

Mechanisms of Turn Exchange, Turn-Taking, and Dialogic Coherence in the Light of Pragmatic Approaches

AMARI Nadia¹, Bahia Bellarbi², Bouguerra Amel³

¹Department of Arabic Language and Literature, University of Algiers 2 - Algeria

^{2,3}University of Algiers 2 - Algeria

Email: ¹nadia.amari@univ-alger2.dz ; ²Bahia.bellarbi@univ-alger2.dz

³amel.bouguerra@univ-alger2.dz

Received: 20/08/2025 Accepted: 22/12/2025 Published: 09/04/2026

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the mechanisms of organising dialogic discourse in light of pragmatic approaches by focusing on three fundamental phenomena: turn exchange, turn-taking, and dialogic coherence. It proceeds from the assumption that dialogue is not merely a spontaneous exchange of speech but rather an organised communicative activity governed by implicit rules that ensure the coherence of interaction and its continuity between speakers. Drawing on the pragmatic approach and the descriptive-analytical method, the study sought to address how these mechanisms operate within discourse and the role of context in directing them. It began by defining the concept of dialogic structure and its characteristics and then analysing the mechanism of turn exchange as the basis for organising interaction, whereby speech is circulated among interlocutors according to precise linguistic, prosodic, and contextual indicators. It also addressed turn-taking as a regular succession of turns, highlighting its types and various strategies, such as claiming the turn, holding it, or yielding it, as well as the phenomenon of interruption and its communicative implications. With respect to dialogic coherence, the study showed that it is achieved through multiple linguistic and semantic means, such as reference, connectives, and repetition, alongside the decisive role of context in constructing meaning and ensuring discourse coherence. The study also reviewed some modern pragmatic approaches, especially Conversation Analysis, which has revealed the rules governing dialogic interaction in different contexts. The study concluded that the success of dialogic communication depends on observing the rules of turn-taking and turn exchange and that coherence is not confined to the linguistic aspect alone but is also related to context and the shared knowledge between speakers.

Keywords: pragmatics, turn exchange, turn-taking, dialogic coherence, discourse analysis.

Introduction

Contemporary linguistic studies have undergone a qualitative shift, marked by a transition from focusing on the formal structure of language to an interest in its pragmatic functions and uses in actual communicative contexts. Researchers have realised that language cannot be fully understood if its analysis is confined to its phonetic, morphological, or syntactic levels; rather, it

must be approached as a communicative activity embodied in real dialogic situations in which speakers interact according to specific intentions and contexts. Hence, pragmatics has emerged as a field of knowledge concerning the study of language in use and the relationships among the utterance, its users, and the circumstances in which it is produced.

Dialogic discourse is regarded as one of the most prominent manifestations of language use, given its interactive nature, which involves the exchange of turns between speakers. Communication is not limited to the production of separate sentences; rather, it is realised in a series of successive speech acts linked to one another through complex semantic and pragmatic relations. From this perspective, dialogue is not merely a spontaneous succession of sounds or expressions; it is an organised structure governed by implicit rules shared by the participants in the communicative process. These rules are embodied in mechanisms that regulate the course of interaction and ensure its coherence and continuity.

Among the most important of these mechanisms is turn exchange, which constitutes the basis of any dialogic interaction, as it enables the distribution of speech among interlocutors in an organised manner that prevents overlap and disorder. Turn-taking also emerges as a manifestation of discourse regularity, in which it alternates according to a precise system based on linguistic, prosodic, and contextual cues that enable speakers to know when each begins and ends speaking. In addition, dialogic coherence appears to be an essential element that ensures the unity of discourse and the interconnectedness of its parts so that it is understood as an integrated whole despite the multiplicity of speakers' voices and the diversity of their positions.

These phenomena cannot be understood in isolation from the context in which they are produced, as situational context plays a decisive role in directing the process of dialogic interaction by determining relationships among participants, regulating their communicative intentions, and interpreting both explicit and implicit meanings. Hence, pragmatic approaches, especially conversation analysis, are important, as they have contributed to uncovering the precise rules that govern dialogic interaction in various social and cultural contexts, showing that dialogue is subject to an exact system of organisation that is no less rigorous than grammatical rules.

Proceeding from this theoretical background, the present study seeks to examine the mechanisms of turn exchange, turn-taking, and dialogic coherence in light of pragmatic approaches by analysing how these mechanisms operate within discourse and revealing their role in achieving effective communication. It also aims to demonstrate that understanding dialogic discourse can be achieved only by combining the linguistic and pragmatic dimensions, thereby enabling a deeper reading of language in its living context.

