

Coherence disruptions in human-chatbot  
interaction: towards quantitative approach to  
conversation

Albert Maršík

# Introduction

Recently, there has been a breakthrough in the way we interact with machines [1]. Now that we can instruct a computer using natural language new possibilities opens up [2]. Besides making existing technology an extra step accessible, new ways to use technology appear. Automated interaction alone can solve previously unsolvable problems, such as notably accessing a knowledge base via semantic search [3]. Until recently a knowledge base would usually be accessed only via fulltext, meaning we would only be able to find information of which we knew a part of the formal encoding. Today, we can search for information simply by asking questions, all thanks to natural language computer interface.

The promise of much practical usage of the current wave of generative AI is ambitious and only brings its fruit slowly, perhaps slower, than was expected [4][5]. There is talk of a "plateau" in development of the technology powering the current cutting edge inventions [6]. And that is not the only issue there is to the current wave of cutting edge AI. To name the most prominent ones:

- high electricity consumption [7]
- unpredictable and broad societal impact [8][9]

That being said, in context of conversation research, this development in technology promises to open many new doors. With a partial control of what happens in the conversation and a decent certainty, that our system will simulate human-human conversation to the user, new kind of conversational data is in reach - logs of the human-bot interaction, that could be categorized based on

- which researcher controlled stimulus and

- which participant reaction to given stimulus

they contain.

In the 1960s the relatively recent emergence and adoption of telephone technology allowed for recording and transcribing the most authentic conversational data to date [10]. This advancement took place thanks to development in technology which is reminiscent of the current day situation. While human-bot conversational data is arguably less authentic than telephone conversation transcripts, experimental approach can be taken while the human element is present.

This paper's intention is to provide a debate on a metaresearch question - is using generative AI a viable methodology for conversation research? This is done by attempting to develop that very methodology. Proceeding we operate in a frontier, our first steps should be establishing data backed baseline knowledge and assessing possible lines of research.

To understand what something is, it can be fruitful first understanding what that thing is not. One way to understand what makes the unraveling text of a conversation a valid one - a coherent one - is obtaining conversational data containing coherence disruptions. This can be done using the discussed technology - it has the capability of conversing in a way that is found generally acceptable by humans and can drift away from the coherent interaction if appropriately instructed to do so.

The data this paper seeks to elicitate and analyse are actual human-chatbot exchanges containing moments which have the potential to be problematic for the human participant to process and follow up on. The line between what a coherent and an incoherent conversation is blurred. It is in no way a binary property of the text of the conversation. The goal is therefore to touch on the gradual divide between them.

While chatbots are evaluated for how natural and error free their way of conversing is, human-human conversation is rarely flawless:

- errors happen
- conversational coherence gets temporarily disrupted

In case of human-human communication, disruptions can however be cured easily.

It used to be (and remains so in legacy systems) that in human-bot communication, disruptions could derail a conversation completely, leaving the

bot, who would only rely on surface level textual clues, in the dark. [11] This has become rare with generative AI. Even though it brings a set of its own problems like frequently lacking factuality or the difficulty to handle data responsibly, the cutting edge technology powered conversation systems are

- better capable of understanding and producing relevant answers
- instructed to return to their conversational point of departure

Human-bot communication is often single-purpose. Companies and institutions deploy voice applications to interact with customers and clients, so there is usually a goal to be achieved. The coherence of such conversation can then be described based on whether the goal has been achieved with success and ease. Another common scenario is an open-domain conversation, also known as chit-chat or smalltalk.

Some factors that influence coherence in conversational texts, whether in human-human or human-bot exchanges, have been extensively studied.

Namely:

**Politeness** Brown and Levinson’s work on politeness strategies describes social alignment in smooth interactions [12]. Politeness strategies, such as using polite language, offering options, or softening potentially face-threatening comments, help to create a comfortable communicative environment. These strategies align with social norms, which people interpret as markers of respect, consideration, or even trust. A failure to employ these politeness strategies, or using them inconsistently, can disrupt conversational coherence. For example, blunt or overly direct responses may be perceived as abrupt or rude, diverting the conversation’s flow or causing discomfort. In such cases, the breakdown of polite norms can lead participants to question intent, hindering effective and smooth communication.

