

استكشاف الفروقات بين البراغماتية النحوية والتفاعلية والنصية في علاقتها بالسلوك الحواري

م.م موج خليل إبراهيم

كلية التربية قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، الجامعة المستنصرية

البريد الإلكتروني Email : mawjkhilil.92@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: البراغماتية، السلوك الحواري، البراغماتية النحوية، البراغماتية التفاعلية،
البراغماتية النصية، تحليل الخطاب، السياق، تفاوض المعنى، استراتيجيات التواصل، الكفاءة
اللغوية.

كيفية اقتباس البحث

ابراهيم ، موج خليل، استكشاف الفروقات بين البراغماتية النحوية والتفاعلية والنصية في علاقتها
بالسلوك الحواري، مجلة مركز بابل للدراسات الانسانية، شباط 2025، المجلد: 15، العدد: 2.

هذا البحث من نوع الوصول المفتوح مرخص بموجب رخصة المشاع الإبداعي لحقوق التأليف
والنشر (Creative Commons Attribution) تتيح فقط للآخرين تحميل البحث
ومشاركته مع الآخرين بشرط نسب العمل الأصلي للمؤلف، ودون القيام بأي تعديل أو
استخدامه لأغراض تجارية.

Registered في
ROAD

مفهرسة في
IASJ





Exploring the Differences Between Grammatical, Interactional, and Textual Pragmatics in Relation to Conversational Behavior

A.L. Muj Khalil Ibrahim

College of Education, Department of English, Al-Mustansiriya University

Keywords : Pragmatics, Conversational Behavior, Grammatical Pragmatics, Interactional Pragmatics, Textual Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, Context, Meaning Negotiation, Communication Strategies, Linguistic Competence.

How To Cite This Article

Ibrahim, Muj Khalil, "Exploring the Differences Between Grammatical, Interactional, and Textual Pragmatics in Relation to Conversational Behavior," Babel Center for Human Studies Journal, February 2025, Volume: 15, Issue: 2.



This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

المخلص

تستكشف هذه الدراسة الفروقات بين البراغماتية النحوية، البراغماتية التفاعلية، والبراغماتية النصية في علاقتها بالسلوك الحوارية. تبحث الدراسة في كيفية تأثير هذه الفروع من البراغماتية على التواصل وصياغته، خصوصاً في الخطاب المكتوب والمنطوق. من خلال تحليل الأطر النظرية والهياكل اللغوية، تحقق الدراسة في كيفية توجيه المبادئ البراغماتية لمستخدمي اللغة في بناء المعنى، وإدارة التفاعلات، وتنظيم النصوص بشكل فعال. وتسلط الدراسة الضوء على دور السياق في تفسير المعاني والتفاوض عليها، حيث يُعتبر السياق عاملاً حاسماً في فهم الرسائل المتبادلة بين الأفراد. يقدم التحليل التفصيلي للبيانات الحوارية، بما في ذلك أمثلة مستمدة من مسرحية بريطانية شهيرة، رؤى حول الآليات البراغماتية التي تحكم فعالية

التواصل. وتساهم النتائج في فهم أعمق للكفاءة البراغماتية وآثارها على التواصل اللغوي والتواصل بين الثقافات المختلفة. من خلال استكشاف كيفية تفاعل هذه الفروع البراغماتية، تساعد الدراسة في تحسين مهارات التواصل، مما يعزز الفهم المتبادل بين الأفراد في مختلف السياقات الاجتماعية ، علاوة على ذلك، تعكس النتائج أهمية الوعي البراغماتي في تعزيز التواصل الفعال، مما يمكن الأفراد من توجيه رسائلهم بشكل دقيق ومناسب وفقاً للسياق.

Abstract

This study explores the distinctions between grammatical, interpersonal, and textual pragmatics in relation to conversational behavior. It examines how these branches of pragmatics influence and shape communication, particularly in spoken and written discourse. By analyzing theoretical frameworks and linguistic structures, the research investigates how pragmatic principles guide language users in constructing meaning, managing interactions, and structuring discourse. The study also highlights the role of context in interpretation and meaning negotiation. A detailed analysis of conversational data, including examples from a British play, provides insights into the pragmatic mechanisms that govern effective communication. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of pragmatic competence and its implications for linguistic and cross-cultural communication.

