

LIST OF PROSPECTIVE PANELS for the 20th International Pragmatics Conference

8 July 2026

This document is only meant to provide basic information about accepted panels for authors who are about to submit a contribution to one of them. (For reasons of privacy, we cannot provide lists of addresses of panel organizers, but if you need to communicate with one of them and you do not have contact data, we can provide them on an individual basis.) Note that in the abstract submission process for **panel contributions** one and only one ‘Topic’ must be chosen from a list consisting of the titles of accepted panels, presented in the same alphabetical order as in this document.

In the course of further preparations for the conference, authors of panel proposals may change the formulation of their panels for purposes of attracting contributions and when making their final submission later on (after the initial submission deadline and after evaluation of the submissions). Such changes will **not** be reflected in the following text.

Note that this is an **unedited** export from the conference database, containing codes that are of no relevance for your interpretation of the text though they seriously affect the layout.

Accommodation as a situated practice in technologized interactions (organized by *Tiina Eilittä, Tuire Oittinen, Lucien Tisserand, Minttu Vääntinen*)

Studies have shown how people adjust their speech and embodied actions depending on the context and co-participants. The ways in which interlocutors change their linguistic, prosodic and nonverbal behaviors to meet the needs of others, or to foster harmonious relations, have been described as interactional adjustment (Gasiorek et al., 2021), convergence (Ticca & Traverso, 2017), and have been theorized as accommodation (Giles, Coupland & Coupland, 1991). The concept of recipient design (Goodwin, 1981) has also been developed to describe how people tailor their actions to co-participants, and it has been linked to accommodation (e.g., Fox, 2008). Various linguistic approaches (e.g., interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, applied linguistics) have been taken to study how people accommodate their talk, e.g., to make it more accessible and acceptable for participants from diverse sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds (e.g., Seidlhofer, 2011). Earlier research on accommodation in interaction (i.e., in talk and embodied conduct) has been conducted across mundane and institutional settings (e.g., O’Neal, 2019; Ticca & Traverso, 2017), including education (e.g., Hjulstad, 2016) and business (Due et al., 2019). Situated accommodation practices have been located at different levels of granularity from pitch (Emina & Jan, 2018) to embodied actions (Parvaresh & Capone, 2017), and they have also been connected to sociolinguistic variation (Kendall, 2013).

This panel brings together scholars from different approaches and deepens the understanding of accommodation as a situated practice in technologized interactions: how it is accomplished via participants’ locally produced actions. By ‘technologized interactions’ we refer to interactions that are supported by or mediated via different technologies (e.g., video-mediated

and hybrid interactions; interactions in extended reality), and interactions involving artificial agents, such as robots or AI-based systems.

Studies on technologized interactions have emphasized interlocutors' orientation to recipient design and the ways in which social actions are adjusted to become suitable within the frames of video-mediated (e.g., Licoppe & Morel, 2012) and hybrid interactions (Tuncer et al., 2026), virtual reality (Haddington et al., 2024), and situations that involve artificial conversation interfaces (Avgustis et al., 2021) and robots (Pelikan et al., 2024). This panel examines these interactional adjustments through the lens of accommodation, showing how people make their actions more accessible and understandable to interlocutors in the moment and as can be observed by the analyst (i.e., when interactions occur).

We welcome contributions based on empirical research on participants' ways to accommodate their actions and/or interactional practices across contexts and technologized settings, for instance, in:

- video-mediated interaction (e.g., remote meetings and classes)
- hybrid settings (e.g., meetings with co-present and remote participants)
- extended reality (e.g., immersive collaboration and training, multiplayer gaming)
- interactions involving robots or artificial intelligence (e.g., chatbots)

We invite paper submissions from diverse fields and ones that represent inter- and multidisciplinary work.

Aged care as a social, cultural and interactional event (organized by *Meredith Marra, Jo Angouri*)

The impact of our ageing population floods media reports and economic forecasts. Against this backdrop, decisions around aged care (whether medical or social, temporary or permanent) become increasingly salient, with far reaching consequences for individuals and society. We argue that these decisions should be recognised as social, cultural and, most importantly, interactional accomplishments; proposed outcomes regarding treatment, escalation, care location, and future planning are negotiated through meetings, consultations, documentation, and informal conversations. An interactional perspective affords understanding of how 'patient-centredness' is enacted or undermined in practice, and how interactional breakdowns generate poor experiences and inefficient use of resources.

In this panel we explore decision making surrounding aged care, inviting panel members who bring perspectives from a range of national and societal contexts to the discussion. We encourage diverse data sources, from policy documents to in-depth interviews, from naturally-occurring talk to narratives of lived experience. We are interested in the viewpoints of the different and multiple formal and informal stakeholders involved in care/caring, embracing epistemological and analytical traditions with a focus on sociopragmatic features. The panel will comprise a short introduction, 3-4 shorter presentations, and discussion time.

In sum, we take on the societal urgency of ageing by exploring decisions made by, with and for older people and their families. We prioritise a holistic understanding of aged care decision making by combining personal and institutional perspectives embedded in the social, cultural and economic context. Our overarching goal is to understand the process to contribute to decision making models based specifically in interaction in order to reduce the

occurrence of deferred, escalated and poorly administered decisions that lead to distress for the older person and families, strain on professionals, and avoidable costs for health and social care systems.

AI Pragmatics: Co-evolution of Human and AI Language (organized by *Xi Chen, Vittorio Tantucci*)

Large Language Models (LLMs) are rapidly evolving, but also changing how language is produced in everyday life. From emails and academic writing to LLMs joining social media and health communication, AI is increasingly shaping the way humans communicate. AI systems are trained not only on human but also on AI interaction, meaning that human and AI communication are now beginning to influence one another in unprecedented ways. Surprisingly, this co-evolution of human and AI speech has received relatively little attention in pragmatics research.

This panel brings together researchers interested in the emerging field of AI Pragmatics, with a focus on the two-way relationship between human and AI communication. We welcome contributions that explore AI evolving pragmatic competence, but also how AI, in turn, affects human communicative behaviours, expectations, and creativity. Relevant topics include, but are not limited to:

- AI (im)politeness (Anderson & McIntyre, 2024; Chen et al. 2024) and reciprocity (Culpeper & Tantucci, 2021)
- Anthropomorphism and perceptions of AI as a social actor (Stein et al. 2020)
- Dialogic resonance and imitation in human–AI interaction
- AI creativity and/or its effects on human creativity
- Implied meaning and inference in and by AI systems
- Emotions, rapport, and trust that humans build with and through AI
- AI’s pragmatic failure and its effects on humans
- Feedback loops (Pedreschi et al. 2025) between AI-generated and human-generated language
- Increasing stereotypicality and standardisation in communicative practices (Tantucci & Sparvoli, 2025)
- AI-assisted data collection and annotation.

We also welcome work on AI ethics and safety as LLMs are found to potentially engage in escalating impoliteness and social harms (Tantucci & Culpeper, 2026).

References

- Andersson, M., & McIntyre, D. (2025). Can ChatGPT recognize impoliteness? An exploratory study of the pragmatic awareness of a large language model. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 239, 16-36.
- Chen, X., Li, J., & Ye, Y. (2024). A feasibility study for the application of AI-generated conversations in pragmatic analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 223, 14-30.
- Culpeper, J., & Tantucci, V. (2021). The principle of (im) politeness reciprocity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 175, 146-164.
- Pedreschi, D., Pappalardo, L., Ferragina, E., Baeza-Yates, R., Barabási, A. L., Dignum, F., ... & Vespignani, A. (2025). Human-AI coevolution. *Artificial Intelligence*, 339, 104244.

Stein, J. P., Appel, M., Jost, A., & Ohler, P. (2020). Matter over mind? How the acceptance of digital entities depends on their appearance, mental prowess, and the interaction between both. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 142, 102463.

Tantucci, V., & Culpeper, J. (2026). Can ChatGPT reciprocate impoliteness? The AI moral dilemma. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Tantucci, V., & Sparvoli, C. (2025). AI, be less ‘stereotypical’: ChatGPT’s speech is conventional but never unique. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 22(2), 231-258.