**Speech acts** Following Austin and Searle’s speech act theories, communication rely on expressing clear intentions and meanings that help build mutual understanding [13] [14]. When speakers convey intentions explicitly through statements, questions, requests, or assertions, it signals to listeners the purpose and direction of the conversation. Effective communication strategies help maintain coherence by ensuring each contribution builds logically on the last. On the other hand, unclear intentions or ambiguous phrasing can create misunderstandings, disrupting the conversation’s flow. Misalignment or mixed signals – such as using sarcasm without cues or making indirect requests without context— can leave listeners uncertain about

how to respond, leading to off-track or irrelevant contributions and possibly creating need to address the communication to regain understanding.

**Conversational Maxims** Grice’s conversational maxims are fundamental to coherent dialogue [15]. They suggest that participants should:

- provide truthful information (Quality)
- neither too much nor too little (Quantity)
- remain on-topic (Relevance)
- communicate in an orderly, clear manner (Manner)

These maxims encourage effective exchange by setting a standard for contributions that are informative, truthful, relevant, and unambiguous. When violated, such as by giving excessive detail, omitting important context, or straying from the topic, coherence suffers. For instance, irrelevant tangents or over-detailed explanations may confuse the listener as to what is the main focal point of conversation in that moment. This misalignment can leave participants uncertain about the conversation’s direction, ultimately diminishing coherence and the effectiveness of communication.

**Sequence Structure** The work of Schegloff and Sacks on sequence structure and turn-taking emphasizes that ordered interactions support predictability and continuity in dialogue [16]. Turn-taking conventions — where participants follow an implicit sequence of speaking and responding — help maintain the flow by structuring the conversation in a logical order. This sequence structure allows both parties to anticipate when to listen and when to speak, contributing to a well-paced, cohesive exchange. However, interruptions, abrupt changes in topic, or skipping expected responses can disrupt this sequence, introducing unpredictability that can confuse participants. These interruptions fragment coherence by shifting the conversation away from expected responses or structured flow, often leaving gaps in understanding or causing conversational breakdowns.

**Message and Topic** Interactional linguistics underscores that consistency in message and topic preserves continuity in conversation [17]. When speakers stick to a shared topic or make gradual, clear shifts, coherence is maintained because participants know what to expect. Frequent or abrupt topic shifts, however, or sending unclear or conflicting messages, can create disjointed exchanges. For instance, introducing a new topic without closure

on the previous one can confuse listeners, leading to a scattered or fragmented interaction. By shifting focus unpredictably or offering unclear messages, coherence diminishes as participants lose track of the conversation's thread, resulting in exchanges that feel scattered or incomplete.

While all of the mentioned areas unveil much about the way conversation works, rarely do they concern themselves with the textual dimension of conversation. Most of the mentioned authors (with the notable exception of those operating within the interactional linguistics framework) would hardly be described as linguists, though their works significantly inform linguistics.

The lack of a true interpersonal dimension in human-chatbot communication allows to focus solely on the elements in conversational text, that make it cohesive and coherent or rather those that have the potential to prevent it from being that. The key concepts discussed in this paper are two closely related topics:

- coreference realized by anaphore
- topic – what the text is about

# Chapter 1

## Theoretical background

### 1.1 Textual dimension of conversation

The following concepts will be explored individually, in relation to one another and in relation to conversation: text, coherence, cohesion, coreference, anaphora, cataphora, endophora, exophora, topic, entity, and association. While the presented exploration draws on existing literature, it seeks to establish an independent and sustainable framework, rather than strictly adhering to established interpretations.

#### **Text**

Text, in its broadest sense, refers to any form of communication that conveys meaning through a combination of signs, symbols, or language ([Hjelmslev]). These semiotic structures can take various forms, including written, spoken, visual, or even non-verbal modes of expression ([Barthes]). A text can be as simple as a single sentence or as complex as a novel, and it can exist across different mediums, from books and articles to advertisements and digital content. What defines a text is its ability to convey a coherent message or idea, often intended for interpretation by an audience or an addressee. Texts can serve a wide range of purposes, including storytelling, instruction, persuasion, or simply recording information. Typically text is a structure that is linguistic, produced and perceived as intentional and coherent.

The text of a conversation is specific because it is multiproducer. Another example of a multiproducer text would be a sequence of commercial signs on a busy street. It is the spatial juxtaposition of the signs and temporal

juxtaposition of utterances, that make them a text.