1. Introduction

This article surveys the distinctions among the branches of pragmatics, namely grammatical pragmatics, interpersonal pragmatics, and textual pragmatics, and explores the often conflicting means each branch of pragmatics uses to find motivations and controls for conversational behavior. Pragmatics can be sliced several ways so it is important to define what constitutes the pieces for the purposes of this investigation. Two of four current possible ways of slicing the pragmatics pie are examined: (1) the interface between pragmatics and other areas of language, especially grammar; and (2) the organization of pragmatic phenomena around the structure of written discourse. Pragmatics articulated as a theoretical paradigm by linguists working in these categories is interrogated for the theoretical possibilities that it opens up for describing and discussing the human propensity to express 'whats' to one another.



There are several ways of slicing the pragmatics pie, a state of affairs that (A. Dooley, 1988) terms ‘the multi-paradigmaticity of the pragmatics enterprise’. ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012) discriminates five different definitions of pragmatics in his introductory textbook. In the field of language study, four basic ones emerge. The distinctions between these possible branches of pragmatics are observed: grammatical pragmatics, representing the ‘reflexive’ reasons languages come to contain specific indexes operating together to generate finer or different conversational effects from their component indexes; interpersonal pragmatics, representing ‘investigations’ that converse-participants undertake to determine the most felicitous conversational behavior for themselves and their interlocutors in a given stretch of conversational text; and textual pragmatics, representing the ‘animadversion’ of the channel, message, and modes of behaviors other than words and that finds motivations for conversational behavior in the creation of literary texts like poems.

1.1. Background and Rationale

Quite paradoxically, conversation has been “a stepchild in traditional linguistics”, although the very object of the latter is basically concerned with language usage, conventionalized language usage, where speakers may be less confident than “one might assume, given the amount of time they have had to learn a language” (A. Dooley, 1988). Some pragmatic phenomena may involve a particular skill which cannot be acquired spontaneously. The treatment of the conversational organization has often been thought “an overly complex interaction of factors”, too onerous to be learned by children, whose performance, nonetheless, is often “remarkable”. Hampered by the difficulty of delineating its province, the traditional linguistic treatment of conversation concerned mainly research on regional variation and controversies about “standard” language, still prominent issues in synchronic descriptive linguistics. Worth mentioning studies about different “species” of conversation, from the anthropology and the sociology of language, mainly took a large-scale, cross-cultural or stigmatized approach, and sometimes precluded “effective cooperation” with field linguists ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012).

Deeply embedded in well-established cultural norms, conversation may present a stunning amount of variation in conversational behavior,

and even a minimal deviation may result in “social disruption”, for a single “primitive” utterance might involve “the accidental performance of any of a dozen different rules in a dozen different ways”. Arena for competitive interaction, knowledge display, consensus and ego involvement, conversation is a behavior entirely different from public, prosodic speech, performable at will and devoid of “established regulatory mechanisms”. Tradition has largely neglected the study of conversation, “deceptively simplistic”, and beyond the linguistic labor “required for its adequate representation” still hides its status as an “instance of a highly complex competence”(Dinan et al.2021)

1.2. Research Objectives

The goal of this study is to explore the distinctions between grammatical, interpersonal, and textual pragmatics in relation to conversational behavior. Conversation which is in a casual style has its personal characteristics tending to make the addresser’s real intentions conveyed. As a special type of conversation exhibiting its unique structural and semantic features, a television play is composed of dialogues spoken by the actors. The present study selects two parts of a British play, focusing on a conversation between Henry and Eliza, examining pragmatic meaning conducted in conversation.