Analysing word searches in social interaction across turns, sequences and activities
(organized by *Florence Oloff, Sara Merlino, Heike Baldauf-Quilliatre*)

This panel is interested in the study of word searches as interactional phenomena that affect the progressivity of turns, sequences, and activities. In contrast to cognitive approaches, which primarily treat speech perturbations and hesitations as individual, cognitive processing problems (e.g. Levelt 1983; Goodglass et al. 1989), conversation-analytic research has studied word searches as a particular type of repair (e.g. Schegloff et al. 1977) and emphasized their collaborative nature, highlighting their interactional and sequential organization (e.g. Goodwin 1979, 1981; Lerner 2013). Studies taking into account the multimodal, embodied dimension of communication have shown that the trajectory of word searches is jointly managed by participants, particularly when shifting from solitary to collaborative searching activities (e.g. Goodwin/Goodwin 1986; Hayashi 2003; Auer/Zima 2021). Previous interactional research focused mostly on asymmetric contexts, typically second language interactions (e.g., Brouwer 2003; Margutti 2007; Koshik/Seo 2012; Greer 2013) and professional encounters (e.g. Merlino 2010, Fatigante et al. 2021). In these settings, word searches are particularly visible, marked, or frequent, which possibly is the reason why they have been at the centre of such a substantial body of research. Nevertheless, a clear understanding of what word searches de facto are is still missing, and more investigations are needed to distinguish them from similar interactional phenomena (e.g. Lerner 1996, 2013).

The panel aims to investigate how “searching activities” in talk-in-interaction emerge and are embedded in specific sequential environments; how participants mobilize particular grammatical, embodied or material resources for doing so; and what kind of social actions – beyond the retrieval of a lexical item – participants can accomplish. We therefore invite contributions that address, among others, the following questions:

- Through which syntactic, prosodic, lexical or non-lexical resources do speakers of different languages typically format word searches, also from a cross-linguistic perspective?
- How can word searches be usefully delimited with respect to adjoining phenomena such as self-repairs, pre-emptive completions or unfinished turns, also considering their multimodal realization?
- In which ways are intra-turn, “local” word searches linked to larger topical and/or sequential trajectories?
- How can different ways of interrupting the progressivity of a turn be systematically linked to specific actions, tasks, or even institutional agendas?
- What kind of other social actions can be accomplished through “doing searching for a word” (e.g., managing (dis)preference, expressing stances, negotiating epistemics)?

Analysis of Speech Acts From the Nepalese Stories (organized by *Mahesh Prasad Bhatt*)

Theme and Purpose

The purpose of this panel is to explore the speech acts in Nepalese stories. With an emphasis on stories written in the Nepali language, the panel aims to uncover the layers of meaning conveyed through the conversations in the stories, the socio-cultural implications of conversational patterns, and the unique features of conversations that reflect Nepalese society. By examining how characters in Nepali stories engaged in the interaction, we can gain insights into broader linguistic and cultural contexts, including politeness strategies, power dynamics, and identity constructions.

Objectives

1. To analyze the structures and functions of conversation in selected Nepalese stories.
2. To explore the role of conversations in developing characters and advancing politeness.
3. To investigate how cultural and social norms influence conversational practices in Nepalese stories.

Potential Participants

The panel will feature contributions from a diverse group of scholars specializing in linguistics, literature, communication and cultural studies.

Panel Format

The panel will be structured to facilitate in-depth discussions and varied presentations. Each 90-minute session will feature three presentations, followed by a question-answer segment to encourage interactive engagement. We plan to organize upto three sessions, ensuring a comprehensive exploration of the topic.

Conclusion

This panel will not only enhance our understanding of conversational dynamics in Nepalese stories but also contribute to broader discussions in pragmatics and cultural studies. By fostering a collaborative environment, we aim to generate new insights and stimulate further research in this vibrant field.

Animals, languaging, and routines in interspecies encounters (organized by *Mika Simonen, Rea Peltola, Anni Jääskeläinen, Katariina Harjunpää*)

Building on the recent “animal turn” in pragmatics (Cornips 2022, Rasenberg et al. 2023, Peltola & Simonen 2024, Harjunpää & Szczepek Reed 2025), the aim of this panel is to better understand how language can be conceptualised and analysed in interactions involving non-human animals and how mutual understanding is achieved – or failed. Communication and interaction in interspecies activities can be understood as forms of languaging. This foregrounds the interactional dynamics and embodied behaviour into which more symbolic meanings are rooted. Language is a distributed phenomenon, since it involves the entire body, activates many time-scales at once (Cowley 2011) and manifests agency beyond an individual (Enfield & Kockelmann 2017). What is observed here and now is viewed through what has happened previously and what is projected in the future. Language thus participates in constructing routines. The distributed approach can open up a less anthropocentric view of language. Languaging is a process of mutual engagement where embodied means of interaction within and beyond human cross. The meaning-making processes of other species,

grounded in their different forms of embodied existence, remain largely inaccessible to humans. In routine interaction, participants nevertheless achieve a momentary, situationally sufficient mutual understanding (Mondémé 2022, Simonen 2026, Jääskeläinen, under review). Participation in routine interaction may create opportunities for animals to deploy actions within a sequential framework, which can also be conceptualised as languaging.

We call for contributions dealing with questions such as:

- By what means do other animals participate in languaging in activities shared with humans?
- What methods are available for observing routines in interspecies interactions?
- How are bodily differences treated in languaging practices?
- How do humans and other animals display divergent interactional orientations?
- In what ways are interspecies languaging and animal agency reported in human-to-human talk?
- How do these phenomena relate to animal ethics?

We welcome contributions from different theoretical and methodological approaches, based on data from interactions that involve, in one way or another, interspecies encounters.

References:

- Cornips, Leonie. 2022. The animal turn in postcolonial (socio)linguistics: the interspecies greeting of the dairy cow. *Journal of Postcolonial Linguistics* 6, 210–232.
- Cowley, Stephen J. 2011. *Distributed language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Enfield, Nick & Kockelman, Paul. 2017 *Distributed agency*. OUP.
- Harjunpää, Katariina & Szczepek Reed, Beatrice. 2025. Investigating sound patterns in interspecies interaction. *Language & Communication* 105, 153–160.
- Jääskeläinen, Anni, under review. Lehmille puhuminen ennen ja nyt – ekolinguistinen näkökulma [‘Talking to cows before and now – an ecolinguistic perspective.’] In Ilona Herlin, Anni Jääskeläinen & Emmi Lahti (Eds), *Ekolinguistiikka: Ihminen, kieli ja ympäristö*.
- Mondémé, Chloé. 2022. Quand les animaux participent à l’interaction sociale : nouveaux regards sur l’analyse séquentielle. *Langage et Société* 176, 9–24.
- Peltola, Rea & Simonen, Mika. 2024. Towards interspecies pragmatics: Language use and embodied interaction in human-animal activities, encounters, and narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 220, 15–19.
- Rasenberg, Marlou et al. 2023. Reimagining language. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 40, 309–317.
- Simonen, Mika. 2026. Animal actions and their involvement in human meaning-making processes in interaction. *Frontiers in Sociology*.

Anonymisation and pseudonymisation – challenges with privacy protection in linguistics (organized by *Lisa Södergård, Therese Lindström Tiedemann*)

Researchers have an ethical responsibility to protect and respect research participants, their personal information, and any sensitive information that might be disclosed in the original data. The General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR (EU 2016/679), emphasises the need to reflect on how we treat personal information. At the same time there is an increased interest in open data (e.g. the FAIR principles & CARE principles) in relation to open science,

reproducibility and sustainability (UNESCO 2021), as well as a need for (authentic) data to train Large Language Models (LLMs) and hence Artificial intelligence (AI).

Automatic pseudonymisation is developing rapidly, but so far guidelines and research have primarily focused on use cases from the health and legal sector while leaving linguistics and humanities largely unnoticed. Within the field of linguistics, data management and ethics have recently gained attention (cf. Berez-Kroeker et al. 2021; D'Arcy & Bender 2023; Terkourafi 2025). In addition, within linguistics and the humanities efforts to empower the participants have been made, giving them a choice how to be represented (see e.g. Deakin-Smith et al. 2025; Lahman et al. 2023). However, there is hardly any knowledge about the effects anonymisation and pseudonymisation have on research possibilities and research findings (Volodina et al. 2025) within linguistics in general, and within fields focusing on linguistic usage and meaning in particular.