Another property of a conversation text is it is negotiated. This is given by its multiproducer and temporal nature. Other types of text which are also negotiated are relatively rare. There are occurrences of debates which take place in written text, whether they are press columns or academic articles, which interact explicitly with each other, making them a negotiation. Such press discourse could however be considered a sequence of text units rather than a single temporarily juxtaposed text. This perspective could hardly be defended in regards to conversation, because its tight temporal coupling and cohesion, making conversation a unique phenomena.

## Coherence

Coherence refers to the logical connections and consistent relationships that make a text easy to follow and possible to understand ([Givón, Hrbáček]). It is achieved when the ideas, sentences, and paragraphs within a text are linked together in a meaningful way, allowing the reader to grasp the author's message without confusion. Coherence often depends on the use of transitions, the logical flow of arguments, and the proper sequencing of information. It ensures that each part of the text contributes to the overall meaning, creating a unified whole ([Hrbáček]). Incoherent text can be difficult or impossible to understand, even if the individual sentences are grammatically correct ([Hrbáček]). It is a property of the whole text, but textual elements can be pointed out that contribute to or diminish the given texts coherence. Those elements are however not referred to as 'coherence elements'.

Coherence is a cognitive phenomenon [18] because it involves the mental processes of interpreting, organizing, and understanding information. When reading a text, coherence arises not only from the structure and linguistic cues provided by the author but also from the reader's ability to make connections between ideas based on prior knowledge, expectations, and context. This cognitive interaction between the text and the reader's mind is what makes the content understandable.

In conversation, coherence becomes even more complex, as multiple participants are simultaneously contributing to and interpreting the flow of information. Each individual brings their own perspective and understanding to the interaction, which requires constant negotiation to maintain coherence. Misunderstandings, different backgrounds, and interruptions can disrupt the coherence of a conversation, making it a more dynamic and fragile process



compared to written text.

- whether a written text is coherent depends mostly on the reader
- whether a conversation text is coherent depends on an ongoing negotiation

Coherence is a scalar property rather than a binary one. It is however tricky to measure. This paper seeks to explore one possible approach of declaring different levels of coherence disruptions and observing the acceptance rates in participants and correlation between them.

## Cohesion

While coherence refers to the interpretative quality of a text, wherein the ideas form a logical and meaningful whole cohesion, focuses on the structural relations within a text, achieved through grammatical and lexical links ([Halliday]. Hrbáček ([Hrbáček] does not see cohesion as a property of the text itself. Instead, according to him, it is an umbrella term covering specific relations within the structure of the text, where cohesive elements can be directly pointed out. While coherent text does not necessarily need to be cohesive, cohesive elements often support it. A coherent text tends to be at least somewhat cohesive.

Halliday and Hasan [19] developed a detailed framework of cohesion, which includes endophoric references, relating parts of the text to each other, and exophoric references, which point outside the text ([Halliday]. Endophoric cohesion covers aspects like anaphoric references and cataphoric references [20]. Exophoric references, however, rely on shared context beyond the text itself, requiring readers to use prior knowledge. Their framework highlights how elements of cohesion contribute to textual unity and flow, even if coherence based on meaning is not fully achieved. Following concepts can be considered cohesive elements.

## Cataphore and Exophore

In Halliday and Hasan's framework ([Halliday], cohesion in language is achieved through various devices that connect different parts of a text, forming a unified whole. They classify cohesive ties as references, substitutive forms, ellipsis, and connectors, with anaphoric references being one of the

primary ways texts achieve cohesion ([Halliday]). When a text element cannot be mapped to a preceding referent, Halliday and Hasan suggest that cohesion is maintained through shared situational understanding, making the reference exophoric. Cataphoric references, though less common, involve elements that look forward in the text, showing intentionality by the author but contributing to cohesion primarily through the eventual resolution of the forward-pointing referent.

In conversation if a seemingly anaphoric text element is not successfully mapped to a preceding textual coreferent the reference can still be understood, because shared context. Such element reaches out of the text with its reference, making it an exophoric one. Cataphore is a related phenomena – a reference which points forward in the text. Such occurrence is relatively rare in written text and even more so in conversation. In fact it is somehow pointless to account for cataphore in a multi-producer text. A cataphore denotes an author's intention to reveal the nature of a referent explicitly after first mentioning them. In conversation, where multiple contributors cocreate given text, and mutual understanding and agreement is the measure of how coherent the produced text is, later realisation of a vague reference does not contribute to how coherent it is. Regardless, in case of a cataphore, only the referent is a cohesive element, not the cataphore, as it ties back to the previous text, creating bonds across large textual units.

