

---

## **Research**

---

### **A Comparative Study of Spoken and Written Thai : Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives**

**Supanee Tiancharoen**

Georgetown University, 1987

This dissertation is aimed at comparing spoken and written Thai discourse. The main focus of this study is on the linguistic features that distinguish spoken and written Thai discourse. These features include subordination, coordination, nominalization, questions, imperatives, direct quotes, particles, and repetition. Since language and social context cannot be kept apart, my ultimate goal is to identify the sociolinguistic variables that contribute to and influence the features differentiating spoken from written texts.

This study focuses on six text types : conversation, academic lectures, television/radio broadcasts, personal letters, academic texts, and magazine articles. It specifically addresses three main issues : degrees of structural complexity, degrees of involvement and detachment, and degrees of repetition.

I have found that subordination in general, and relative clauses in particular occur more often in information-focused text types (broadcasts, lectures, magazine articles, and academic texts), than in involvement-focused text types (conversation and personal letters). The latter favor adverbial clauses and nominal clauses. Coordination occurs less frequently than subordination in all text types. I have concluded that information-focused discourse is more complex than involvement-focused discourse.

Nominalization rarely occurs in conversation and personal letters, but occurs more frequently in the other text types. Questions occur most often in conversation and fulfill several pragmatic functions. Imperatives and direct quotes are rare, though slightly more frequent in spoken texts. Particles occur far more often in spoken language than in written language. The findings suggest that spoken-like language creates more involvement than written-like language.

Repetition is very common in both spoken and written Thai. I have suggested that this is due to the structure of the language itself.

I have concluded from this study that spoken and written language are categories too broad to compare. In addition, differences in modality may not be as important in determining linguistic features as differences in sociolinguistic attributes that make up the text.

### **Procedures for Materials Evaluation**

**Uma Srisupinanont**

University of Lancaster, 1985

The underlying purpose of this dissertation is to formulate some techniques to be used as a tool for materials evaluation, which will be relevant to language learning and teaching in present-day Thailand. The assumption was that it might be possible to integrate two procedures,