Privacy protection is not only something that must be thought about when publishing findings; it is also an important part of preparing datasets. Today there is more and more use of large datasets (corpora) which researchers often hope to be able to share with others for reasons of transparency, replicability but also sustainable continued research. How can linguistic datasets be pseudonymised without affecting their usefulness for linguistic research? How can secondary users be informed of which items have been altered and how without revealing identities?

We welcome contributions which discuss how anonymisation/pseudonymisation can be done in linguistics and how it can affect their research topics. We urgently need joint efforts to build bridges on reliable, solid data for linguistics as well as for LLM-development.

Berez-Kroeker, A. L., McDonnell, B., Koller, E., Collister, L. B. eds. 2021. *The Open Handbook of Linguistic Data Management*. Cambridge, Massachusetts & London: MIT Press.

D'Arcy, A., & Bender, E. M. 2023. Ethics in linguistics. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 9(1), 49-69.

Deakin-Smith, H., Pilcher, J., Flaherty, J., Coffey, A., & Makis, E. 2025. The research politics of (re) naming participants: A sociology of names perspective. *Qualitative Research*, 25(3), 629-647.

Lahman, M. K., Thomas, R., & Teman, E. D. 2023. A good name: Pseudonyms in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 29(6), 678-685.

Terkourafi, M. 2025. An ethics for linguistics? What, why, and how?. *Linguistics*, 63(2), 317–347.

Volodina, E., Dobnik, S., Lindström Tiedemann, T., Muñoz Sánchez, R., Szawerna, M. I., Södergård, L. & Vu, X.-S. 2025. Towards shared standards for pseudonymization of research data. *Huminfra Conference proceedings*, 12th–13th Nov. 2025, Stockholm.
https://www.huminfra.se/resources/humevents/hic-2025_proceedings.pdf

Art in Situated Interaction (organized by *Yuval Geva, Agnes Löfgren, Sara Ronnqvist*)

Art is a ubiquitous feature of human culture and social life (Abell 2012), yet there is little agreement on what defines art or its value(s). Research on art and society has traditionally

avoided this question, focusing on artworks as reflections of social order or on the institutions surrounding their production and consumption (Becker 1982). More recently, scholars have reconceptualized art as a dynamic process whose forms and meanings are negotiated through action and engagement between social actors (Acord & DeNora 2008). Yet how art is practically talked and acted into being in everyday life remains underexplored.

This panel addresses this gap by recruiting ethnomethodological and practice-oriented thinking. Building on studies depicting art production and consumption as situated practices contingent on participants' use of semiotic, embodied, and material resources (e.g., in rehearsals, performances, and museum visits, Lehn et al. 2001, Tolmie et al. 2013, Krug et al. 2020, Rönqvist 2020, Löfgren & Hofstetter 2023), it invites contributions addressing questions such as:

- What characterizes semiosis in and around artistic experience?
- How do participants use language, the body, and the material environment to render aesthetic experiences communicable and accountable?
- How do participants accomplish cooperative action when engaging with art?
- How does interaction in artistic settings differ from “ordinary conversation”?

We welcome studies on interaction in any artistic setting. Research informed by Conversation Analysis, Interactional Linguistics, and Multimodal Interaction Analysis is especially encouraged, though contributions from related traditions (e.g., linguistic anthropology, sociology of art) are also welcome. The panel aims to shed light on the interactional mechanisms through which art is produced and experienced while also contributing to discussions of human creativity and sociality.

References

- Abell, Catharine. 2012. “Art: What it is and why it matters.” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 85(3): 671–691.
- Acord, Sophia Kryzs & Tia DeNora. 2008. “Culture and the arts: From art worlds to arts-in-action.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 619: 223–237.
- Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Krug, Maximilian, Messner, Monika, Schmidt, Axel & Anna Wessel. 2020. “Instruktionen in Theater-und Orchesterproben.” *Gesprächforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 21: 155–198.
- Lehn, Dirk vom, Heath, Christian & Jon Hindmarsh. 2001. “Exhibiting interaction: Conduct and collaboration in museums and galleries.” *Symbolic Interaction* 24(2): 189–216.
- Löfgren, Agnes & Emily Hofstetter. 2021. “Introversive semiosis in action: Depictions in opera rehearsals.” *Social Semiotics* 33(3): 601–620.
- Rönqvist, Sara. 2020. “Towards a shared understanding: A study of the intersubjective management of critique between an artist and a critic”, in Heli Paulasto & Sari Pöyhönen (eds.), *Language and the arts – creative inquiry in applied linguistics*, 12: 218–241.

Tolmie, Peter, Benford, Steve & Mark, Rouncefield. 2013. "Playing in Irish music sessions", in Mark Rouncefield & Peter Tolmie (eds.), *Ethnomethodology at Play*, 227–256. Abingdon: Routledge.

Artificial Others: Bridges or Barriers? Discursive Perspectives on Robots in Polarised Societies (organized by *Emma Lupano, Bettina Mottura, Natalia Riva*)

Bridges are not built only between people. They are also imagined through the figures, technologies, and social actors that societies create to negotiate difference. Among these figures, humanoid robots and biomimetic agents occupy a revealing position: they are simultaneously technological artefacts, cultural objects, and discursive constructions.

In a period marked by growing social and political polarisation, public discourse increasingly presents artificial agents as potential mediators, companions, assistants, or, conversely, as threats and sources of disruption. This panel examines discourse about robots rather than human–robot interaction itself, while recognising the close relationship between representations of artificial agents and the forms of interaction they make possible.

The panel explores how linguistic and multimodal resources contribute to the construction of robots as social actors and how these constructions shape understandings of otherness, agency, and social cohesion. We are particularly interested in the metaphors, narratives, evaluative practices, and stance-taking strategies through which humanoid and biomimetic robots are represented in different social, political, cultural, and linguistic contexts. While the panel is not inherently contrastive, it encourages contributions that can help shed light on local, national or international discursive trends on the subject.

Possible topics

of research include (but are not limited to):

- the institutional, corporate, and policy discourses that formulate promises, expectations, or warnings concerning robots in social domains;
- the ethical debates surrounding the deployment of robots in contexts such as education, healthcare, social management, justice, political dialogue, and military activities;
- the discursive representations of biomimetic robots and the ways they blur or reinforce categorical boundaries between humans, animals, plants, and machines.

We welcome established as well as innovative analytical approaches including metaphor analysis, critical discourse studies, conversation analysis, corpus pragmatics, historical pragmatics, and related frameworks, in order to shed light on:

- narratives that portray robots as agents of conflict resolution, reconciliation, or social integration, as well as discourses that challenge or resist such visions;
- metaphors and figurative framings of robots as bridges, mediators, servants, threats, or mirrors of the human, and their variation across languages and cultures;
- epistemic markers, evaluative language, and other pragmatic resources that contribute to attribution or denial of intentionality, emotions, and agency;
- discursive strategies such as humour and irony that either humanise or delegitimise artificial agents.

By bringing together pragmatics, discourse analysis, human–robot interaction, and science and technology studies, the panel aims to advance understanding of how discourse about

artificial beings may contribute to either reinforcing or reconfiguring contemporary social divides.

Beyond Face and Social Norms: New Perspectives on Im/Politeness in Asian Language Learning (organized by *Sun-Hee Lee*)

Bringing together politeness research in pragmatics and its relevant fields, this panel explores how im/politeness is structured and negotiated in Asian language learning. Moving beyond classic theories of face and social norms (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ide, 1989), a growing body of studies has focused on im/politeness as a dynamic, interactional, and indexical resource and examined how it is realized in target languages and in processes of language learning. The panel welcomes research on Korean, Japanese, and Chinese, as well as contributions on other Asian languages, drawing on diverse methodological frameworks including corpus linguistics, conversation analysis, sociolinguistics, and AI-supported approaches. We invite studies on L2 pragmatic development alongside research on L1 interactional practices and cross-linguistic pragmatic processes that shape language learning. Contributors may address how L1 and L2 speakers handle speech levels, honorific agreement, and terms of address; how stance, affect, gesture, gaze, and prosody interact with grammatical politeness and impoliteness; how ideologies of deference, hierarchy, and solidarity emerge in metapragmatic discourse; and how corpus-based or AI-supported analyses reveal patterns of im/politeness across large datasets of interaction. Over the past two decades, politeness studies have expanded with perspectives from interlanguage pragmatics focusing on L2 speakers' language use (Byon 2006; Brown, 2011) and metapragmatics exploring how speakers reflect on, evaluate, and negotiate the social appropriateness of im/politeness (Watts, 2003; Kádár & Haugh, 2013; Brown & Kim, 2025). This panel aims to explore diverse and innovative methods linking fine-grained analyses of language use to pragmatic and sociocultural factors, particularly welcoming studies that examine linguistic patterns not usually treated as conventional politeness devices, and work addressing broader questions of social meaning, identity, and interactional practice.

