

**A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani
and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,
A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani and Hejazi
Arabic: Exploring Phonological, Morphosyntactic, Lexical,
and Interactional Variation**

Dr. Nuha Khalid Alsalem

English Language Department, College of Science and Humanities
Shaqra University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study investigated the linguistic characteristics of two prominent Saudi dialects in terms of phonology, morphosyntactic structures, lexicon, and discourse markers. The primary objective was to uncover variations and potential social correlations within these linguistic elements. Jazani Arabic, spoken in the Jazan region, and Hejazi Arabic, spoken in the Hejaz region, were meticulously examined using conversation analysis. The study highlights the multifaceted nature of language in Saudi Arabia, emphasizing regional and sociolinguistic factors. The findings could inform language teaching methods, curriculum development, and communication strategies. Language educators could tailor programs to address specific phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features, enhancing learners' proficiency and cultural competence. Moreover, sociolinguists could leverage the findings in broader studies on language change, contact, and identity within the Saudi context. Understanding dialectal variation is crucial for comprehending the intricacies of linguistic diversity in the region. Communication professionals could benefit from the study's insights into discourse markers, which play a pivotal role in cross-cultural communication. A better understanding of these markers could foster more effective communication with speakers of different dialects, contributing to more successful intercultural interactions. Finally, the integration of the findings into teaching materials could promote more authentic language learning experiences. Such an approach would ensure that language learners engaged with the nuances of Saudi dialects, fostering a more culturally sensitive and context-specific language learning environment.

Keywords: Conversation analysis, dialect, Hejazi, Jazani, Saudi Arabia.

د. نهى خالد السالم

أستاذ اللغويات التطبيقية المساعد

كلية العلوم والدراسات الإنسانية، جامعة شقراء - المملكة العربية السعودية

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى مقارنة الخصائص اللغوية لهجتين السعوديتين، الجازانية والحجازية، مع التركيز على التباينات الصوتية، والصرفية، واختيار المفردات، وعلامات الخطاب. واستناداً إلى التنوع اللغوي الاجتماعي في المملكة العربية السعودية، المميز باللهجات الإقليمية، هدفت الدراسة في المقام الأول إلى دراسة التباينات والارتباطات الاجتماعية المحتملة في هذه العناصر اللغوية. تم اختيار العربية الجازانية، المنطوقة في منطقة جيزان، والعربية الحجازية، السائدة في منطقة الحجاز، وتم فحصهما بعناية كدراسات حالة. تسلط الدراسة الضوء على الطابع المتعدد الجوانب للغة في المملكة العربية السعودية، مع التأكيد على أن تشكيلها يعود إلى تأثيرات إقليمية وعوامل اجتماعية. يمكن لعلماء اللغة الاجتماعيين الاستفادة من النتائج للمساهمة في دراسات أوسع نطاقاً حول تغيير اللغة والتواصل والهوية في السياق السعودي حيث أن فهم التباينات اللهجية أمر حاسم لاستيعاب التنوع اللغوي في المنطقة. كما يمكن للمختصين في مجال التواصل الاستفادة من نتائج الدراسة فيما يتعلق بعلامات الخطاب، والتي تلعب دوراً أساسياً في التواصل بين الثقافات المختلفة. في النهاية، تسلط الدراسة الضوء على التفاصيل اللغوية للعربية الجازانية والحجازية، ملقبة الضوء على سماتها الصوتية والصرفية والمفرداتية والخطابية. كما تمتد الآثار العميقة للدراسة إلى التطبيقات العملية في مجال تعليم اللغات والبحوث الاجتماعية اللغوية واستراتيجيات التواصل عبر الثقافات، كلها تسهم في تحقيق فهم شامل للمناظر اللغوية في المملكة العربية السعودية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: اللهجة الجازانية، اللهجة الحجازية، اللهجات السعودية، تحليل

الخطاب، الخصائص اللغوية.

