

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Going by the findings of the study, we can say that although the ultimate goal of the netizens is the same, that is to identify a suitable marriage alliance, the writers, may occasionally express themselves differently with their own personal preferences of lexical items and other non-linguistic features. Nevertheless their discourses did not show any significant difference in terms of language structure and language use because there seemed to be a continual adherence to the contextual meaning which makes the discourses more coherent.

Though cohesion was never the key factor that contributed to the coherence of the discourses meant for this study, there is still a correlation between cohesion and coherence (Brown and Yule, 1983). This conclusion is made on the basis of the relationship of language structure with the contextual use in this study.

By observing the processed data closely, a technique of ‘simplification of the words used’ is also observed among the writers of the discourses. A scrutiny of the texts uncovered another such non-linguistic feature which may be considered as one of the variables for future studies (that can be conducted with regard to online matrimonial sites and their related entities). The investigator observed a trend of ‘write-less and fast’ attitude among most of the writers whereby they used numerous simplified versions of texts (and words), short forms and abbreviations (both standard and non-standard versions), and semiotic representations when making their discourses. Some examples of those are substitutes that agree in pronunciation like the numerical 2 and 4, the letters

m, n, r and *v*, slang like '*lil*', short forms like *ppl, yr*, etc. Owing to the fact that those discourses selected for this study have been subjected to a 'check' by the organisers of the matrimonial sites before displaying for public view online, what could have probably caused the retention of those forms in the discourses? Are these short forms a constituent of the Internet language? Is such usage widely accepted? Are those sentences with such forms considered cohesive (or coherent)? If yes, is there a need for a complete sentence to achieve cohesion (or coherence) in respect to Internet language? With all these questions in mind, this study has therefore left some issues unexplained which could make up for further investigations in future.

In another instance, a statistical report by 'Internet World Stats' (2010) which estimates the percentages of Internet world users by language states that English is used the most (with a percentage of 27.3% of the total Internet users worldwide in the year 2010). If this is the scenario in the actual world of Internet, what makes English 'the language' of choice for the users? Is it because English is a lingua franca, or is it because of other associating linguistic aspects such as its structure, etc.?

The phenomenon of so many people using English all over the world unavoidably means that the language is changing, as individuals communicate with each other in the way that they find the easiest. The fact that English is used by so many people explains why linguistic change has become so unpredictable (Crystal, 1996). Having said this, most of the online social networking sites including Indian matrimonial sites use English as its medium of expression (or communication). As a matter of fact, the first language (L1) of the organisers and the users of those sites may not necessarily be English. Hence, what makes them choose English instead of their own L1? This may be another area that can be explored by researchers. They can simply investigate the

structure of language and its use in the various domains or areas in the Internet by applying the Structural Linguistic Methods and Sociolinguistic Analysis like the one carried out in this short term research.