Taken together, the panel aims to foster cross-linguistic, interdisciplinary dialogue on im/politeness in Asian language learning and, in doing so, to contribute to broader pragmatic discussions of politeness, social meaning, relational work, and interactional practice that extend beyond the language learning context.

References

Brown, L. (2011). Korean honorifics and politeness in second language learning. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Brown, L., & Kim, S.-U. (2025). Politeness metapragmatics: Inductive research, multimodality and critical theory. Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-81643-7>

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.

Byon, A. S. (2006). The role of linguistic indirectness and honorifics in achieving linguistic politeness in Korean requests. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 2(2), 247–276

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2–3), 223–248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>

Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press

Bridging the Big and Small Stories: Uncovering Coherence Systems in Narrative Discourse (organized by *Masataka Yamaguchi, Makiko Takekuro*)

In pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies of narrative, a longstanding tension persists between structuralist approaches and social constructionist paradigms. Labovian structural analysis (Labov, 1972; Labov & Waletzky, 1967), often associated with “Big Stories” (Freeman, 2006), remains highly effective for examining macro-level biographical organization, retrospective meaning-making, and the ways speakers construct coherent life trajectories. At the same time, such approaches have been criticized for treating narratives as relatively stable, monologic artifacts detached from the immediate interactional contexts. By contrast, the “Small Stories” framework (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2007) foregrounds narratives as emergent, collaborative social practices embedded in the here-and-now of interaction. Yet, as Hill (2005) argues, even highly situated narrative practices depend upon coherence in order to function as meaningful stories. Such coherence cannot be reduced to linguistic structure alone. Rather, it is a culturally mediated and interactionally negotiated achievement through the interpretation of contextualization cues including prosody, gesture, and other semiotic resources.

This panel seeks to bridge the divide between these approaches by proposing an integrated framework centered on culturally specific coherence systems. Rather than treating Big Stories and Small Stories as analytically incompatible, we argue that coherence systems mediate between local interactional practices and broader ideological, and institutional structures. Through this perspective, locally situated narrative fragments can be understood as sites where broader cultural assumptions, communicative ideologies, and social norms become visible and negotiable. Concepts such as “indexicality” (Silverstein, 2003), “stance-taking” (Du Bois, 2007), and “metalinguistic awareness” provide key analytical tools for examining how interactional practices both constitute and refract larger social structures.

To develop and refine this integrated approach, the panel brings together studies examining diverse forms of narrative discourses across a wide range of communicative spheres. In addition to face-to-face interaction, we incorporate work engaging with online communication, media discourse, digital storytelling, and other mediated forms. This broader empirical scope allows us to investigate how speakers navigate identity, institutional constraints, and life trajectories under the conditions of globalization and digitalization (Blommaert, 2010).

The panel focuses on two dimensions of discourse: (1) the interactional negotiation of culturally situated coherence systems, including how interlocutors interpret contextualization cues and draw upon sedimented communicative ideologies and implicit cultural knowledge; and (2) emergent interactional strategies through which speakers negotiate meaning, stance, and identity in real-time or digitally mediated interaction.

By examining identity construction from both structural and interactional perspectives within increasingly pluralistic communicative spaces, this panel moves beyond “big” versus “small” stories divisions in narrative research. It aims to contribute to the development of a comprehensive pragmatic framework that connects narrative theory, interactional sociolinguistics, and multimodal discourse analysis, among others.

Our current lineup features research on foreign technical trainees, migrants, media, and education; however, we seek to broaden the scope of our panel by inviting contributions that explore diverse empirical materials, geographic settings, and multilingual or multicultural contexts. We particularly welcome discourse-centered approaches that examine the intersections of narrative pragmatics, identity construction, and ideological constraint through underexamined modalities, such as embodied interaction, sound-symbolic practices, fragmented tellings, and digitally mediated forms of narrative production.

Bridging the gap: New speakers, new domains, and new approaches for the revitalization and reclamation of Indigenous languages (organized by *Yumiko Ohara*)

Regarded as a distinct academic field in the past three decades, language revitalization has produced groundbreaking advancements such as the construction of community-led immersion schools and master-apprentice programs as well as technological innovations in learning and teaching. However, serious challenges and issues remain as language shift continues to accelerate, resulting in decreases in the number of speakers and sometimes severe language endangerment. With this dire situation as a backdrop, the panel focuses on current endeavors undertaken by community members, language activists, and scholars toward the revitalization and reclamation of Indigenous languages. The focus is especially placed on bridging crucial gaps that include the need to foster new speakers (e.g., Heinrich 2023), to venture outside of traditional domains of language usage (Santalahti & Ijas 2024), and to create and strengthen relationships among community members, language activists, and scholars (e.g., Lewis 2023).

In particular, the panel intends to generate some initial inquiry into and to showcase some innovative solutions for the following questions: 1) What is being done to increase the number of speakers; 2) what is being done to improve language attitudes toward Indigenous languages; and 3) what is being done to expand language usage into different domains.

The panel is open to anyone with a research focus on Indigenous languages and we are planning to have participation from specialists on Ryukyuan in Japan, Ainu in Hokkaido, Jeju in Jeju Island in South Korea, and Hawaiian in the islands of Hawai‘i. By bringing in these and other participants working on different languages embedded within varying cultures and historical backgrounds, this panel will offer crucial insights toward the unified objective of increasing the usage and visibility of Indigenous languages.

References

- Heinrich, Patrick. 2023. Ryukyuan perspectives for language reclamation. *Languages* 8.0.
- Lewis, M. Paul. 2023. Bridging the gap between language communities and linguists. In Eda Derhemi & Christopher Moseley (eds.) *Endangered Languages in the 21st Century*. London: Routledge. 105-118.

Santalahti, Saana & Silja Ijas. 2024. Linguistic Landscapes in Sapporo – ‘When’ is Ainu Situated? In Elia Del Corso & Elisabetta Ragagnin (eds.) *Time in East Asian Endangered Languages: Grammar, History, and Society*. Venice: Venice University Press. 267-294.

Building Bridges Across Artistic Cultures: Pragmatic and Discourse-Analytic Approaches to Meaning and Value in the Arts (organized by *Cecilia Lazzeretti, Darryl Hocking*)

Artistic practice is conceptualised, communicated, and legitimised through culturally specific discourses. When these discourses are not recognised, institutions risk imposing external frameworks of value onto culturally distinct practices, thereby misrepresenting how such practices are understood, what motivates them, and how meaning is produced within their own cultural contexts (Baumann, 2007; Bourdieu, 1984). Building bridges across artistic cultures therefore requires close attention to the discursive and pragmatic processes through which artistic value is negotiated, so that artistic practice can be interpreted on terms meaningful within its own cultural setting, rather than judged through externally imposed frameworks.

This panel explores how bridges can be built across artistic, linguistic, and cultural worlds through the study of discourse, communication, multimodality, and meaning in the arts (Hocking, 2025), and more broadly in culturally situated forms of creativity (Jones, 2014). In line with the conference theme, we are especially interested in how pragmatic and discourse-oriented approaches can illuminate the negotiation of artistic legitimacy, cultural identity, and value across different contexts, including those marked by asymmetry, misunderstanding, contestation, or polarisation.

The panel adopts a broad understanding of the arts, encompassing visual, performative, literary, applied, and AI-generated or AI-supported forms. Attention is also given to the role of digital media—including websites, social media, and multimedia platforms (Bou-Franch & Blitvich, 2019)—as key sites in which discourse about the arts is produced, circulated, and contested. In these online environments, artistic identities may be constructed, challenged, and recontextualised across geographic and cultural boundaries, shaping how audiences interpret and evaluate artistic work. At the same time, these environments may enable both dialogue and division.