The importance of this topic lies in its shedding light on a vital aspect of language use, one that extends across multiple fields, including discourse analysis, language teaching, and media communication, as well as modern areas such as natural language processing and artificial intelligence. Hence, the study of these mechanisms is not confined to the theoretical dimension but also opens into practical applications that contribute to a better understanding of human communication.

Chapter One: Dialogic Structure in the Light of Pragmatic Approaches

Dialogue constitutes the fundamental structure in which the actual use of language is realised, as the linguistic, pragmatic, and social dimensions intersect simultaneously. Modern pragmatics has shifted attention from the study of the sentence as an abstract unit to the analysis of discourse as a living communicative practice through which meanings are exchanged within specific contexts. This chapter aims to establish the basic concepts of dialogic structure, highlighting its characteristics, components, and relationship to pragmatic approaches.

Section One: The Concept of Pragmatics and Its Relationship to Dialogic Discourse

1. Definition of pragmatics

Pragmatics is defined as the branch of linguistics concerned with the study of language in use, that is, the relationship between the utterance, its users, and the context in which it is produced. Levinson maintains that pragmatics concerns “the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used” (Levinson, 1983, p. 21).

Yule also holds that pragmatics focuses on understanding the meaning intended by the speaker rather than merely the literal meaning of sentences, enabling it to go beyond the limits of structural analysis of language (Yule, 1996).

2. The Emergence and Development of Pragmatics

Pragmatics emerged in the second half of the twentieth century and was influenced by the following works:

- Austin in speech act theory
- Searle in the development of this theory
- Grice on the cooperative principle and conversational implicature

These theories highlight the importance of intention and context in interpreting meaning, thereby paving the way for the emergence of discourse analysis and conversation analysis.

3. Pragmatics and Dialogic Discourse

Dialogic discourse is closely linked to pragmatics because it:

- is based on the interaction between speakers
- depends on context for the understanding of meaning
- involves implicit communicative intentions

Thus, analysing dialogue requires the adoption of pragmatic tools that reveal the deep structure of linguistic interaction (Brown & Yule, 1983).

Section Two: The Concept of Dialogic Structure and Its Characteristics

1. Definition of Dialogic Structure

Dialogic structure refers to the internal organisation of dialogue, which is manifested in the arrangement of turns, the sequence of utterances, and their interrelatedness within a given communicative context. It is a dynamic structure formed through continuous interaction among participants.

2. Characteristics of Dialogic Discourse

a. Interactivity

Dialogue is characterised as an interactive activity in which participants continuously exchange roles, making meaning a jointly produced outcome.

b. Sequentiality

Dialogue is based on the sequence of utterances, in which each discursive unit is connected to what precedes and what follows it, within what is known as “adjacency pairs”, such as question/answer.

c. Contextuality

Dialogic discourse cannot be understood without reference to the context in which it is produced, whether linguistic, social, or cultural.

d. Intentionality

Each utterance is associated with a particular intention that the speaker seeks to realise, which makes the understanding of dialogue dependent upon the interpretation of these intentions.

Section Three: Components of the Dialogic Structure

1. Speaker and Addressee

The speaker and the addressee constitute the two poles of the communicative process, as they continuously exchange roles and share knowledge and context.

2. Utterance

The utterance is the basic unit of discourse, and it cannot be understood in isolation from context; rather, its meaning is determined according to the circumstances of its production.

3. Context

Context is a decisive element in the interpretation of discourse, and a distinction may be drawn between the following:

- linguistic context, situational context, and cultural context

Hymes emphasised the importance of “communicative competence”, which includes the ability to use language appropriately according to context (Hymes, 1974).

Section Four: Pragmatic Approaches to Dialogue Analysis:

1. Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is among the most prominent approaches to the study of dialogic interaction. It was established by Sacks and his colleagues, who focused on the following:

- turn-taking, turn exchange, and the organisation of talk

Sacks holds that dialogue is governed by a precise system of rules regulating the process of interaction (Sacks, 1992).

2. Speech Act Theory

This theory is based on the premise that language is used to perform actions rather than merely to convey information. Austin distinguished between the following:

- the locutionary act, the illocutionary act, and the perlocutionary act (Austin, 1962)

3. Cooperative Principle

Proposed by Grice, this principle is based on the assumption that speakers cooperate to ensure successful communication by observing four maxims:

- quantity, quality, relation, and manner (Grice, 1975)

Chapter Summary

This chapter makes clear that the dialogic structure constitutes an organised framework for linguistic interaction, which is based on a set of elements and characteristics that make dialogue a complex communicative activity. It has also become evident that pragmatic approaches, in their various orientations, provide effective analytical tools for understanding this interaction by focusing on context, intention, and the mechanisms regulating discourse.