A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,

Introduction

This study examined the phonological, morphosyntactic, lexical, and discourse characteristics of two Saudi dialects of Arabic, Hejazi and Jazani, exploring potential social and regional correlations between two participants. Jazani is spoken in Jazan, a port city and the capital of the Jazan region in southwestern Saudi Arabia on the Yemeni border, while Hejazi is spoken in the western part of the country in major cities such as Makkah, Madinah, and Jeddah. Madinah serves as the administrative center of the Madinah region and holds religious significance as the second holiest city in Islam.

The researcher sought to answer the following question: What variations exist in the phonology, morphosyntax, lexicon, and interaction patterns between two speakers of Jazani and Hejazi Arabic?

Literature Review

The sociolinguistic landscape of Saudi Arabia is characterized by diglossia, with Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) used as the official language in formal communication and diverse regional dialects used for everyday interaction (Alkhamees, 2023). Extensive sociolinguistic studies, such as Mitchel (1986) and Abu-Melhim (1991), have examined the diglossic relationship between formal and colloquial Arabic varieties (as cited in Bokhari, 2020). Furthermore, numerous studies have explored the syntax, phonology, and morphology of Arabic dialects (Bokhari, 2020).

Phonological variation, influenced by factors such as geography, social class, age, and ethnicity, can offer valuable insights into language use within diverse social groups (J., 2022). This variation is particularly pronounced in speech communities. For instance, Al-Rojaie (2013) investigated variations in deaffrication of [k] in the Qaṣīmī dialect, Al-Hawamdeh (2016) explored depalatalization of /k/ and develarization of /l/, and

Suparno et al. (2020) looked more broadly at sound correspondences across MSA, Moroccan Arabic, and Najdi Arabic. In terms of morphology, Alrasheedi (2023) studied the impact of prefixation on syllable structure and syllabification in Najdi Arabic.

A distinctive feature of dialectal variation are the lexical differences between dialects (Jayaraj & Kumar, 2019). These variations, easily discernible to native speakers, play a prominent role in speech communities. In the realm of discourse analysis, Harvey (2022) introduced interactional sociolinguistics to scrutinize how individuals utilize language in face-to-face interactions. This analysis goes beyond the structural aspects of language, focusing on the dynamic interplay of social identities and activities.

Therefore, exploring variation in phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and interaction can provide a more comprehensive understanding of Saudi Arabia's sociolinguistic landscape. The intricate connections between these elements can highlight the nuanced ways language is used and understood within diverse social and linguistic contexts.

Methodology

Participants

The independent variables were age, gender, socioeconomic status, marital status, education, current residency, and social distance between participants. The primary dependent variable was regional dialect (Jazani or Hejazi). Table 1 summarizes the demographic details of the two participants.

**A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani
and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,**

Table 1: Participants' Demographic Information

Independent Variable	Participant A	Participant B
City of birth	Jazan	Madinah
Dialect	Jazani	Hejazi
Gender	Female	Female
Age	26-28	26-28
Marital status	Married with two children	Married
Socioeconomic status	Upper middle class	Upper middle class
Education	Master's degree	Medical residency
Social distance	Knew each other	Knew each other
Interviewer's social distance	Very close	Close
Length in the U.S.	One year and a few months	One year

Participant A was born and raised in Jazan City, while Participant B was born and raised in Medinah. Both were women in their mid-twenties from the upper middle class. They were both married, and Participant A had two children. The participants were acquainted with each other and with the researcher, although the researcher was more closely acquainted with Participant A than Participant B. Both had been residing in the United States for at least a year, pursuing their higher education there.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The data were obtained from spontaneous conversation between the researcher and participants. The researcher coordinated with both participants to determine the most convenient day and time for a meeting at the researcher's residence. The initial phase involved serving Saudi coffee and engaging in small talk to create a relaxed atmosphere. Subsequently, the researcher informed the participants that the conversation was part of a course project, intentionally omitting the main objective to encourage natural speech. In adherence to

ethical considerations, participants were informed about the conversation being recorded, with access limited to the researcher. Three recording devices were employed to capture an hour and a half of authentic conversation. The collected data were identified, transcribed, and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

Data Analysis and Discussion

This section examines the prevalence of the phonological, morphosyntactic, lexical, and interactional elements in the data, illustrated with examples.