Normally, when a conversation happens, the involvement of context in the interpretation of the language is mostly indispensable. Actually, distinct interpretations on a certain conversation can be made by different people, largely referring to the background or the context with which the conversation is produced. Such a frequently occurred phenomenon further enhances the interests of pragmatic research. In order to define the meaning of a conversation and to specify the areas where the assigning of meaning is allied, a substantial description on context has been unfolded as an introduction of the interpreting process. Like other pragmatic studies, this paper also takes tangible notice of the context in conversation; however, the significance of the specific conversation spurs the consideration. In conversation, there is five-fold of context persuading the interpretation of language: linguistic context, background knowledge about the world of the conversation, situational context, sequential context, societal or socio-cultural context. Facts suggested in this paper will be guided by the above frame of context (Hameed Al-Hindawi & D. Saffah, 2017).





1.3. Scope and Structure of the Work

This work is centrally concerned with some basic conversational behavior. It is relevant too to differentiate. There is a good deal of confusion over the borders and scope of grammatical, interpersonal and textual pragmatics, all too often pragmatic phenomena are dealt with cursory reference to them below thus anyone interested in pragmatics must first clarify these distinctions. At its core there is a simple and easily stated idea, that of the 'paradox of saying' and the observation that in the organization of conversation some degree of meta-communication is called for. Following the work of Grice, dissatisfied with his general level account of saying, is given an alternate view with greater precision given to linguistic forms and that formal means other than Grice's maxims are called upon. This is then exemplified in the examination of two naturally occurring extended dialogues, which discussion will involve reference to those linguistic devices most germane to a 'grammariness' of talk (A. Dooley, 1988). It is taken it, too, that this focus on language does not exclude interest in the broader socio-psychological constraints on its use in conversation.

This discussion hopes some clarification of the issues will emerge. That, it is also hoped, will open the way to a more fruitful research. To this end, it is the argument, initially, that the distinction of grammatical, interpersonal, and textual pragmatics is a principled and analytically valid one and therefore that, by contrast, they would disagree with a characterization such as the following.

2. Foundations of Pragmatics

This article is exposed to scrutinize one of the salient ideas in pragmatics: the organization of conversation ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012). This is the primary concern of a subfield of this branch of cognitive science referred to as conversation analysis. On a more practical level, this presentation is expected to be beneficial to students over the course of the term as a means of helping the students understand the specific procedures entailed in an analysis of co-present conversational social practices. With a nod toward the end of clarity, this endeavor will be initiated through a presentation of conversation examples, manifest consciousness examination, and discussion on some essential rules in turn-taking organization in conversational English talk. Then, some examples are exposed to observe how speakers manage topics, repairs, and feedbacks in actual conversations.

Conversation as the most basic pragmatic phenomena is a salient part of our social life. A conversation frequently reveals the subtle, background, unspoken rules governing a social talk discourse, the pragmatics, that is, in the grammar in which is most use by the people. Yet, if text grammars, the organization of speech shape is actually reducible to written language; the same cannot be stated for conversational pragmatics. So far, the descriptive studies have been presented to offer a few facts about English language conversation and to evaluate some of the concepts implied by these facts (A. Dooley, 1988).

2.1. Defining Pragmatics

Globalization has had a great influence on cross-cultural interaction, as most importantly it has resulted in meeting a variety of cultures which involve different languages and norms; and therefore different use of language. Such a fact asks for the learning of different rules and norms of language use. To claim oneself to be fluent in a language also means to bear the knowledge of how to use and interact with language properly in social context. Pragmatics in this regard, as the science of language use and language in use in society (Boussebaa, 2021)

Pragmatics has been concerned with attempts to explain how a hearer or reader goes beyond the semantic content of an utterance or sentence in order to understand what a speaker or writer means; and 'meaning' here is taken as what is 'communicated'. Broadly speaking, previous work on pragmatics has been devoted to so-called 'cognitive' or 'decode' pragmatics aspect, aiming to describe how listeners or readers are able to understand the intended meanings of a sentence or utterance. Since Grice's work, this has largely been cast in terms of inferencing on the basis of the identification of non-truth conditional meaning contribution of sentences and realization of a variety of communicative principles or maxims which constrain conversation in order to work out what a speaker is implicating ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012). One of the principal criticisms of the Gricean approach is that it has perhaps not said enough about how it is that humans are able to arrive at all the extra-truth conditional implications they supposedly do. This has been the impetus behind a burgeoning subdiscipline within pragmatics, so-called 'processing pragmatic', which is concerned with explaining how individuals understand (and indeed produce) indirect utterances in real-time. Concerned with cognitive mechanisms underlying inference, it has investigated issues such as how it is that a putative implicature is derived,



how levels of implicature are computed, and the role that context plays in this computation.