Against this backdrop, we welcome papers that explore how contemporary art texts and practices construct, negotiate, and transform understandings of artistic practice and value across diverse linguistic and cultural settings. Contributions may draw on a range of methodological and theoretical approaches, including corpus linguistics, multimodal analysis, ethnography, genre analysis, and related interdisciplinary perspectives. We particularly welcome work that connects pragmatics with neighbouring fields and examines how communicative practices in and around the arts may foster, or hinder, mutual understanding across cultural difference. Baumann, S. (2007). A general theory of artistic legitimation: How art worlds are like social movements. *Poetics*, 35(1), 47–65.

Bou-Franch, P. & Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P. (Eds.) (2019), *Analysing digital discourse: New insights and future directions*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1979).

Hocking, D. (Ed.) (2025). *The language of art and artists*. Springer Nature.

Jones, R. (Ed.) (2014). *Discourse and creativity*. Routledge.

Children's eating in early childhood education and care (ECEC) settings (organized by Sally Young, Amanda Bateman)

Children's engagement with interlocutors and environmental resources in early childhood education and care (ECEC) settings has long been of interest for interactional researchers, within which a specific focus on eating and mealtimes has emerged (e.g. Bateman, 2024; Burdelski, 2025; Wiggins, Majlesi, et al., 2024; Wiggins, Willemsen & Cromdal, 2024; Willemsen et al., 2023). An international exploration of mealtime interaction with infants, toddlers, and young children provides insights into unique interactional contexts in which language, food, and eating become intertwined. Research in this area has already demonstrated the importance of analysing the details of social interaction for identifying infant gestural requests for food (Bateman, 2024), socialising children into culturally appropriate expressions of taste (Burdelski, 2025), playing with food (Wiggins, Willemsen, & Cromdal, 2024), and establishing assisted eating as a caring practice (Wiggins, Majlesi, et al., 2024).

Our panel theme aims to provide opportunity to focus on children's eating practices in ECEC settings across the globe, where curriculum frameworks often shape the ways in which mealtimes are managed, and national food policies influence ECEC food protocols. Within these overarching international frameworks, we are interested in interactional organisation practices such as opening and closing mealtimes, establishing preferences and appetites, offering and requesting food, and negotiating amounts of food. Children's handling of food and emerging use of eating utensils is also of interest. The panel is open to contributions that explicitly focus on analytical approaches that treat language as social action and on the multimodal organisation of social interaction, such as ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA), discursive psychology (DP), and the language socialisation approach.

We aim to bring together researchers working on young children's eating practices and mealtimes within ECEC settings across an international and interdisciplinary landscape, to build a solid research platform of work on language and eating in early years and to establish future research opportunities. Panel co-authors will initially recruit participants through our international data lab networks to ensure good global spread, in addition to the open call for contributions.

References

Bateman, A. (2024). Infant embodied requests and teacher-practitioner offers during early childhood education mealtimes. *Appetite*, 200, 107539.

Burdelski, M. (2025). Interactional and cultural shaping of appetite: Children's talk about food taste during meal and snack time in Japanese preschool. *Appetite*, 211, 107930.

Wiggins, S., Majlesi, A. R., Ekström, A., Hydén, L. C., & Cekaite, A. (2024). How assisted eating becomes a caring practice in institutional settings: Embodied gestures and stages of assisted eating. *Appetite*, 200, 107552.

Wiggins, S., Willemsen, A., & Cromdal, J. (2024). Eating prickly peas: Sharing play worlds during preschool meals. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 56(3), 479-496.

Willemsen, A., Wiggins, S., & Cromdal, J. (2023). Young Children's mealtimes and eating practices in early childhood education and care: A scoping review of 30 years of research from 1990 to 2020. *Educational Research Review*, 38, 100503.

Children's orientation to grammar in interaction: metalinguistics and metapragmatics in social interaction (organized by *Asta Cekaite, Olga Anatoli*)

Naturally occurring interaction is the primary resource for children's language learning. Previous research has supported the theoretical position that metalinguistic and metapragmatic awareness displayed in interaction is an important factor contributing to children's language learning and language use (Auer, 2022; Cekaite, 2017). This has been demonstrated in studies that focused on lexical meanings, including joint knowledge exploration among children and parents (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 2002; Goodwin, 2007), spontaneous vocabulary work in classroom settings (Stoewer & Musk, 2019), or in bilingual early childhood education (Anatoli, 2024; Rickert, 2023). Less attention has been paid to whether and how children orient in interaction to grammatical meanings, such as verbal tense, gender, deictics, and how these features are relevant to children becoming competent language users.

The panel aims to bring together researchers who work on children's interaction and language learning by attending to metalinguistic features that are observable in social interactions across various contexts and age groups. The panel will engage with questions such as which grammatical categories become explicitly invoked in children's interactions, how these metalinguistic interactions unfold, and with what pragmatic outcomes. What does orientation to grammatical meanings in interaction tell us about children's understanding of language and language use?

Potential topics of interest include: very young children's interaction with adults and peers; bilingual children's interaction at home and in institutional contexts; the use of multimodal resources in grammar instruction for children; and children with communicative difficulties.

The panel is open to applications across an international and interdisciplinary landscape, with a particular interest in children's perspectives (e.g., Ahrenkiel et al., 2021; James et al., 1998) on language, learning, and interaction.

References

Ahrenkiel, A., Holm, L., & Eilenberg, L. (2021). Children's language use in ECEC in a child perspective. *Ethnography and Education*, 16(4), 420–436.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2021.1943699>

Anatoli, O. (2024). Swedish-English preschool as a site for the collaborative discovery of bilingual meanings. *Journal of Early Childhood Education Research*, 13(1), 92–121.
<https://doi.org/10.58955/jecer.129823>

Auer, P. (2022). 'Translanguaging' or 'Doing Languages'? Multilingual Practices and the Notion of 'Codes.' In *Multilingual Perspectives on Translanguaging* (pp. 126–153). *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800415690-007>

Blum-Kulka, S. (2002). "Do you believe that Lot's wife is blocking the road (to Jericho)?"': Co-constructing theories about the world with adults. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to Adults: The Contribution of Multiparty Discourse to Language Acquisition* (pp. 85–116). Taylor & Francis Group.

Cekaite, A. (2017). What Makes a Child a Good Language Learner? Interactional Competence, Identity, and Immersion in a Swedish Classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000046>

Goodwin, M. H. (2007). Occasioned knowledge exploration in family interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507069459>

James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Rickert, M. (2023). 'You don't know how to say cow in Polish'. – Co-creating and navigating language ideological assemblages in a linguistically diverse kindergarten in Germany. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 20(4), 1287–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2023.2224012>

Stoewer, K., & Musk, N. (2019). Impromptu vocabulary work in English mother tongue instruction. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(2), 123–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1516152>

Chinese Politeness – Multiple Perspectives (organized by *Fengguang Liu, Daniel Kadar, Juliane House*)

The aim of this panel is to bring together many different perspectives on Chinese politeness and to explore directions for future research on the basis of such perspectives. Since Gu's (1990) seminal study, Chinese has been an important language in politeness studies, with hundreds of studies dedicated to its analysis. This popularity of Chinese politeness naturally triggered many different views on Chinese politeness phenomena, including for example diachronic approaches (e.g. Pan and Kadar, 2010), cultural approaches (e.g. Chen, 2019), metapragmatic analyses (Zhao, 2025), and intercultural takes (e.g. Wang, 2017). Yet, little collaboration has taken place between experts of these areas, so it can be said that Chinese politeness research is typically conducted in 'little bubbles': scholars tend to be aware of what others in the field are doing, but little attempt has been made to synthesise our research results. The present panel aim to fill this gap, by bringing together internationally leading experts in the field.

Following this goal to create a collaboration between experts of different areas of Chinese politeness, the panel will follow an interactive format: all presentations will be planned for 15 minutes, followed by a Discussion session of 5 minutes, and in the end of a panel we aim to have a roundtable discussion. This discussion will be led by Professors Dengshan Xia and Yansheng Mao, two internationally leading experts of Chinese politeness studies. The aim of this roundtable conversation is to explore ways in which we could further

the field, preferably as a collaborative effort between experts of different areas of Chinese politeness research. We would like to explore the following questions in particular:

- Is it possible to identify areas of research which would benefit from collaboration between seemingly distant areas, such as strictly language-based approaches versus cultural approaches? What are these areas?
- How could we combine our research outcomes to better introduce Chinese politeness for an international audience?
- How could we create politeness-relevant open access corpora in an era where corpora are increasingly important?

