teaching practice.

REFERENCES

1. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Longman.

2. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

3. Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring spoken English*. Cambridge University Press.

4. Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English: A comprehensive guide*. Cambridge University Press.

5. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

6. Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.

7. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

8. McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

9. Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

10. Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (2004). *How to use corpora in language teaching*. John Benjamins.

11. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

12. Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A:

Corpus of 20 Authentic English Short Conversations

Conversation 1: In a supermarket

A: Excuse me, do you know where the quinoa is?

B: Uh, maybe aisle nine? Near the rice.

A: Thanks! Couldn't find it anywhere.

B: Yeah, they move stuff around all the time.

Conversation 2: Gym locker room

A: Hey, did you finish the spin class?

B: Yeah, killer as always.

A: I bailed halfway.

B: Don't worry, everyone's dying in there.

Conversation 3: Ordering takeaway

A: Hi, yeah, I'd like a large pepperoni and, um, garlic bread.

B: Okay, anything to drink?

A: Just water. That's it.

B: Alright, ready in 20.

Conversation 4: Asking for the time

A: Hey, do you have the time?

B: Yeah, it's, uh, quarter past four.

A: Thanks a lot.

Conversation 5: At a clothing store

A: Thanks. I love the color.

A: Do you have this in a small?

B: Hmm... not on the rack. Let me check out back.

Conversation 6: Making weekend plans

B: Let's do it.

A: Agreed. Early start Saturday?

A: So... beach or mountains?

B: Hmm, mountains. Less crowded.

Conversation 7: Complaining about traffic

A: Took me an hour to get here.

B: Ugh, traffic's insane lately.

A: I left early too. Still barely made it.

B: You need a jetpack.

Conversation 8: In a group project

A: Lifesaver.

A: Who's presenting first?

B: Not me. I did the slides.

C: I can go if no one else wants to.

Conversation 9: Airport gate

A: This the line for boarding?

B: Yep. Gate B12 to JFK.

A: Cool. Always get nervous flying.

B: You're not alone.

Conversation 10: Meeting neighbor

A: Hey, just moved in next door.

B: It's quiet. You'll like it.

A: I'm Nora. Place seems nice.

B: Oh cool! Welcome. I'm Leo.

Conversation 11: Waiting for a bus

A: Hey, you know if the 52's come yet?

B: Uh, no, I've been here like, five minutes. Haven't seen it.

A: Typical. Always late when I need it.

B: Tell me about it. Last week I waited half an hour.

Conversation 12: Asking about lunch

B: Not yet. Thinking of Thai.

A: Mind if I join?

A: Did you eat already?

B: Of course not.

Conversation 13: At a coffee shop

A: Can I get, um, a medium latte, please?

B: Sure. Any milk preference?

A: Oh, uh, almond milk, if you've got it.

B: Yeah, no problem.

Conversation 14: Morning chat at work

B: Yeah, third time this week.

A: Oh no, again?

A: Morning! You look exhausted.

B: Don't even ask. Baby was up all night.

Conversation 15: In a bookstore

B: Ah yeah, we got a few copies over here.

A: Excuse me, do you have the new Murakami book?

B: Hmm, let me check. What's the title?

A: Something like... *The City and Its Uncertain Walls*?

Conversation 16: Quick call with a friend

B: Oof. Okay. Saturday?

A: Need help moving this weekend.

A: Hey! Can you talk now or busy?

B: Just a sec... okay, yeah, what's up?

Conversation 17: Meeting someone new

A: Hi, I'm Jen.

B: Hey Jen, I'm Chris. First time at this meetup?

A: Yeah, kinda nervous.

B: No worries. Everyone's super chill.

Conversation 18: Customer at tech store

B: Ah, MagSafe two. Aisle three.

A: Hey, I'm looking for a charger for, uh, an older MacBook.

B: What year is it?

A: I think... 2017?

Conversation 19: Asking for help in a library

A: Hi, sorry, can you help me find a book on linguistics?

B: Sure. Do you know the author or title?

A: Just looking for something introductory.

B: Try the 400s section, left corner.

Conversation 20: At a party

A: Same. I feel awkward already.

B: Let's get a drink and pretend we belong.

A: You know anyone here?

B: Honestly? Just the host.