### **Anaphore, Endophore and Coreference**

A common cohesive text element is an anaphore [21]. It is a reference inside the text pointing back to a previously mentioned entity. Often it is realised via personal pronouns. Though there are other ways for anaphore to realise. In Czech, anaphoric references often rely on grammatical gender and number, making participial endings essential for identifying the referent. For instance, when a grammatically masculine entity is mentioned, later references might use a participle in the masculine form, such as *šel* ("he went"), connecting back to it without repeating the noun or using a demonstrative. Demonstratives, such as *ten* ("that") or *tento* ("this one"), also frequently serve anaphoric functions, guiding the reader to a previously mentioned subject. Temporal and locative adverbs, such as *tam* ("there") and *tehdy* ("then"), also contribute cohesion by indirectly referencing time and place details introduced earlier in the text. These anaphoric elements strengthen textual coherence by reducing redundancy and maintaining flow. The reader identifies coref-

erential links through these markers, following the cohesive threads without needing explicit repetitions.

An anaphoric element is by definition also endophoric ([Halliday]). It points inside the text it appears in. By definition an anaphoric element has a referent, which occurs earlier in the text. These two elements are then coreferent. As such they also share an identical exophoric reference ([Halliday]) – they point outside of the text.

In conversation, many aspects of which are subject to negotiation, also specific coreference relations can be questioned. The reference realised by one communication participant may be unclear to the other resulting in a repair request coming from another participant. In conversation analysis, Sacks's concept of repair traditionally addresses misunderstandings related to intentions and actions, loosely drawing on frameworks like Austin's and Searle's speech act theories. From this perspective, repairs often target interpretative gaps about what a speaker intends to do with their utterance. However, viewed from a broader, more abstract level, what is called repair triggers can extend beyond intentions alone, encompassing issues on the textual level as well. For instance, an unassignable anaphora — a reference that lacks a clear antecedent — may lead to a repair request, thereby showing how textual ambiguities prompt interactional responses. This approach expands the causes of repair in conversation, integrating elements of reference and interactional misalignment, where a structural aspect of the language itself can become a repairable issue in the communicative exchange.

## Topic

Topic is what a text is about. That makes topic very complicated to define. Among others, some issues with topic and annotating it in text are:

- A text can and typically does cover multiple topics
- Different framing will produce different topic annotations of text
- The span of a topic section can be impossible to delimit within text.
- Topic annotation is by its nature always more text, so even it can be annotated for topic. making topic annotations recursive. One cannot therefore achieve a definite topic description of a text.

Despite all these complications, topic cannot be ignored in conversation research as it is deeply intertwined with the aforementioned concepts. Topic progressions across text are realised via anaphore and association and tightly interact with coherence. An appropriate amount of time has to be spent on a given topic unit, enough information has to be said about a given topic in order for it to be possible to move on or add another one in the conversation. Closure has to be provided in order for a topic to be done. Transitioning from one topic to another has a potential to disrupt coherence, if the association between the topics is too distant. A divergence in topic has to be justified.

### **Association**

Association is a textual realization of an isotopic relation [22]. By their exophoric properties, referents exist in a semantic web of relationships. Similarly to coherence, associative relationships are a cognitive phenomena. They come to exist when they are perceived. While association is a cohesive element it is difficult to formalize the way it can and has been done with anaphoric text relations. It is however a major factor in a coherence of text as in some cases a text can only rely on association in its coherence.

### **Entity**

An entity is an exophoric referent. Words or text elements which can be referred to by an anaphore will be called entities. Since a phrase containing an anaphore typically adds more information about the referent the new information must be semantically compatible, in other words association has to be possible between the referent and the added information. Entity also has to do with topic. In text topic can be represented by a single or multiple entities. Coreferent words will be regarded as a single entity. It can serve to partially map a topic distance in the texts chronology.

## **1.2 Interactional dimension of conversation**

In terms of introduced background, conversation is a text which is produced by multiple producers This complicates things:

- Conversation is an interactive process, distinct from static text, which is created collaboratively.

- Conversational content is continuously negotiated by participants, who continuously adapt one another.