We hope to publish a selection of papers presented in this panel in the form of a journal special issue, edited by the organisers of the panel. We also hope that the panel will provide a meeting point for China-based and international experts of Chinese politeness research.

The editors of the panels have extensive collaboration experience. Liu, Kadar and House are all members of a research centre in China where they have developed extensive experience in collaborating with other pragmatics teams working on Chinese politeness. All the four organisers have collaborated on various projects, resulting in many publications dedicated to Chinese politeness. The organisers also have collaboration history with the Discussants.

Clinical Pragmatics and Communicative Diversity: Pragmatic Skills Development, Break Down and Reorganization (organized by *Valentina Saccone, Greta Mazzaggio, Alessandro Panunzi*)

Clinical pragmatics investigates the relationship between communication, cognition, and language use in populations with atypical pragmatic development or acquired communicative difficulties (Perkins 2005; Cummings 2009, 2023). Originally emerging at the intersection of pragmatics, clinical linguistics, psychology, and speech-language pathology, clinical pragmatics has increasingly become a central area for understanding how communicative competence is shaped, negotiated, and mutually adapted across different cognitive and social conditions. Crucially, pragmatic frameworks have also proven valuable in informing clinical practice, offering theoretically grounded tools for the assessment of communicative abilities and the design of intervention strategies tailored to diverse communicative profiles (Ball et al. 2024; Garraffa & Mazzaggio 2025).

This panel aims to explore how pragmatic abilities develop, break down, or reorganize in clinical populations, with particular attention to communicative diversity, adaptive processes, and interactional strategies. The panel encourages contributions examining how individuals with different communicative profiles establish cooperation, manage interaction, and achieve communicative goals through alternative pragmatic strategies and processes of embodiment in language production.

We welcome contributions from different theoretical and methodological perspectives, including interactional pragmatics, conversation analysis, cognitive pragmatics, clinical linguistics, and interdisciplinary approaches combining linguistics with psychology, neuroscience, education, or speech-language pathology.

Particular attention will be given to studies based on naturally occurring or semi-spontaneous interactional data, although experimental and mixed-methods approaches are also welcome.

We invite contributions addressing topics such as:

- pragmatic development in clinical populations across the lifespan;
- interactional and conversational strategies in atypical communication;
- communicative competence and adaptive or compensatory pragmatic processes;
- cooperation and alignment in interaction across diverse communicative profiles;
- corpus-based approaches to the study of spoken interaction and multimodal communication in clinical settings;
- methodological challenges in the study of clinical interaction;
- assessment and intervention from a pragmatic perspective.

The panel aims to foster dialogue between theoretical and applied approaches to pragmatics and to promote discussion on how communicative differences can contribute to broader understandings of human interaction and social participation.

Selected References

Ball, M. J., Müller, N., & Spencer, E. (Eds.). (2024). *The Handbook of Clinical Linguistics* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Cummings, L. (2009). *Clinical Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummings, L. (2023). *Introducing Pragmatics: A Clinical Approach*. London/New York: Routledge.

Garraffa, M., & Mazzaggio, G. (2025). *Pragmatics in the Health Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perkins, M. (2005). "Clinical Pragmatics: An Emergentist Perspective." *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 19(6–7), 367–372.

Collateral sounds (organized by *Vladislav Maraev, Ellen Breitholtz, Christine Howes*)

Collateral sounds, a subset of what H. Clark calls collateral signals (Clark, 1996, Chapter 8), which are related to such concepts as 'liminal signs' (Dingemanse, 2020) or 'non-lexical vocalisations' (Keevallik & Ogden, 2020), are frequent in human-human communication, and play a role which is parallel to information exchange between speakers. Collateral sounds can be used for meta-communication, negotiating the meaning and understanding, construction of epistemic stances towards one another and modifying the propositional content of utterances. Despite the variety of potential functions, such collateral sounds are highly underspecified and meanings conveyed by them are defeasible (e.g., laughing at vs. laughing with). In sociolinguistics, such sounds can be analysed as socially conditioned variations (e.g., -ing vs. -in') and act as resources for constructing personal linguistic styles (Burnett, 2019), and attribution of personae (Noble et al., 2020). Even though current AI systems seem to display conversational behaviours, such sounds are rarely, if ever, detected or produced by these systems. Nevertheless, they should be an important resource for human-robot interaction design (Pelikan & Keevallik, 2023). However, such signals are typically missing from

training data, thus limiting interactions with conversational AI – even when using the voice modality – to impoverished informational exchanges which lack many of the inferential meanings that people can draw from any conversational interaction. This panel welcomes submissions from a wide range of subject areas: linguistics, conversation analysis, computational linguistics, sociolinguistics, human-computer interaction and cognitive science. The topics of the panel include (but are not limited to) the following sounds:

- Laughter and speech-laughterVoice quality, accents, socially conditioned variationsClicks and lip-smacksSighs, coughs, in-breaths and gruntsBlowing the raspberry and other ‘inappropriate sounds’Prosodic markingsFilled pauses

References: Burnett, H. (2019). Signalling games, sociolinguistic variation and the construction of style. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 42(5), 419–450. Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge university press. Dingemanse, M. (2020). Between sound and speech: Liminal signs in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53(1), 188–196. Keevallik, L., & Ogden, R. (2020). Sounds on the margins of language at the heart of interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53(1), 1–18. Noble, B., Breitholtz, E., & Cooper, R. (2020). Personae under uncertainty: The case of topoi. In C. Howes, S. Chatzikyriakidis, A. Ek, & V. Somashekarappa (Eds.), *Proceedings of the probability and meaning conference (PaM 2020)* (pp. 8–16). Association for Computational Linguistics. Pelikan, H., & Keevallik, L. (2023). Learning from humans: How research on vocalizations can inform the conceptualization of robot sound. In *Sound and Robotics*. Chapman; Hall/CRC.

Conflict and contested meaning in interaction (organized by *Ibi Baxter-Webb, Chi-Hé Elder, Eleni Kapogianni*)

In this panel we focus on conflict as an interactional-pragmatic phenomenon. It aims to explore how speakers signal, negotiate, and contest meaning, with emphasis on the dynamic interplay between communicative practices and the contextual features of conflict. These may include the nature of the dispute, the medium of interaction, participants’ roles and relationships, and social or institutional stakes.

Bringing together scholars working in different areas of pragmatics, this panel aims to illuminate how pragmatic communicative strategies function to generate and repair cases of language conflict, as well as the interpretive frames through which language in conflict can be theorised. Papers will explore the linguistic and interactional resources through which understanding and position are expressed and countered, whether overtly or implicitly, and how these choices influence the trajectory and interpretation of conflict.

The panel invites contributions that combine theoretical insight with empirical analysis, drawing on diverse types of interactional data from everyday talk to institutional exchanges, to reveal how conflict is managed, mitigated and/or intensified through linguistic practice.

Papers may address topics including but not limited to the following:

- Conversational interaction in conflict Non-cooperative communicationInterpersonal conflictDisagreements and decision-makingNormative commitment and conflict Contested concepts (and

conceptual engineering) Metapragmatic talk in conflict Resolving conflict through language

Co-present third parties in interaction: mediation, facilitation, and speaking on behalf of others (organized by *Katariina Harjunpää, Suvi Kaikkonen*)

Since Goffman's (1981) seminal work, interactional studies have expanded our understanding of participation in social interaction by showing how co-present parties display their understanding of ongoing events and in doing so shape those events, even without talking (Goodwin 2007, Mondada 2016). Yet, conversational organization has been argued to favor dyadic participation, entailing more effort to include multiple participants (Stivers 2021). In multi-party interactions, participants use various verbal and embodied means to manage triadic constellations (e.g. Tiitinen & Ruusuvuori 2012; Wilkinson et al. 2023). The locally relevant social units here may not be individual persons but distributed (Enfield 2013, Hofstetter & Keevallik 2023), such as spokespersons (Levinson 1988) and collectivities (Lerner 1993).