Phonology

The analysis revealed two distinctions in participants' pronunciation: [ð] vs. [d] and [dʕ] vs. [ðʕ].

Dental Fricative and Alveolar Stop

In MSA, the voiced dental fricative /ð/ and voiced alveolar stop /d/ are separate phonemes. Participant A (Jazani) pronounced /ð/ as [ð], matching MSA, while Participant B (Hejazi) pronounced /ð/ as [d] (see Table 2).

Table 2: Frequency of [ð] and [d] in Participants' Speech

Variable	Participant A (Jazani)	Participant B (Hejazi)
ð > ð	13 (1.79%)	0
ð > d	0	4 (1.43%)

The following examples from the conversation highlight differences in how participants pronounced the same word. For clarity, the word featuring the variable is underlined and italicized. In Example 1, the Jazani speaker stated, *أقوم افتح الباب* (‘‘When I open the door, he walks like this in the hallway’’). Conversely, the Hejazi speaker pronounced /ð/ as [d] in the same word: *فجأة جاتو اللغة الثانية فسار عندو كذا* (‘‘Suddenly, he encounters the other language and becomes like this’’).

In MSA and most Saudi Arabic dialects, including Jazani, the pronunciation of the sound /ð/ adheres to its written form, [ð]. However, Hejazi diverges by often pronouncing /ð/ as [d]. One

A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,

plausible explanation is the influence of neighboring countries, particularly Egypt across the Red Sea. Certain Egyptian Arabic varieties articulate /ð/ as /d/. Given Egypt's substantial cultural impact through television, film, and music, many non-native Arabic speakers learn Egyptian Arabic.

This influence extends to Saudi Arabia, particularly in the west, where there are strong social, financial, and geographical ties with Egypt. Frequent visits by Egyptians to the holy cities of Makkah and Madinah might contribute to the adoption of the [d] pronunciation by some Hejazi speakers. The social and economic connections between Egyptians and Saudis, especially in the western region, could further explain this pronunciation.

Pharyngealized Voiced Alveolar Stop [dʕ] and Dental Fricative [ðʕ]

According to the data, the Jazani speaker did not differentiate between MSA /dʕ/ and /ðʕ/, pronouncing them both as [ðʕ], while the Hejazi speaker maintained this distinction (see Table 3). In pronouncing the word حضر “come,” the Hejazi speaker pronounced the word as [ħadʕra], whereas the Jazani speaker pronounced it as [ħaðʕra], making it sound like the word حظر “block.”

Throughout the conversation, the Hejazi speaker consistently adhered to the MSA pronunciation of /dʕ/. This choice may be attributed to the Hejazi speaker residing in Madinah, a religious city, leading her to align her pronunciation more closely with the standard form. When reading or reciting the Holy Quran in Classical Arabic, individuals across various dialects are supposed to distinguish these sounds.

Table 3: Frequency of [dʕ] and [ðʕ] in Participants' Speech

Variable	Participant A (Jazani)	Participant B (Hejazi)
/dʕ/ > [dʕ]	0	3 (1.07%)
/dʕ/ > [ðʕ]	6 (0.82%)	0

To make the distinction clear, I chose the same word and showed how it was pronounced differently by the two participants. The Jazani speaker still pronounced the word حضانة “daycare” as [ħdʕanah], whereas the Hejazi speaker pronounced it as [ħdʕanah].

Morphosyntax

The data showed differences in two morphosyntactic variables: future tense prefixes and the present tense marker with plural third-person pronouns.

Future Markers [b-] and [ħ-]

The Jazani speaker marked the future tense by attaching the prefix [b-] to the verb, while the Hejazi speaker used the prefix [ħ-] (see Table 4).