2.2. Key Concepts and Terminology

This much-quoted remark clearly denies any important discursive connection between language and the world. On the basis of this distinction, philosophy and formal linguistics for many years have separated pragmatic issues from grammatical topics. Language, then, no longer is seen as describing an autonomous reality without direct assertion, but as relating signs to cognitive concepts, not divisible entities, by means of thought-states in which knowledge of the world is stored into mental objects conventionally divided into encyclopedic and episodic elements (A. Dooley, 1988). Frequently, however, such viewing leads to denying or misunderstanding a wide range of conversational behaviors closely related to semantics and syntax, though producing specific and distinctive effects in dialogues and written texts, and not restricted to insubstantial topics. Whenever she chooses to inspect, X, the wife asks Y not only to describe briefly Z, but to draw it in rough as well. Even in the most impartial and spontaneous discourses it is usual to find several elements. An element is a clause, that is to say a single shortest possible sequence of cue, and/or answer or related verbal items, easy to point to as the minimal response to an equivalent cue. To reveal its function in the prosodic configuration of a sequence comparison is free to any other kind of exchange one coaching session of significant interaction.

3. Grammatical Pragmatics

Pragmatics is often referred to as the crossroads of grammar and contextual factors. There are distinctions between grammatical, interpersonal, and textual aspects of pragmatics that parallel the distinctions within pragmatics of the sentence level (or traditional) variety, and this is the topic of this document. The traditional issues in semantics are divided into those of grammar, where context-free truth-conditional considerations suffice for semantic assessment, and those of pragmatics, where context-sensitive considerations become relevant. Grammatical pragmatics, sometimes called syntax-pragmatics, occurs when grammatical (or syntactic) structures require or constrain certain patterns of conversation behavior (A. Dooley, 1988). Textual pragmatics concerns the decontextualized features of the text, like topic shift, coherence, and cohesion ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012). Interpersonal

pragmatics, on the other hand, concerns the often unstated social conventions regarding behavior in everyday conversation, viewed as the balancing of rights and obligations between the participants in an interaction based largely on the context of the interaction.

Tasks stemming from (grammatical) pragmatic goals are less direct, resulting for the most part in the generation of discourse strategies to effect strategical conversation behavior. Pragmatics has implications for many fields within linguistics and related disciplines. Therefore, numerous people from various subfields approach it from many perspectives. Some critics argue that the division of pragmatics from semantics is too artificial and that consideration of discourse context and situation is always paramount to a complete understanding of meaning. In grammar pragmatic perspective, the distinct division of competencies is somewhat blurrier. Much conversation behavior appears to arise from the interaction of pragmatic knowledge with other grammatical and lexical knowledge instead of standing entirely apart from it (Taguchi, 2022).

3.1. Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence begins with the perception of the intended meaning of an utterance. Depending on the social context, the perceived meaning can vary during an interaction, purposefully or spontaneously changed by interlocutors. Such social behavior is based on the unspoken dimensions of meaning that co-exist with the literal meaning of language. These unspoken dimensions, coexisting with the semiotic prime of language, are generally referred to as pragmatics. In broad construals, pragmatic considerations can be regarded as social elements that pertain to language, contextual assumptions that are shared by the participants or critical for the production and understanding of utterances, and the temporal and physical environment in which a stretch of discourse is delivered and processed (Huang, 2022).