This panel explores interactions in which the involvement of third parties is central, such as facilitation, mediation, and other activities in which participants in some way coordinate the interaction of others (e.g. language brokering and interpreting). Following Goodwin (2007), the panel seeks to understand the category of "speaker" not as an attribute of isolated utterances or individuals, but as a distributed, multiparty system organized through cooperative action. By examining how this system operates in third-party mediated interactions, the panel aims to advance knowledge of the interactional organization of action, participation and speakerhood in such settings. The presentations may address, for example, ways of facilitating interaction and speaking for/on behalf of others, including multimodal analyses of formulating and reporting the talk of co-present parties.

Potential analytic themes include, but are not limited to:

- Coordination of participation frameworks
- Verbal and embodied practices of indexing another voice
- Representation of others when speaking on their behalf
- Action, agency and participant roles

Planned talks include Kaikkonen & Harjunpää on distributed speakerhood between mediators and clients, Dubovyi on co-construction of accountability in mediation, Saarenmaa on other-correction in interpreted interaction, and Kurhila et al. on colleagues supporting L2 speakers in workplace interaction. We encourage paper submissions by researchers working on similar or related topics.

Enfield, N. 2013. Relationship thinking: Agency, enchrony, and human sociality. OUP.

Goffman, E. 1981. Forms of talk. UP.

Goodwin, C. 2007. Interactive Footing. In *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*. CUP, 16-46.

Hofstetter, E., & Keevallik, L. (2023). Prosody is used for real-time exercising of other bodies. *Language & Communication*, 88, 52–72.

Levinson, S. C. 1988. Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's participation framework. In *Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*, Polity Press, 161-227.

Mondada, L. 2016. Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *J. Socioling.* 20.3, 336-366.

Stivers, T. 2021. Is conversation built for two? The partitioning of social interaction. *ROLSI* 54.1, 1-19.

Tiitinen, S. & Ruusuvuori, J. 2012. Engaging parents through gaze: Speaker selection in three-party interactions in maternity clinics. *Patient Educ. Couns.* 89.1, 38-43.

Lerner, G. H. 1993. Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text* 13.2, 213-246.

Wilkinson, R. et al. 2023. Participation within multiparty conversation: Responses to indirect complaints about a co-present participant. In *New Perspectives on Goffman in Language and Interaction*. Routledge, 195-216.

Critical Methodological Engagements with Human-‘AI’ Interaction Analysis (organized by *Samira Ibnelkaid, Marlou Rasenberg, Mark Dingemanse*)

Recent years have witnessed the rapid emergence of research on Human-‘AI’ interaction, within the fields of pragmatics, ethnomethodology, conversation analysis (EM/CA), discursive psychology, and interaction analysis, particularly following the widespread uptake of generative ‘AI’ (Van Rooij et al. 2024) and so-called Large Language Models (‘LLMs’) (Birhane & McWhann 2024). While this growing body of work has generated important insights into the organization of such interactions, critical methodological reflection remains comparatively scarce. Consequently, researchers run the risk of adopting an implicitly techno-solutionist orientation or of mobilizing forms of supposed neutrality that reproduce the very sociotechnical ideologies embedded within these systems.

Yet generative ‘AI’ ecosystems are not neutral tools: they are deeply entangled with colonial capitalism, extractive data practices, environmental devastation, invisible labor, and the flattening and commodification of knowledge and language itself. This panel argues that human-‘AI’ interaction calls not only for new empirical research, but also for pressing methodological and ethical reckonings (Dingemanse & Cuskley 2026). It asks: how are human-‘AI’ interactions conceptualized, described, analyzed, and framed within academic knowledge production?

Critical perspectives on ‘AI’ are mostly emerging from macro-social fields such as linguistic anthropology, emancipatory pragmatics, cultural studies, sociology, decolonial theory, gender studies, etc. (Guest et al. 2026). By contrast, disciplines concerned with the fine-grained organization of everyday life have often rapidly extended analytical frameworks developed for human-human interaction to human-‘LLM’ encounters, sometimes without sufficiently interrogating the ontological and methodological implications of doing so. The deceptive anthropomorphic appearance of ‘LLM’ outputs risks being replicated in scientific productions

and obscuring the fundamental divergence between socially accountable human participants and probabilistic ‘language’-generating systems.

Therefore, this panel invites contributions engaging critically with our theoretical, methodological, and ethical approaches to human-‘AI’ interaction analysis. Possible concrete points of interest include:

- The conceptualization of Gen‘AI’ and more specifically ‘LLMs’ in interaction;
- The inadequacy of EM/CA concepts such as sequentiality, TCU, repair, participation, or member’s perspective for the study of human-‘AI’ interactions;
- The terminological challenges associated with describing ‘LLM’ processes (e.g., “learning,” “understanding,” “hallucinating”);
- The methods used to transcribe interactions that involve voice-based ‘LLMs’ (prosody, pauses, synthetic in-breath, etc.);
- Ethical and sociopolitical accountability in conducting interaction research that may indirectly contribute to the legitimization, optimization, and commercialization of increasingly human-resembling and engaging ‘AI’ systems.

Ultimately, this panel asks how interaction research must critically position itself when the very conditions of our everyday interactions are being unilaterally reconfigured by unaccountable private corporations without collective deliberation or even consent.

References

Birhane, A. & McGann, M. (2024). Large models of what? Mistaking engineering achievements for human linguistic agency. *Language Sciences*, 106.

Dingemanse, M., & Cuskley, C. (2026). For robust research, center values, not technology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.

van Rooij, I., Guest, O., Adolphi, F., de Haan, R., Kolokolova, A., & Rich, P. (2024). Reclaiming AI as a Theoretical Tool for Cognitive Science. *Computational Brain & Behavior*, 7(4), 616–636.

Deficit, Difficulty, or Difference? Rethinking Pragmatics in Neurodiversity (organized by *Dimitrios Kastanas, Napoleon Katsos, Songqiao Xie*)

Research on pragmatics and neurodiversity has expanded rapidly over the past three decades, particularly in relation to autism and, increasingly, ADHD. Taking autism as an example, early influential accounts explained pragmatic challenges through impairments in theory of mind (Happé, 1993), executive functioning (Hill, 2004), central coherence (Frith, 2003). Although some accounts highlighted the role of language skills in pragmatic performance (Norbury, 2005), observed differences in both children and adults continued to be interpreted as reflecting deficits in one or more underlying cognitive processes relative to a neurotypical norm.

Over the past decade, this picture has become increasingly nuanced. A growing body of research suggests that pragmatic performance in autism cannot be straightforwardly characterised in terms of deficit. Studies have reported comparable communicative outcomes despite differences in processes and strategies supporting interpretation, alongside substantial variability across pragmatic domains, contexts, and individuals (Andrés-Roqueta & Katsos, 2020; Martín-González et al., 2025; Morra, 2016; Williams et al., 2021). These findings have

motivated theoretical perspectives that emphasise differences in communicative style and processing priorities rather than reduced pragmatic competence per se (Crompton et al., 2020; Milton, 2012; Scholten et al., 2021; Vicente et al., 2024). Among the most influential, the Double Empathy account (Milton, 2012) highlights the reciprocal nature of communication and suggests that communicative difficulties may emerge from between-interlocutor mismatches rather than deficits located within a single individual or group.

These developments raise important questions. First, what pragmatic profiles associated with different neurotypes, and how much variability exists within and between them? Second, what qualitative and quantitative evidence allow us to determine whether observed divergences are best conceptualised as differences, difficulties, or deficits in pragmatics and underlying processing strategies? Third, how can pragmatic theories accommodate findings from neurodiversity research, and how might those findings contribute to pragmatics more broadly? Fourth, can existing explanations of neurotype-based variation be integrated within a common theoretical framework? Finally, what implications do these insights have for intervention, education, and communicative support?

This panel brings together researchers working on pragmatics and neurodiversity from a broad range of perspectives. Although autism has been the primary focus, we also particularly encourage submissions addressing ADHD and other underrepresented forms of neurodiversity. Topics include, but are not limited to, figurative language, implicature, conversational coordination, topic management, communicative success in different neurotypes, and neurodiversity-informed theories of pragmatics. Contributions employing experimental, corpus-based, conversation-analytic, developmental, computational, clinical, and interdisciplinary methodologies are all welcome. We also encourage submissions examining the heterogeneity within neurotypes.