Due to its temporal and cooperative nature, conversation allows for:

- Overlaps in speech,
- Swift corrections of minor errors,
- Multiple layers of perspective, including:
  - Each participant’s personal viewpoint,
  - Each participant’s perception of others’ viewpoints,
  - Each participant’s understanding of the shared conversation as it’s being co-created.

each of these perspectives can desynchronize resulting in misunderstandings. Humans however are excellent at correcting misunderstandings this is because under regular circumstances, people cooperate.

The Cooperation Principle, introduced by philosopher H.P. Grice, suggests that participants in a conversation typically work together to achieve effective communication. Grice proposed that, to ensure this cooperation, speakers follow four conversational maxims. In practice, people may not always follow these maxims but they do so in ways that still rely on shared expectations of cooperation. Even when misunderstandings arise, humans naturally engage in conversational repair, using their social intuition and mutual cooperativity to clarify intention and realign perspectives.

Contemporary conversation research can be understood to draw from conversation analysis. Modern conversation research traces its roots to conversation analysis, a field pioneered by sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff in the 1960s. Despite verbal interaction being viewed as mostly chaotic at the time ([Sacks]), they sought to understand the structure and social rules of everyday interactions, focusing on the patterns and norms that govern turn-taking and response. Thanks to recordings of phonecalls, transcripts could be qualitatively analyzed. This research has led to coining new terminology.

## **Adjacency pair**

Adjacency pairs describe sequences of two related utterances by different speakers ([Sacks]). These pairs are characterized by their predictable and reciprocal nature, where the first part sets up the expectation for a specific type of response. Common examples include greetings ('Hi' → 'Hello'), questions and answers ('What time is it?' → '3 PM'), or offers and acceptances/declines ('Would you like some coffee?' → 'Yes, please' or 'No, thank you').

## **Sequence structure**

Sequence structure refers to the organization of conversational turns into coherent patterns or sequences. It describes how interactions are shaped by predictable structures, such as adjacency pairs. These sequences provide order and meaning to conversations, guiding participants in understanding when and how to respond. Schegloff [23] emphasized that sequence structure is central to the social organization of talk, as it allows participants to manage and negotiate interaction effectively.

## **Topic shading**

Topic shading, as discussed by Sacks, refers to the subtle way in which a conversation naturally shifts from one topic to another while maintaining coherence. Instead of abruptly changing the subject, speakers introduce a related idea or concept, gradually steering the discussion in a new direction. This process allows for smooth transitions in dialogue, helping participants maintain engagement and avoid confusion.

## **Dis/preferred answers**

Preferred answers, according to Sacks ([Sacks]), are responses in conversations that align with social norms and expectations, making interactions smoother and more cooperative. In conversation analysis, preferred answers typically follow the format or intent of the preceding question or statement. They contrast with "dispreferred" answers, which might include refusals or disagreements and often require additional explanation or mitigation to maintain social harmony.

## Conversational repair

Conversational repairs refer to how participants address and resolve problems in understanding, hearing, or speaking during interactions ([Sacks]). These issues, can occur at any point in a conversation. Repairs are classified into self-repair, where the speaker corrects their own error, and other-repair, where a different participant addresses the issue. They can further be classified into self-initiated repair and other-initiated repair.

As a descendant of conversation analysis interaction linguistics has emerged, building on its insights to examine language use in social contexts. It broadens the focus to study not only verbal exchanges but also multimodal cues like gestures, gaze, and intonation, analyzing how these elements contribute to meaning. Interaction linguistics aims to understand the dynamic aspects of conversations, such as how topics shift and how sequences of speech acts unfold, reflecting the fluid nature of human communication.

## 1.3 Disruptions in conversation coherence

While the question of what makes for a coherent text is too broad, the answer to what makes for a coherent conversation can be somewhat easier to answer. Because conversation participants negotiate understanding, it is up to them, when a conversation is and is not coherent to describe what a coherent conversation is, it is worth pursuing the moments, when the conversation stops flowing with ease. Such moments can be called coherence disruptions. A coherence disruption is a complex phenomena as

- it penetrates through some or all of mentioned perspectives on an on-going conversation
- it can't be evaluated in a binary fashion

There are different degrees to which a conversation coherence can be disrupted:

- if a participant suddenly starts speaking in an a way that can hardly be considered interaction due to its irrelevance or
- if the utterance simply is not grammatical or understandable, while the conversation has been compromised and becomes incoherent, it

has more to do with incoherent written text, because the incoherence is encapsulated on the level of a single utterance

Roberts [18] Discusses various types of incoherent text. He exemplifies so called giberish as incoherent text that is absent of structural relations. On the other hand he discusses experimental theater or literature as a type of text which is assumed to be coherent in the sense that there is an intention behind it but contains little to no structural relations. Lastly he mentions a so called "schizophrenic discourse" as a speech that is not assumed to be coherent even if it has structural relations to it. In any case Roberts definitively states that coherence is assumed and is therefore a receptive phenomena. The incoherence Roberts discusses is considerably different from when the source of incoherence stems from the structure of the conversational text or relationship between different utterances - this is when another participant assesses, they are simply speaking leading a different conversation perhaps with a differing intention or that they are conversing under differing set of circumstances which manifests formally in the linguistic fabric of the conversation - its text. All that despite everyone included being cooperative.

### **1.3.1 Sources of incoherence in conversation**

Schegloff shows how incoherence arises when people interpret sequence structure differently, namely in terms of which turn is seen as an answer to which previously occurring turn. In his example, the participants misread each other's intentions, leading to confusion about how their turns fit together. They each project different expectations for how the conversation should unfold, which causes misaligned sequence structure interpretations. When this happens, they turn to brief metacommunication — comments about the conversation itself to try to clarify and re-align their understanding. Schegloff illustrates how these efforts to "repair" the misalignment are central to managing and resolving incoherent moments in conversation.

Coherence disruptions are also discussed in linguistic literature. Hrbáček's approach to coherence and cohesion in text distinguishes the two concepts, noting how they often interact but can also be independent. He highlights that while cohesion involves grammatical or lexical links that make sentences flow together, coherence relies on the logical and meaningful progression of ideas. This means that a text could be cohesive - using connectives, repetitions, and consistent lexical choices - yet lack coherence if the sequence of



ideas doesn't make logical sense or follow a clear progression. Conversely, a text may be coherent in its narrative flow without relying heavily on cohesive devices. In Czech linguistics, the distinction between *téma* (theme) and *réma* (rheme), as used by Daneš, underlines the role of topic progression. Hrbáček illustrates this by discussing examples where a story progresses logically from one point to the next while being incoherent despite being clear about its topic structure due to never coming back to a previously mentioned topic.

Two kinds of phenomena are at hand when it comes to ways in which conversation coherence can be disrupted - topic shifts and unassignable anaphore. While not unique to conversation both take on specific forms in it worth looking at.

**Topic shifts** When conversations shift abruptly from one topic to another, it can create confusion for the conversation partner. They might find themselves trying to reconnect to the previous discussion or wondering how the new subject relates. This can lead to misunderstandings as the transition can feel jarring.

One interesting question is, how do we determine when a topic has run its course? What common traits do conversations share when a subject is truly exhausted? Perhaps observing transcripts could reveal repeating patterns in topic progression or sequence structure.

Moreover, what makes for a smooth transition between topics? Is it related to the cues participants give each other, or perhaps the context of the discussion? How do we navigate the flow of conversation and what indicates a natural shift versus a disruptive one?

**Nonassignable anaphore** Unassignable anaphore is closely tied to topic progression. Currently established topic or topics help assigning anaphore and determining between an anaphore and an exophore. Even if an anaphoric device is not assignable, and the reference is presumably an exophoric one, The reason for employing this reference must be relevant to an established topic. In conversation meaning of demonstratives is to be negotiated. If an anaphores assignability causes confusion, chances are it is caused by one of the following

- there are no relevant assignment candidates
  - this situation can be understood as a vague or unjustified exophore
- there are multiple equally relevant candidates

- candidate has occurred in the conversation text too long ago  
can be understood as an abrupt return to previously established topic

### 1.3.2 What do people do about coherence disruptions?

In conversation, coherence disruptions often prompt participants to employ strategies to maintain understanding and flow. Schegloff suggests that people manage these disruptions through interactive repair or inference. Interactive repair often involves explicitly addressing misunderstandings or clarifying intentions, often by rephrasing or asking questions. Interactive repair refers to immediate, collaborative corrections within dialogue, where one speaker might correct the other or themselves to enhance clarity. Inference and pragmatic reasoning, the most seamless methods, allow participants to fill gaps based on context and social cues, helping conversations continue smoothly without explicit repair.