Chapter Two: Mechanisms of Turn Exchange in Dialogic Discourse

Turn exchange is among the fundamental pillars of dialogic discourse, as no effective linguistic interaction can be conceived without a system that determines how speech passes between interlocutors. Dialogue, as an interactive activity, is grounded in a precise organisation that allows each participant to express themselves while preventing disorder and uncontrolled overlap. Pragmatic studies, particularly Conversation Analysis, have been concerned with uncovering the implicit rules governing this process, showing that turn-taking is not random but rather subject to a precise system that speakers implicitly recognise.

Section One: The Concept of Turn Exchange and Its Importance

1. Definition of Turn Exchange

Turn exchange (turn-taking) refers to the process by which the speaking turn passes from one speaker to another during dialogic interaction, according to an organisational system that determines when each participant speaks and how they end their speech. This concept is regarded as one of the central concepts in conversation analysis, as Sacks and his colleagues maintain that dialogue is based on “a turn-distribution system that ensures the succession of speakers in an organised manner” (Sacks et al., 1974).

2. The Importance of Turn Exchange in Communication

The importance of turn exchange is manifested in the following:

- ensures the organisation of dialogic interaction
- allows each speaker the opportunity to express themselves
- prevents random overlap in speech
- contributes to the achievement of mutual understanding

The absence of such an organisation also leads to disruption in communication and a loss of coherence among participants (Levinson, 1983).

Section Two: The Rules Governing Turn Exchange

1. Principle of One Speaker at a Time

Dialogue is fundamentally based on the rule that there is one speaker at any given moment, with participants taking turns in an organised manner, thereby ensuring the clarity of discourse and facilitating its comprehension (Yule, 1996).

2. Transition Relevance Places

These points refer to the moments at which the turn may pass from one speaker to another, and they often occur at the following:

- the end of the sentence
- the completion of the idea
- a prosodic pause

These points are important indicators on which participants rely in determining the timing of their intervention (Sacks et al., 1974).

3. Mechanisms for Selecting the Next Speaker

The next speaker may be determined through the following:

- direct selection by the current speaker
- Self-selection by one of the participants
- continuation of speech by the same speaker

These mechanisms reflect the flexibility and capacity of the dialogic system to adapt to different contexts.

Section Three: Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Indicators of Turn Exchange

1. Linguistic Indicators

These include:

- closing expressions (such as “That is all”)
- linking devices indicating the end of the idea
- questions that call for a response from the addressee

These indicators are clear signals showing the speaker’s readiness to relinquish their turn.

2. Prosodic Indicators

Such as:

- falling intonation
- a temporary pause
- Vowel lengthening

These are elements that help determine the end of the speaking turn.

3. Nonlinguistic Indicators

These are represented by:

- gestures
- eye gaze
- head movements

Studies have shown that these signals play important roles in regulating interactions, especially in face-to-face communication (Goffman, 1981).

Section Four: Strategies for Controlling the Speaking Turn

1. Strategies for Claiming the Turn

The speaker resorts to:

- raising the hand (in formal contexts)
- using expressions such as “If you please”
- polite interruption

To obtain the opportunity to speak.

2. Strategies for Holding the Turn

These include:

- the use of connectives (such as “then” and “also”).
- avoiding long pauses
- raising the intonation to indicate continuation

These strategies are intended to prevent others from taking the turn.

3. Strategies for Yielding Turn:

These are manifested in the following:

- ending the sentence clearly
- directing a question to the addressee
- using closing signals

These reflect the speaker’s desire to end their turn and allow others the opportunity to speak.

Section Five: Disruption of the Turn-Exchange System

1. Interruption:

Interruption is regarded as one of the most prominent manifestations of disruption in the turn-exchange system, and it may be as follows:

- supportive interruption (for confirmation or support)
- oppositional interruption (for correction or objection)

It may also carry social implications related to power or status (Zimmerman & West, 1975).

2. Overlapping Talk:

This occurs when more than one person speaks at the same time, and it may be as follows:

- spontaneous or intentional

It is a common phenomenon in natural dialogues, especially in informal contexts.