4. Interpersonal Pragmatics

Conversational constructs are far more than the words exchanged within talk. There is engaging in and maintaining the talk, creating the topic that is ripe for talk, adhering to prescribed ways to take within talk, dwelling within the euphorics of talk and often beyond. Thus the words exchanged are but an intricate link within processes that are said and done in the talk. The many ways and reasons that people hang in talk, or don't



do so, are then tips of the thousands of pragmatic facts of notes in conversation ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012).

Of many ways to approach to the study of the pragmatics of talk is focusing on the variations in talk, or the deviations within turn-taking rules; what Schegloff and Sacks refer when discussing conversation analysis as amalgamating in squandered efforts, failed invocations, and disaster-ridden initiations. Such perspective has critically explored the mischief managing of which speakers have to frequently attend to so as small talk proceeds. Minor speakers undertake a variety of ploys for having the forthcoming utterance happen to be an up-take, for maintaining a more suitable up-take, or for announcing why an up-take is currently inappropriate. Major speakers in turn must attend to not only the misfires, and missteps, be they the uttered and already adored, but to the varieties of established pathways for a counter strategy that are so difficult to unseat (Spencer-Oatey, 2002).

This proposes to instead apprehend the constant vexation of conversationalists as an application of, or into, displays of emotions within talk.

4.1. Speech Acts and Politeness

Pragmatics is typically defined as the study of linguistic signs and symbols, and expressions of human language, and the relation between them. This means investigating the interaction between the speaker and the hearer, the speaker and the listener, and among other linguistic levels, investigating how meaning is achieved in natural discourse. Meaning is inevitably related to context as people not only rely on the language and capital of the speaker and the message, but also make use of co-text (Tilahun Desta, 2012).

During the 1970s, researchers exploring the distinctions between grammatical, interpersonal, and textual pragmatics began to look beyond (V. Redmond, 2015). Much early work in relational communication was based on the assumed distinctions between semantic and grammatical rules in human language.

Later, several theorists proposed a broader set of rules that other scholars then began to map on to communication events. As a result, researchers began to investigate how these rules or norms interacted within specific communication episodes. This exploration of the relationship between

rules and events led to an increased examination of the relationship between grammar and interaction, grammar and politeness, and language structure and conversation. While early pragmatic work in communication initially focused on speaking styles and forms that were appropriate, it eventually developed to encompass a host of other topics (MacIntyre and Gregersen2022)

Researchers questioned the definitions and production of face-threatening acts and how to mitigate them. They investigated indirect speech acts, politeness strategies, and repairing conversation breakdowns. Subsequent work blurred Widdowson's distinct definitions of grammatical, interpersonal, and textual pragmatics, complicating the mapping of norms onto behavior. Scholars suggested alternative analyses of pragmatics and politeness using fictive interaction, face theory, or interactional sociolinguistics (Sifianou and Tzanne2021)

5. Information Structure

The signals of the information status attributed to each noun phrase in the clause – the topic, focus, or ground that the clause contributes (in the case of topic) or the way in which the event described in the clause is viewed (in the case of focus/parallel and ground/mid-focus) – are in the domain of information structure within sentence syntax. This plays a role in negotiations, where talk is aimed at lobbying for ideas or clarifying agreements.

Topicality can be signaled by the use of preposed or fronted noun phrases and adverbials. The string features of noun phrase preposing, together with the verb prepare, signal the news value of a phrasal constituent. The sentence-initial, preverbal adverbial however, instead specifies the way in which the event described in the clause is viewed. The verbal element features the same item, the head of a double-depreciated single-prepositional question that cannot have a non-interrogative answer.

Low focus is signaled by presence at the right edge of the verb clause of embedded epistemic degree adjectives marking the mental attitude of the speaker concerning the purpose of the embedded informal speech acts, complemented by matched verb phrase axial dependents. The attribution before the verb in making up the text, as well as the



subjunctive structures between the related clauses, marks the enclosed intensional dimension of the proposed action so that it is imputed to an adequately locatable participant and not to the algorithms themselves.