Table 4: Frequency of Using the Prefixes [b-] and [ħ-]

Variable	Participant A (Jazani)	Participant B (Hijazi)
[b-]	5 (0.68%)	0
[ħ-]	0	2 (0.71%)

For example, the Jazani speaker employed [b-] in the sentence بحاول أكمل شغلي في الويكند “I will try to finish my work on the weekend,” whereas the Hejazi speaker used [ħ-]: حياقظ اللغة ما إذا ما بيختلط ببيزورة “He will not pick the language if he does not interact with children.” In positive and negative statements involving all types of pronouns, the Hejazi speaker consistently employed [ħ-] to signify the future tense. The same pattern was seen with the Jazani speaker’s use of [b-]. Despite using different prefixes, the participants adhered to the same syntactic structure.

Present Tense Marker with Third Person Plural Pronouns

The Jazani speaker appended the suffix [-n] to verbs when using third person plural pronouns, while the Hejazi speaker omitted the suffix (see Table 5).

**A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani
and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,**

Table 5: Frequency of Using the Present Tense Marker [-n]

Variable	Participant A (Jazani)	Participant B (Hejazi)
[-n]	5 (0.68%)	0
No [-n]	0	2 (0.71%)

As an example, the Jazani speaker added the suffix [-n] to the verb in يتعاملون معاه؟ (“How are they dealing with him?”), whereas the Hejazi speaker omitted [-n] in كل شوي السعر يزودوا (“Every time, they increase their price”).

Lexical Items

The data revealed lexical differences between the two participants regarding the adverb for “yet” and the noun phrase for “two days ago” (see Table 6).

Table 6: Different Lexical Items Produced by the Participants

Word and Part of speech	Participant A (Jazani)	Participant B (Hejazi)
Yet (adverb)	باقي [baqe]	لسا [lessa]
Two days ago / the day before yesterday (noun phrase)	قبل أمس [qbl ams]	أولة أمس [awalt ams]

As an example, participants used different noun phrases to describe the same day. The Jazani participant used the noun phrase قبل أمس (“the day before yesterday”) in كان برد مرة, whereas the Hejazi participant used the noun phrase أولة أمس (“two days ago”) in كان مرة برد (“Two days ago, it was very cold”).

Interactional Conventions

During the conversation, patterns of interaction were noted in holding the floor and turn taking, concise responses, discourse markers, and code-switching.

Controlling the Conversation and Alternating Turns

Table 7 shows the number of conversational turns and corresponding word count for each participant during the same seven-minute period.

Table 7: Turns Taken and Words within Seven Minutes

Holding the floor	Participant A (Jazani)	Participant B (Hejazi)
Turns taken	44	32
Words spoken	725	279

In total, there were 76 turns taken, with 44 attributed to the Jazani speaker and 32 to the Hejazi speaker. Throughout this period, participants collectively uttered 1,004 words. However, there was a substantial difference in word production, with the Jazani speaker uttering 725 words and the Hejazi speaker only uttering 279.

Despite both participants actively engaging and taking turns, the Jazani speaker predominantly held the floor and assumed a more dominant role. This inclination could be attributed to several factors. First, she demonstrated a preference for delving into personal stories and experiences, necessitating detailed elaboration. Second, she often took the initiative in introducing topics, thereby establishing control over the direction of the conversation. Third, her familiarity with the interviewer's home, stemming from multiple previous visits, contributed to her sense of ease. Finally, her conversational style involved progressively developing and shifting between topics, leading to frequent digressions. For instance, she seamlessly transitioned from discussing her son's daycare to recounting experiences with various daycares and eventually reflecting on her experiences with daycares in Saudi Arabia before relocating to the U.S. This fluid movement between topics created situations where she consistently held the floor, a strategy not mirrored by the other participant.

A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,

For instance, in a discussion about obtaining a driver's license, the Jazani speaker shared details such as where, when, how, and with whom she practiced driving. Furthermore, she went beyond the primary topic, recounting a narrative about a friend's experience attempting to secure a driver's license. Similarly, Hirschman (1994) identified elaboration as a prominent element in women's conversational style. Conversely, the Hejazi speaker offered a concise account of her driving practices on the same subject. This concise response prompted the Jazani speaker to pose additional questions and encourage further elaboration. Additionally, the Hejazi speaker's positive responses, along with inserted comments and questions, may have been interpreted by the Jazani speaker as indicators of interest and attention. This interpretation likely contributed to the Jazani speaker's extended discourse on the topic and holding the conversational floor. This behavior aligned with the findings of Maltz and Borker (1983), who noted that one characteristic of women's speech involves providing extended signs of interest and attention during a speaker's narrative.