3. Silence:

Silence represents an important element in dialogue, as it may indicate the following:

- Reflection, hesitation, or refusal to participate

Long silence may also disrupt the course of interaction (Tannen, 1984).

Section Six: Turn Exchange in the Light of the Social Context

1. Influence of Social Relations:

Turn exchange is influenced by the relationships between speakers, such as the following:

- a power relationship (teacher/student)
- a horizontal relationship (friends)

Those in positions of authority tend to control the distribution of turns.

2. Influence of Culture:

The rules for turn-taking differ from one culture to another. Some cultures accept interruption, whereas others regard it as inappropriate behavior (Tannen, 1984).

3. Formal and Informal Contexts

In formal contexts:

- Turn exchange is strictly organised

In informal contexts:

- It is characterised by greater flexibility and more overlap

Chapter Summary

Turn exchange constitutes a central mechanism in the organisation of dialogic discourse, as it is governed by a precise system of rules and indicators that enable speakers to manage interaction effectively. This system is also influenced by multiple factors, including social and cultural context, making it a complex phenomenon that requires in-depth pragmatic analysis. The importance of this mechanism lies in ensuring the coherence and continuity of dialogue and in contributing to successful communication between individuals.

Chapter Three: Turn-Taking in Dialogic Discourse: An Analytical Pragmatic Approach

Turn-taking is one of the most prominent phenomena that reveals the organized nature of dialogic interaction, as it is reflected in the orderly succession of speakers' turns during discourse production. This succession is not understood as a mere spontaneous transfer of speech; rather, it is a process governed by precise rules that participants in dialogue implicitly share and that are controlled by linguistic, prosodic, and contextual cues. Pragmatic studies, especially conversation analysis, have given this phenomenon great importance because of its role in maintaining the continuity of interaction and achieving mutual understanding.

Section One: The Concept of Turn-Taking

1. Definition of turn-taking:

Turn-taking is the process by which speakers alternate in taking turns in speech, according to an organisational system that determines the timing and limits of intervention. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson maintain that turn-taking constitutes “a basic system for organising everyday conversation” (Sacks et al., 1974).

2. Turn-Taking in the Light of Pragmatics

Pragmatics shows that turn-taking does not depend solely on linguistic structure but is also affected by the following:

- context
- communicative intentions
- Shared knowledge

The speaker does not choose the timing of their intervention arbitrarily but rather bases it on an assessment of the state of the interaction and others' reactions (Levinson, 1983).²

Section Two: Patterns of Turn-Taking

1. Smooth Turn-Taking:

This occurs when the turn passes from one speaker to another without overlap or noticeable silence, and it is regarded as the ideal form of dialogue.

Applied Example (Everyday Dialogue):

- A: Have you finished the work?
- B: Yes, I submitted it this morning.

→ We observe a smooth transition without interruption.

2. Overlapping Turn-Taking

This occurs when more than one person speaks at the same time, and it may be as follows:

- supportive (for confirmation)
- or competitive (to dominate the conversation)

A real Arabic example (from a media discussion):

- Speaker 1: We need reform
- Speaker 2: However, reform must begin with

→ Here, overlap appears as a result of each party's attempt to impose its own view.

3. Delayed Turn-Taking

This occurs when the speaker is delayed in taking their turn, often because of the following:

- hesitation
- Reflection
- lack of understanding

Example:

- A: What is your opinion of the decision?
- B: (Silence) ... I think it needs reconsideration.
-

Section Three: Turn-Taking Strategies

1. Strategies for Taking the Turn:

These include:

- beginning to speak directly
- using expressions such as “In my opinion”
- regulated interruption

2. Strategies for Holding the Turn

These include:

- the use of connectives (then, also)
- avoiding long pauses
- raising the intonation

3. Strategies for Yielding the Turn

These are manifested in the following:

- ending the sentence
- asking a question
- using closing signals

Yule indicated that these strategies are regarded as pragmatic tools for organising interaction (Yule, 1996).³

Section Four: Turn-Taking and Adjacency Pairs

1. The Concept of Adjacency Pairs

These are dialogic units consisting of two interrelated parts:

- question/answer
- greeting/response to greeting
- request/response

(Schegloff, 2007).

2. Arabic Examples

Example 1 (Greeting):

- A: Peace be upon you.
- B: And upon you be peace.

Example 2 (Request):

- A: Could you help me?
- B: Yes, certainly.

→ This interrelatedness demonstrates the precise organisation of dialogue.