6. Methodological Approaches

Conversational or discourse analytic methods are derived from three approaches. The a priori intention of the speaking action approach is to elicit and analyze a particular kind of conversation, which involves applying a discourse-based activity towards a well-defined task. Conversational or dialogue-as-discourse approaches assume no such a priori structure, and their techniques generally provide a data corpus of a conversational nature. But more often than not, the particular discourse context is produced through the application of a task, for example, by introducing a topic to talk about or designing a question-answering system. Data produced by eliciting task-oriented conversations often provide a rich and revealing picture of conversational behavior in a variety of structured conversational functions and lend themselves to the development of natural language interfaces for particular systems or activities.

The data-gathering methods from psychological or psycholinguistic approaches to language use, although largely focused on written language, also provide a valuable resource. They are largely a medley of shadowing techniques and either experimental conversations or reported conversation studies. The advantage of these techniques is that they provide convincing evidence about the nature of fluent spoken conversation via the method of observing more naturalistic behavior. But although they provide an interesting reenactment of some features of conversational interaction, they are not models of the interaction itself, precisely because observing more naturalistic behavior excludes the interactive nature of naturally occurring interaction. These data, particularly data on turn-taking behavior, are an important resource, but as yet they are not sufficiently clean to provide a robust empirical test for most accounts of turn-taking phenomena.

6.1. Quantitative vs. Qualitative Methods

The kind of behavioral data obtained from the research suggested in this chapter has traditionally been laborious; indeed, the complexity and subtlety of pragmatic behaviors challenge our most sophisticated

techniques. As a result, pragmatic theorizing has often proceeded without investigating those phenomena that constrain pragmatic options. Because quantitative methods are traditionally laborious, creating pragmatic corpus resources and evaluating pragmatically sophisticated techniques have precluded attempts to model aspects of behavior that, in contrast to many kinds of outdated methods, are rich enough to challenge the more sophisticated problems.

In our view, many of the most interesting and challenging problems of pragmatic theorizing entail a reversal of the traditional pragmatic research enterprise. Most work has been concerned with the mapping of high textual level input to high-level behaviors, such as abstract dialog acts or intentional slips. Our ultimate aim is more ambitious: understanding conversational behavior. This demands that the analyst work bottom-up from observed instances of word- or phrase-level prosodic and pragmatic phenomena to theorize about more abstract functional, pragmatic, discourse, and conversational behaviors. In such a research agenda, quantitative methods would be of great value. Our research on discourse iconicity of uncertain messages serves to illustrate these general principles.

6.2. Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics

Although corpus linguistics and pragmatics share a number of common goals, and despite the undoubted illuminative power of the quantitative methods espoused by the former, the two sometimes seem to be on different, if not collision, courses. This paper attempts to assess some of the recent developments in corpus linguistics with the aim of establishing how such developments can contribute to our understanding of the pragmatics to postpone but not to ignore Harder's distinction between linguistic and conversation analysis practices employed by researchers interested in uncovering the meanings realized in the dialogical talk of conversational interaction. Although the meaning-related practices of these researchers are to some extent converging, we claim that some distinctions along the grammatical-interpersonal-textual pragmatics axis are still valid and may indeed be crucial in explaining what we are observing. Recent developments in corpus linguistics consist of how concordances are generated in corpus searches, how diverse sets of data are compared and contrasted, how variable or changeable the linguistic phenomena under investigation are, and how information about



linguistic features is automatically annotated. Such developments, we argue, allow the linguist to engage in analyses not just of the conversation's small stories but of large numbers of such stories, with positive, negative, and null data, as well as nuggets, both to drive principled generalizations and to raise profound and informative questions about talk, conversation, and interaction. Relevant questions that may bring pragmatic relevance into corpus linguistics include the following: For a particular linguistic item, what does X in direction Y allow us to infer about what is going on in the corpus and how the behavior observed fits within or deviates from the general interactive activity represented in the corpus? What contextual factors of the interaction, be they personal, social, or institutional, are associated with item Z as used in the direction observed? Can highly frequent item U in general and U in a particular direction be considered to be the result of a selection or deployment mechanism operating in a dialogical mode? What is the perceptible probability of a possible counter-direction of items X, Y, Z, and U in large corpora?