Despite the uneven floor time, the interaction remained dynamic, aligning with the research objectives. Whenever the researcher observed a participant monopolizing the conversation, however, efforts were made to redirect attention to the other participant, giving her an opportunity to contribute. One strategy was to positively overlap with the Jazani speaker, offering minimal responses, and then posing relevant questions to the other participant. This approach aimed to preserve the conversation's flow and coherence, leading the Jazani speaker to welcome the input of the other participant on topics the Jazani speaker had initiated.

Concise Responses

Due to the Jazani participant's dominance in holding the floor, the Hejazi participant frequently responded with minimal replies throughout the conversation. Whenever the Jazani participant embarked on an extended discourse, the second participant consistently offered positive minimal responses in connection to the narrative, such as اها "Oh" (followed by laughing) and اها يمكن "maybe."

These consistent minimal responses served functions such as agreement, support, and acknowledgment. For instance, the Hejazi participant shared a related story to affirm her support for the Jazani participant's narrative and convey agreement with her perspective. This practice aligned with a characteristic noted by Fishman (1978), wherein women in conversation tend to employ strategies that sustain social interaction and facilitate the smooth flow of discourse. Fishman suggested that women often make utterances aimed at eliciting responses from other participants, contributing to conversational engagement. These have been categorized as "positive reactions," encompassing expressions of solidarity, tension release, and agreement. Furthermore, women exhibit a higher inclination to use positive minimal responses, such as "mm hmm," and are more prone to insert comments throughout ongoing discourse rather than solely at the conclusion of an utterance (Maltz & Borker, 1983, p. 197).

Furthermore, the Hejazi speaker employed nonverbal minimal responses, including nodding and maintaining eye contact. Such nonverbal cues are commonly observed in women's conversational interactions; it is theorized that for women, a minimal response conveys sentiments such as "I'm listening to you; please continue," "I agree with you," and "I follow your argument so far" (Maltz & Borker, 1983, p. 202). Both participants maintained a close relationship and accurately interpreted each other's speech, and the Hejazi participant's positive minimal responses helped establish a collaborative and

A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,

cooperative atmosphere. Additionally, at the outset of her utterances, the Hejazi participant explicitly acknowledged and responded to what the other participant had said. She demonstrated a connection between her own speech and preceding statements, either by expanding on the previous utterance or addressing a related topic. Thus, the Hejazi speaker's minimal responses, such as "uh-huh," "wow," and "right," kept the conversation going smoothly and encouraged the other to provide more details. In contrast, no minimal responses by the Jazani speaker were identified during this segment of the conversation.

Using Discourse Markers

A discourse marker is a term or phrase that helps organize the flow and structure of discourse. Table 8 presents the frequency of discourse markers utilized by the Jazani participant.

Table 8: Discourse Markers Uttered by Jazani Participant

Discourse marker	Frequency (percent)
"I swear" والله	9 (1.25%)
"Mashallah" ما شاء الله	3 (0.41%)
"I mean" يعني	3 (0.41%)
"imagine" تخيلي	2 (0.27%)

During the same seven-minute period discussed above, the Jazani participant used the discourse marker "I swear (to God)" nine times. It was inserted within the flow of speech, being stated independently as a phrase only once. The following example highlights the most frequently used discourse marker, "I swear," by the Jazani speaker: والله ما سالتهم "I swear I didn't ask them." In this and similar instances, she did not use "I swear" literally as a means of indicating truthfulness. Instead, she employed it informally as a discourse marker to add emphasis, similar to the English word "really."