Section Five: Analytical Applications of Arabic Dialogues

1. A Sample from Everyday Dialogue

Text:

- A: Did you go to the university today?
- B: Yes, but the lecture was cancelled.
- A: Why?
- B: The professor is ill.

Analysis:

- smooth and organised turn-taking
- the presence of adjacency pairs (question/answer)
- the absence of overlap

2. A Sample from a Literary Text (Novelistic Dialogue)

Text:

- He said, "Do you trust me?"
- She replied: Trust is not easy.

Analysis:

- condensed turn-taking
- implicit meanings
- strong contextual coherence

Section Six: The Effect of Context on Turn-Taking

1. The Social Context

It affects:

- the distribution of turns
- the freedom to intervene

2. The Cultural Context

Cultures differ in the following ways:

- Acceptance of interruption
- the length of turns (Tannen, 1984).

3. The Institutional Context

In institutions (school, media):

- Turn-taking is regulated
- Roles are predetermined

Chapter Summary

It becomes evident that turn-taking constitutes a central mechanism in organising dialogic interaction, as it is governed by a precise system of rules and strategies that enable speakers to manage dialogue efficiently. This system is also influenced by social and cultural context, making it a complex pragmatic phenomenon that requires in-depth analysis. Practical applications confirm that turn-taking is not merely a formal succession but rather a semantic process that contributes to the construction of meaning and the achievement of coherence within discourse.

Chapter Four: Dialogic Coherence in the Light of Pragmatic Approaches

Dialogic coherence is regarded as one of the fundamental pillars of interactive discourse, as it ensures the connectedness of its units and the harmony of its components despite the multiplicity of speakers and the diversity of their intentions. If turn exchange and turn-taking reflect the organisational dimension of dialogue, dialogic coherence represents the semantic and pragmatic dimension that grants discourse its unity and consistency. Modern linguistic studies, especially text linguistics and pragmatics, have attached great importance to this phenomenon because of its role in achieving understanding and effective communication.

Section One: The Concept of Dialogic Coherence

1. Definition of Coherence

Coherence (cohesion/coherence) is defined as the sum of the relations that connect the parts of discourse so that they are understood as an integrated semantic unit. Halliday and Hasan distinguished between the following:

- cohesion, which is based on linguistic means
- coherence, which is based on meaning and context

(Halliday & Hasan, 1976).¹

2. Coherence in Dialogic Discourse

In dialogue, coherence is achieved not only through linguistic links but also through the following:

- interaction between speakers
- the invocation of shared knowledge
- respect for the sequence of turns (Brown & Yule, 1983).

Section Two: Means of Dialogic Coherence

1. References

This consists of the use of linguistic elements that refer to other elements within or outside the text, such as the following:

- pronouns
- demonstratives

Example:

"Muhammad arrived, then he left quickly."

→ The pronoun "he" refers to "Muhammad".

2. Conjunctions

These include:

- temporal conjunctions (then, after that)
- causal conjunctions (because, therefore)
- adversative conjunctions (but)

→ They contribute to organising the relations between sentences.

3. Repetition

The repetition of a word or meaning to strengthen cohesion.

Example:

"Knowledge is light, and knowledge is the foundation of progress."

4. Ellipsis

The omission of an element understood from the context.

Example:

- A: Have you read the book?
- B: Yes (i.e., I have read it).

5. Lexical Cohesion

Semantic relations between words, such as the following:

- synonymy
- antonymy
- belonging to the same semantic field

(Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Section Three: Pragmatic Coherence and the Role of Context

1. Pragmatic coherence:

This is achieved when discourse is consistent with the following:

- the context
- the speakers' intentions
- Shared knowledge

Levinson holds that understanding meaning depends on what is left unsaid as much as what is explicitly stated (Levinson, 1983).⁴

2. Role of Context in Achieving Coherence:

The context includes the following:

- linguistic context
- Social context
- cultural context

It contributes to:

- interpreting implicit meanings
- linking the parts of discourse

Section Four: Analysis of Dialogues from the Qur'an

1. The Dialogue between Moses and Pharaoh

Text:

The Exalted says,

"Pharaoh said, 'And what is the Lord of the Words?' He said, 'The Lord of the heavens and the earth and whatever is between them, if you are certain.'"

Analysis:

- The presence of semantic coherence through question and answer
- the use of the reference ("Lord")
- pragmatic consistency based on dialogic conflict
- gradual progression in argumentation

→ The dialogue reflects strong interconnectedness despite the difference in positions.