7. Applications in Conversational Analysis

This chapter has presented relatively long-range, broad-brush approaches to a discussion of the distinctions between grammatical, interpersonal, and textual pragmatics in conversational behavior. The aim in those treatments was to draw out the varying nature of these pragmatic elements, and how they interact with each other and the nonpragmatic aspects of linguistic structure in conversations. To suggest the breadth of these phenomena and their role in explicating languages in use, talk can be related to any spoken semantics, and general semantic structures can be postulated which are motivated with respect to the function of turns in a conversation. It can draw upon a wide, evolving range of analyses, since far more work has been done in the area of conversational behavior by scholars like ((Muhamad) Ahsanu, 2012) since they first took this up a decade ago.

While it's useful to operate with distinctions between grammatical, interpersonal, and textual lexicons, much lexical usage cannot be categorized solely in one way. Distinguished as a separate lexicon, it combines phrases and clauses to create conversational semantics, generated by deep sentence processes. This is strongly motivated by discourse function, performing communicative roles as expressed in

Grice's maxims in conversation analysis. These texts impose constraints on linguistic sequences, requiring an economy of mental representation, as hearers must track comprehension. Constructions like seem are generally dispreferred and often lead to marked repair attempts. A perspective on conversational analysis provides insights into anticipatory strategies, the importance of syntactic parallelism, and the organization of contingent information in contexts of inferential asymmetry.

7.1. Speech Act Theory in Practice

Apart from its talk-situated view, speech act theory was also a landmark in the transition from static to dynamic views. One of the first more cognitive models of speech acts was developed by Searle in his classification of five illocutionary points that languages can serve (assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations) (Levinson, 2017). However, the boundaries between pragmatics and sociolinguistics are sometimes vague. In this sense, the contribution of Grice was more a cooperation model and a set of maxims, later extended to the area of pragmatics, known as the 'principle of conversation'. Interaction in spoken language is mainly carried out by sentences with an illocutionary force. The study on spoken language has been broadening in recent years from syntax and lexis to the pragmatic level. The focus has shifted as well to conversational behavior (CB), which was relegated to a secondary-level study just for philosophers for such a long time. Some of the main studies in the realm were made by those, including Grice, who aimed to develop maxims or principles necessary for the use of language, and rules, problems, and principles necessary for the inherently cooperative nature of speakers both at the decoding and producing levels (Robinson and Kolloff2021).

7.2. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics

Pragmatics has long been classified into distinct subtypes following Leech and Thomas. Archer's original distinction between field, mode, and manner of discourse was elaborated in (McConachy, 2019). She reviews the distinction made by 11 discourse analysts who break the notion of conversational inference into an average 3,1,1 move categories (one for might and mightonomously made inferences into 3rd party preanalyzed moves). Two of these evince surprisingly narrow views of both language use and pragmatics, employing the latter term purely in Gricean sense. Driven by their own dissatisfaction with orthodoxy in the



latter of Jucker et al. have formulated new three-fold taxonomy of stylistics, not dissimilar in spirit to Archer, comparing and contrasting it with both earlier and prevailing current quads of discourse/pragmatics breakdown. Two responses to these earlier schemes in feudal 'cultural' and post-rationalist 'orientational' traditions are also explored in short, before some final comments on how pragmatics-in-interaction might be further developed in the future are offered. In a narrow sense, the sets of strategic style used by individual participants in conjunction with the communicative goals pursued when interacting are discussed.

8. Conclusion

This chapter has sought to distinguish between levels of pragmatics that may be fruitfully exemplified by and across conversational behavior, those levels again being construed as grammatical, interpersonal, and textual. By way of a somewhat marginalized sub-discipline of linguistic study, conversational analysis was employed to provide the empirical background to these distinctions. Both lexical meaning and intonational expression of one and the same word have made seminal contributions to the distinctiveness of such levels from one another, illustrating how a particular level of pragmatics is instanced by multiple levels of grammar. When subsequent subdivisions of meaning-making processes are explored, this principle carries over well between the various species and strata of meaning herein considered. Lastly, implications for grammar in the wider sense, i.e., to that study of utterance, and for pragmatic theories are examined, together with those finer levels of analysis that similarly contribute to meaning interpretation.