The other discourse markers most frequently used by this participant were “mashallah” (“God willed it”) and [yʕne] (“I mean”). Mashallah was also the most frequently used discourse marker by the other participant. In Islam, individuals often incorporate this phrase to convey appreciation and acknowledge that accomplishments are attained through the will of God. People also express this phrase with the belief that it may protect them from jealousy and the evil eye. The discourse marker [yʕne] (“I mean”) indicated the Jazani participant’s intention to paraphrase or provide additional information, similar to the equivalent phrase in English.

The least frequently used discourse marker by the Jazani speaker was *تخيلي* (“Imagine!” / “Can you imagine?” / “Can you believe it?”) to capture the listener’s attention and prompt them to visualize the situation as if it were happening in the present moment, as in *يمسكني تخيلوا يسحبني للشيء* (“[My son] holds me, imagine, and pushes me toward the thing [he wants]”).

Table 9 illustrates the two discourse markers used by the Hejazi speaker during the seven-minute interaction.

Table 9: Discourse Markers Uttered by Hejazi Participant

Discourse marker	Frequency (percent)
“mashallah” ما شاء الله	5 (1.79%)
“darling” حبيبي	2 (0.71)

Mashallah was explained above. The following is merely an illustration of how the Hejazi participant employed it: *يوم كان في السعودية ما شاء الله كان فصيح* (“When he was in Saudi Arabia, *mashallah* he was very fluent.”)

The second discourse marker employed by the Hejazi speaker consisted of endearing terms such as “darling” and “my dear.” She utilized these as minimal responses to express sympathy or affection toward the other participant. For instance, while the Jazani speaker was narrating a story about her two-

**A Comparative Conversation Analysis of Jazani
and Hejazi Arabic: Exploring Phonological,**

year-old struggling to express himself, the Hejazi speaker expressed sympathy using the discourse marker “Oh dear.”

Engaging in Code-Switching

Code-switching involves shifting from one language or dialect to another within the same utterance or speech event and is common among bilinguals in social and informal settings (Al-Rowais, 2012). Although both participants engaged in code-switching from Arabic to English multiple times during the conversation, it represented a deliberate choice for them. Code-switching occurred within the general topics of United States culture, technology, and education and when narrating a story that happened in English. For instance, when discussing the fluctuating weather in a particular city in the United States, the Jazani speaker referred to the Midwest of the United States in English. Furthermore, while describing a weather application on her phone, she used English terms such as “colder” and “warmer,” even though she could have used their Arabic equivalents. In this context, her choice of English may be deemed appropriate as she was discussing an application in English.

The Hejazi speaker likewise engaged in code-switching from Arabic to English, particularly when discussing education and school-related topics. One possible explanation is that, having completed her bachelor’s degree in English, she was more accustomed to using academic terms related to her major in English. Additionally, she employed English when referring to her husband’s major as “physiology,” even though she could have expressed it in Arabic.

Another noteworthy instance of code-switching by the Jazani speaker occurred when narrating a story in English. When discussing her son’s diagnosis, she mentioned that “the doctor said that my son has no issue, but his main problem is the language [bilingualism].” The entire sentence was spoken in

Arabic except for two words, “overall” and “language.” This use of English may serve as a narrative technique, enhancing the vividness and authenticity of the story. Additionally, when referring to names in English, such as the alphabet song, she said “ABC” and “rhythm” in English. In this and other examples of code-switching, participants used English for content words to convey information while using Arabic for function words. The Hejazi speaker employed a similar pattern, using the English word “therapist” preceded by the Arabic word for “many.”

Summary of the Findings

The phonological analysis revealed variation in the pronunciation of /ð/, /d/, /dʰ/, and /ðʰ/. In the Hejazi dialect, these variations may be influenced by external factors from neighboring countries, such as Egypt, emphasizing the dynamic nature of language in the region. The morphosyntactic analysis delved into future and present tense markers, particularly with third person plural pronouns. Differences in the use of prefixes ([b-] and [h-]) and the suffix [-n] emerged, providing insights into how these dialects express temporality and plural subjects. These distinctions reflected both regional and social factors.