Dingemanse and Enfield [24] echoes this from a cognitive perspective, highlighting how inference and pragmatic reasoning are particularly effective. Participants rely on shared understanding and contextual knowledge to interpret ambiguous statements. Together, they use both explicit (meta-communication and repair) and implicit (inference and reasoning) methods work to restore coherence.

It needs to be noted however that both interactive repair and reasoning are deployed in a number of other contexts other than conversation coherence disruption. Inference takes place constantly [25]. Each of those moments could be hardly considered a coherence disruption. There is however always potential for it, particularly via unclear or nonassignable anaphore or abrupt unjustified topic shifts. Repair and metacommunication also takes place in a mutually informed and synchronized interaction. It is for example deployed when it is revealed that the interaction participants intentions or opinions differ.

These uses of interaction management are however hardly possible to analyse on a textual level since they do not cooccur with coherence disruptions. What can be observed are – as mentioned above – troublesome anaphoric references and topic progressions.

# Bibliography

- [1] Dipankar Sharma, Deepak A Vidhate, Joel Osei-Asiamah, R Meena Kumari, Vaishali Mahajan, and K Rajagopal. Exploring the evolution of chatgpt: From origin to revolutionary influence. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 2024.
- [2] Gary G Hendrix. Natural-language interface. *American Journal of Computational Linguistics*, 8(2):56–61, 1982.
- [3] Eetu Mäkelä. Survey of semantic search research. In *Proceedings of the seminar on knowledge management on the semantic web*. Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, 2005.
- [4] Bloomberg News. Openai, google, and anthropic are struggling to build more advanced ai. *Bloomberg News*, 2024. Accessed: 2024-12-19.
- [5] Reuters News. Openai rivals seek new path to smarter ai as current methods hit limitations. *Reuters*, 2024. Accessed: 2024-12-19.
- [6] Gordon Ritter and Wendy Lu. The ai plateau is real — how we jump to the next breakthrough. December 2024.
- [7] Hannah Ritchie. What’s the impact of artificial intelligence on energy demand? *Sustainability by Numbers*, November 2024.
- [8] Alexa Hagerty and Igor Rubinov. Global ai ethics: a review of the social impacts and ethical implications of artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.07892*, 2019.
- [9] Maria Teresa Baldassarre, Danilo Caivano, Berenice Fernandez Nieto, Domenico Gigante, and Azzurra Ragone. The social impact of generative ai: An analysis on chatgpt. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Information Technology for Social Good*, pages 363–373, 2023.

- [10] Harvey Sacks. *Lectures on Conversation*, volume 1–2. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1992.
- [11] Michael F. McTear. *Conversational AI: Dialogue Systems, Conversational Agents, and Chatbots*. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [12] P. Brown and S.C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [13] John Langshaw Austin. *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press, 1962.
- [14] John R. Searle. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- [15] H. P. Grice. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, editors, *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, pages 41–58. Academic Press, 1975.
- [16] Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [17] Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting. *Interactional Linguistics: Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [18] Richard M. Roberts and Roger J. Kreuz. Nonstandard discourse and its coherence. *Discourse Processes*, 16(4):451–464, 1993.
- [19] M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. Longman, 1976.
- [20] Eva Hajičová, Jiří Havelka, and Petr Sgall. Discourse semantics and the salience of referents. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 11(1):127–140, 2003.
- [21] Anna Nedoluzhko. *Rozšířená textová koreference a asociční anafora (koncepte anotace českých dat v pražském závislostním korpusu)*. Phd thesis, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav českého jazyka a teorie komunikace, Prague, 2010.
- [22] Tomáš Koblížek. *Untitled Work (Details Provided in Czech)*. Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta, Prague, 1 edition, 2015.

- [23] Emanuel A. Schegloff. On the organization of sequences as a source of 'coherence' in talk-in-interaction. In Bruce Dorval, editor, *Conversational Organization and its Development*, page 51–77. Ablex, Norwood, NJ, 1990.
- [24] Mark Dingemanse and N.J. Enfield. Interactive repair and the foundations of language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 28(1):30–42, 2024.
- [25] Harold Garfinkel. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. pages 209–261. Routledge, 2023.