It is now time to attempt some resolution to the question of the extent of overlap that actually exists between levels of pragmatic meaning-making, a question central to our understanding of exactly when the occurrence of different pragmatic phenomena should belong to one or another level. This chapter has commended us to recognize three broad levels within the wholly wider field of pragmatics, that of language use. These being the grammatical, the interpersonal, and the textual. At no point should this view seek to establish an exclusive taxonomy: categories belong to the realm of theoretical classification devices, and nature is free to show any exceptions to suggested patterns. Rather, the overall aim has been to differentiate boundaries between meanings at all levels of pragmatics. Would that these boundaries might at least be made

coextensive in some way! A priori, it could be argued that lexical meanings bear no similarity to intonational ones, yet as we have seen, their distinction may not necessarily be of great value or be clearly owed to entirely separate semantic processing for either having been made.

8.1. Summary of Findings

Three distinct types of pragmatic distinctions are supported by the current data. A literal relater shows significant context-relatedness with both content questions and content-acknowledging utterances: one gives an account, the other brings the account in. Both of these functional signals are interpersonal and non-grammatical. A content connector, on the other hand, exhibits significant context-relatedness only with content questions: one brings in information to an account, the other gets the account. The behavioral and interactional concerns in conversational support for literal relating emphasize the need for conversational and pragmatic data from natural spoken interaction. That data from real concrete talk examined with genuinely inductive methodologies is lacking in research on pragmatic development, which argues for more typical language usage in the examination of pragmatic development. If the model established here inductively from data is accurate in describing adult pragmatic behavior, it also describes the inputs that contribute to further pragmatic development.

References:

- (Muhamad) Ahsanu, M. (2012). A Snapshot on Conversational Analysis. [\[PDF\]](#)
- A. Dooley, R. (1988). Pragmatics and grammar: Motivation and control. [\[PDF\]](#)
- Boussebaa, M. (2021). From cultural differences to cultural globalization: Towards a new research agenda in cross-cultural management studies. critical perspectives on international business. gla.ac.uk
- Dinan, E., Abercrombie, G., Bergman, A. S., Spruit, S., Hovy, D., Boureau, Y. L., & Rieser, V. (2021). Anticipating safety issues in e2e conversational ai: Framework and tooling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03451. [\[PDF\]](#)
- Hameed Al-Hindawi, F. & D. Saffah, M. (2017). Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis. [\[PDF\]](#)
- Huang, N. (2022). Revisiting L2 pragmatic competence through implicit vs. explicit instructional framework. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Levinson, S. (2017). Speech acts. [\[PDF\]](#)



Exploring the Differences Between Grammatical, Interactional, and Textual Pragmatics in Relation to Conversational Behavior



- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gregersen, T. (2022). The idiodynamic method: Willingness to communicate and anxiety processes interacting in real time. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 60(1), 67-84. [\[HTML\]](#)
- McConachy, T. (2019). L2 pragmatics as 'intercultural pragmatics' : probing sociopragmatic aspects of pragmatic awareness. [\[PDF\]](#)
- Robinson, A., & Kolloff, P. (2021). Preparing teachers to work with high-ability youth at the secondary level: Issues and implications for licensure. *The handbook of secondary gifted education*, 569-603. [\[HTML\]](#)
- Sifianou, M., & Tzanne, A. (2021). Face, facework and face-threatening acts. *The Cambridge handbook of sociopragmatics*, 249-271. [\[HTML\]](#)
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. [\[PDF\]](#)
- Taguchi, N. (2022). Immersive virtual reality for pragmatics task development. *Tesol Quarterly*. [\[HTML\]](#)
- Tilahun Desta, M. (2012). Pragmatics as Applied to Characters' Relationships: Focus on Wole Soyinka's Play "The Lion and the Jewel". [\[PDF\]](#)
- V. Redmond, M. (2015). Face and Politeness Theories. [\[PDF\]](#)