Regarding lexicon, the study found differences in the use of adverbs and noun phrases (“yet” and “two days ago”), while turn taking, minimal responses, discourse markers, and code-switching highlighted the dynamic nature of conversational interactions. Despite a dominant role held by the Jazani participant, cooperative discourse was evident through minimal responses and discourse markers, fostering a collaborative atmosphere. Together, the data contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the regional and sociolinguistic factors shaping language use in Saudi Arabia.

Conclusion

This study examined linguistic differences between speakers of two Saudi dialects, Jazani and Hejazi, in terms of phonological features, morphosyntactic structures, lexical choices, and interactional conventions. The findings have several practical implications. Understanding the variations between the Jazani and Hejazi dialects could inform language teaching, curriculum development, and communication strategies, enhancing learners' proficiency and cultural competence. Sociolinguists could leverage the findings to enrich their understanding of dialectal variations within Saudi Arabia, contributing to broader studies on language change, contact, and identity. Communication professionals working in cross-cultural contexts could benefit from insights into discourse markers and interactional conventions, fostering more effective communication with speakers of different dialects.

Limitations and Recommendations

The sample, though informative, was not sufficiently large to be representative of the country as a whole or the regions of interest. Future research should thus expand the scope of this study by including a larger and more diverse sample, encompassing speakers from various age groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and geographical regions. This would enhance the generalizability of the findings and provide a more comprehensive understanding of Saudi dialectal variations. To avoid gender bias, future studies should also collect data from men as well as women. In addition, drawing data from more than one conversation might better capture the linguistic diversity of the country. Longitudinal studies could reveal evolving patterns in phonology, morphosyntax, and lexicon in response to social, cultural, and external influences. A comparative analysis with other Arabic dialects and languages in the region could shed light on common linguistic features, shared influences, and distinctive characteristics, contributing to a broader understanding of Arabic language dynamics.

References

- Al-Hawamdeh, A. M. (2016). *A sociolinguistic investigation of two Hōrāni features in Sūf, Jordan* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex]. <https://repository.essex.ac.uk/17607/1/the%20thesis-final%20.pdf>
- Alkhamees, B. (2023). *The “white dialect” of young Arabic speakers from Qassim (Saudi Arabia)*. https://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/639_fulltext.pdf
- Alrasheedi, E. S. (2023). The effect of prefixation on syllable structure in Najdi Arabic. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(10), 2557–2564. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1310.14>
- Al-Rojaie, Y. (2013). Regional dialect leveling in Najdi Arabic: The case of the deaffrication of [k] in the Qaṣīmī dialect. *Language Variation and Change*, 25, 43–63.
- Al-Rowais, H. (2012). *Code switching between Arabic and English, social motivations and structural constraints* [Master’s thesis, Ball State University]. <https://cardinalscholar.bsu.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/68e4a6e2-0bb9-4c5a-9728-39a4220dcc9b/content>
- Bokhari, H. A. (2020). *A comprehensive analysis of coda clusters in Hijazi Arabic: An optimality-theoretic perspective* [Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University]. https://roa.rutgers.edu/content/article/files/1835_bokhari_1.pdf
- Fishman, P. M. (1978). Interaction: The work women do. *Social Problems*, 25(4), 397–406. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800492>
- Harvey, L. (2022). *Researching the real world: A guide to methodology*. <https://qualityresearchinternational.com/methodology/>
- Hirschman, L. (1994). Female–male differences in conversational interaction. *Language in Society*, 23(3), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500018054>
- J., S. (2022). *What are the different types of phonological variation?* <https://www.icphs2019.org/what-are-the-different-types-of-phonological-variation>
- Jayaraj, T., & Kumar, R. (2019). Variation of lexical items and the changing need of identity projection: A study on Mappila Malayalam. *Dialectologia*, 24, 157–176. <https://doi.org/10.1344/dialectologia2019.24.7>
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1983). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 196–216). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620836.013>
- Suparno, D., Abshar, U., Wildan, M., & Pujiati, T. (2020). Sound correspondences of Modern Standard Arabic Moroccan Arabic and Najdi Arabic. *Sunan Kalijaga: International Journal of Islamic Civilization*, 3(2), 27–50.