2. The Dialogue between Abraham and His Father

Text:

"O my father, why do you worship that which neither hears nor sees?"

Analysis:

- The use of the vocative style ("O my father") → affective coherence
 - a coherent argumentative structure
 - reliance on interrogation as a communicative device
- It combines linguistic and pragmatic coherence.

Section Five: Analysis of Dialogues from the Arabic Literature

1. A Model from an Arabic Novel:

Text (an imaginary dialogue inspired by narrative literature):

- He said, "Why were you late?"
- She replied, "The road was crowded."
- He said, "However, you were very late."

Analysis:

- coherence through repetition ("late")
- an adversative connector ("but")
- a logical sequence in the dialogue

2. A Model from Arabic Drama

Text:

- First, do we have a choice?
- Second, there is always a choice.

Analysis:

- semantic connectedness (question/answer)
- linguistic condensation
- pragmatic consistency based on the idea

Section Six: Breakdown of Dialogic Coherence

1. Causes of Breakdown

- absence of connectors
- misunderstanding
- difference in context
- interruption of turn-taking

2. Manifestations of Breakdown

- fragmentation of discourse
- ambiguity of meaning
- breakdown of communication

Chapter Summary

It becomes evident that dialogic coherence constitutes an essential element in the construction of discourse, as it ensures the connectedness of its parts and its consistency, whether through linguistic means or pragmatic factors. Applied analyses, especially in Qur'anic and literary texts,

have also shown that coherence is not confined to the formal aspect but extends to the semantic and contextual dimensions, making it a complex phenomenon that requires a comprehensive approach for understanding.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that examining dialogic discourse through pragmatic approaches offers broad horizons for understanding language as a living communicative activity that extends beyond formal structure to explore mechanisms of use and context. This research has sought to analyse three fundamental phenomena that constitute the essence of dialogic interaction: turn exchange, turn-taking, and dialogic coherence as interrelated components that organise discourse and ensure its effectiveness.

The study has shown that turn-taking is not a spontaneous process but is governed by a precise system of implicit rules that enable speakers to distribute speaking roles in an organised manner, thereby ensuring clarity of communication and avoiding uncontrolled overlap. It has also been demonstrated that turn-taking is a dynamic mechanism that reflects the orderly succession of roles, as it relies on linguistic, prosodic, and contextual cues that enable participants to determine the timing of their interventions in dialogue. The analyses revealed that this mechanism is influenced by multiple factors, including the nature of the relationship between the speakers and the social and cultural context in which the interaction occurs.

With respect to dialogic coherence, it has become clear that it provides the basis for discourse unity and consistency, whether through linguistic means such as reference, connectives, and repetition or through pragmatic factors related to context and shared knowledge. Through the analysis of models drawn from the Qur'an and literary texts, the study highlights that coherence is not confined to formal connectedness but extends to the semantic and pragmatic constructions that guide the understanding and interpretation of discourse.

The findings have also confirmed that pragmatic approaches, foremost Conversation Analysis, are effective tools for uncovering the rules governing dialogic interaction, as they provide a deeper understanding of how meaning is constructed within discourse. Therefore, the study of these mechanisms is not limited to the theoretical aspect but extends to practical applications in multiple fields, such as media discourse analysis, language teaching, institutional communication, and even in modern domains such as natural language processing.

On this basis, it may be said that the success of the communicative process depends on the extent to which speakers observe the rules of dialogic interaction and on their ability to employ linguistic and pragmatic means to achieve consistency and mutual understanding. Understanding these mechanisms also contributes to the development of Arabic linguistic studies. It opens the way for future research exploring other dimensions of discourse, particularly in light of digital transformations and the development of communication technologies.

In light of the above, the study recommends the need to expand the scope of applied pragmatic studies in the Arabic language, with a focus on analysing real discourse in various fields, given the

effect this has in enhancing our understanding of language as a dynamic communicative instrument that interacts with context, culture, and society.

References

- Al-Khattabi, M. (1991). *Linguistics of the text*. Arab Cultural Centre.
- Al-Zamakhshari, M. (1987). *Al-Kashshaf* [The Revealer]. Dar al-Maarifah.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*—University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ibn Kathir, I. (1999). *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim* [Exegesis of the Great Qur'an]. Dar Taybah.
- Laid, S. (2003). *On pragmatics and discourse analysis*. Dar Houma.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simple systematics for organising turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organisation in interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analysing talk among friends*. Ablex.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex Roles, Interruptions, and Silences in Conversation. In B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105–129). Newbury House.