Importantly, the panel is not committed to any single theoretical, clinical, or philosophical position. We welcome contributions investigating pragmatic strengths, differences, and successful communicative adaptation, as well as research documenting communicative difficulties, support needs, and intervention outcomes, including work involving individuals with high support needs or complex communication profiles.

The panel will consist of three 90-minute sessions, comprising eight 30-min (including 10 min Q&A) presentations and a concluding discussion.

Democracy in action: Interactional practices shaping participation and polarization
(organized by *Elina Salomaa, Teija Ahopelto, Simon Magnusson, Melisa Stevanovic*)

Today's democracies are facing increasing internal and external threats. Alongside political polarization and widespread mis-/disinformation, recent OECD data (2024) indicates a declining trust in national governments and public institutions, with many citizens feeling unable to influence public decisions. Simultaneously, participatory practices – both grassroots and institutionally organized – are expanding. This tension between decreased democratic trust and attempts to increase participation highlights a key challenge: ensuring that citizens experience their participation as meaningful.

This panel approaches democratic participation from an interactional perspective, examining how it is enacted, negotiated, and challenged in the micro-practices of everyday interaction. Research in settings, such as participatory forums (Magnusson, 2020; van Burgsteden & te

Molder, 2022), activism (Pütz, 2020), traditional and social media (Nielsen, 2023; Salomaa, 2020), workplace encounters (Van De Mierop et al., 2019; Salomaa, 2024), and health care consultations (Stevanovic et al., 2022; Logren et al., 2017), shows how interactional organization of activities like decision-making, problem-solving and public debate shapes people's possibilities for influence. Bringing together researchers working across institutional and mundane contexts, the panel explores how people with differing interests and stakes co-create, refrain from engaging in, or constrain opportunities for voice, influence, and mutual understanding – for themselves as well as for others.

The panel invites studies on democratic participation and interactional practices that can either bridge divides or intensify polarization. Contributions may draw on ethnomethodology, (multimodal) conversation analysis, membership categorization analysis, narrative and positioning analysis, discursive psychology, interactional sociolinguistics and related approaches that treat participation as accomplished through situated sequential practices.

References

Logren, A., Ruusuvuori, J. & Laitinen, J. 2017. Group members' questions shape participation in health counselling and health education. *Patient Education and Counseling* 100(0), 1828-1841. Magnusson, S. 2020. Constructing young citizens' deontic authority in participatory democracy meetings. *Discourse & Communication* 14(6), 600–618.

Nielsen, S. B. 2023. Orchestration of perspectives in televised climate change debates. *Discourse & Society* 34(2), 175-191.

OECD (2024), *OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions – 2024 Results: Building Trust in a Complex Policy Environment*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en>.

Pütz, O. 2020. *Talking collective action: A sequential analysis of strategic planning in anti-nuclear groups*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Salomaa, E. 2020. *Dissertation: In the intersection of television and Twitter: Social television as a tool for interaction and participation in a media event*. *Fachsprache* vol. XLII 1–2, 72–75.

Salomaa, E. 2024. Digital facilitation-as-a-process: The mismatch between promotional text and situated interaction. *Discourse, Context & Media* 62.

Stevanovic, M., Weiste, E. & Uusitalo, L. L. 2022. Challenges of client participation in the co-development of social and health care services: Imbalances of control over action and the management of the interactional agenda. *SSM - Qualitative Research in Health* 2.

van Burgsteden, L. & te Molder, H. 2022. Shelving Issues: Patrolling the Boundaries of Democratic Discussion in Public Meetings. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 41(6), 685-715.

Van De Mierop, D., Clifton, J. & Verhelst, A. 2019. Investigating the interplay between formal and informal leaders in a shared leadership configuration: A multimodal conversation analytical study. *Human Relations*, 73(4), 490-515.

Digital communication within and across generations: Linguistic practices, norms, and media ideologies (organized by *Marianne Skov, Kira Heiskanen, Andreas Candefors Stæhr, Åsa Palviainen, Åsa Wengelin*)

This panel explores digital communication within and across generations as a site where social divides may emerge, but also where communicative bridges are built. As digitally mediated interaction has become an integral part of everyday life across age groups, people from different generations are increasingly engaging with one another online. These generations may differ in communicative styles, norms, media ideologies, and experiences with digital technologies, depending on when such technologies became part of their everyday lives. Research on digital communication, however, has predominantly focused on young people's online interactions, language use, and identity work, as they were the first to embrace new communication technologies. In contrast, digitally mediated interactions between older adults and communication across generations have received less attention within media-focused language research (Stæhr 2023) and in sociolinguistics in general (Coupland 2004) (but see Fernández-Ardèvol et al. 2022, Hansen and Stæhr 2020, Palviainen 2021, Stæhr 2023, and Tagg and Lyons 2022).

Addressing this gap, the panel invites researchers to examine how linguistic practices, norms of language use, and social relations unfold and are negotiated within and across generations in digitally mediated contexts. The panel welcomes contributions analyzing language users' meta-linguistic and meta-pragmatic reflections, their actual communicative practices, or a combination of both.

Bringing together perspectives on intra- and intergenerational digital language practices across a range of geographical and social contexts, the panel explores how social interaction unfolds in digitally mediated spaces and how norms of language use and media ideologies are articulated by media users of different ages. In this way, the panel highlights how digital communication may produce social division through clashes of communicative norms, expectations, and media ideologies, while also creating opportunities for adaptation, alignment, and common ground.

References.

Coupland, N. (2004). Age in social and sociolinguistic theory. In J.F. Nussbaum and J. Coupland (eds.), *Handbook of communication and aging research* (pp. 69–90). London: Routledge.

Fernández-Ardèvol, M., Belotti, F., Ieracitano, F., Mulargia, S., Rosales, A. and Comunello, F. (2022). "I do it my way": Idioms of practice and digital media ideologies of adolescents and older adults. *New media & society* 24(1): 31-49.

Hansen, M. H. and Stæhr A. C. (2021). Sproglige generationsforskelle på de sociale medier. [Linguistic generational differences on social media]. *NyS, Nydanske Sprogstudier*, 1(59): 113-165.

Palviainen, Å. (2021). This is the normal for us: managing the mobile, multilingual, digital family. In L. Wright and C. Higgins (eds.), *Diversifying Family Language Policy*. Pennsylvania: Bloomsbury.

Stæhr, A. C. (2023). Digital language practices and youth in the family. In B.A. Svendsen and R. Jonsson (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Youth Culture* (pp. 235-248). London: Routledge.

Tagg, C. and Lyons, A. (2022). *Mobile Messaging and Resourcefulness: A Post-digital Ethnography* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Digital Humanities and Pragmatics in Tourism: Discourse, Data, and the Construction of Tourist Imaginaries (organized by *Ayodele James Akinola, Lindsay Yotsukura, Fredrick Friday John, Simeon Oyedemi Ajiboye*)

Tourism is rarely a neutral encounter. Digitally mediated tourism discourse is a space where cultural imaginaries, identity, emotion and intentionality are constructed, negotiated, contested, and sometimes weaponized. Representations of places and peoples circulate as hyperreal simulacra; host and guest identities are negotiated under conditions of asymmetry; and antagonism, misrecognition, and polarisation find expression in the seemingly ordinary language of reviews, captions, and platform-curated narratives. This panel takes that contested communicative space as its object of inquiry, bringing Digital Humanities and Pragmatics together to examine how digital tourism discourse both reflects and reproduces broader tensions in cross-cultural understanding.

In direct conversation with the IPrA 2027 conference theme of building bridges and mitigating antagonism, conflict, and polarisation, we ask what role language plays in either deepening or bridging the divides that tourism discourse so often enacts. Online platforms amplify certain voices while marginalizing others, and algorithmic curation shapes which cultural narratives gain visibility. The pragmatics of evaluation, stance, and face-work in reviews and social media further encode attitudes that can reinforce stereotypes or open space for genuine cross-cultural dialogue. Understanding these dynamics requires integrating computational methods with pragmatically informed discourse analysis, and that integration is the methodological commitment that unifies this panel.

Drawing on frameworks from interactional pragmatics, speech act theory, metapragmatic awareness, and critical discourse analysis, and employing methods such as corpus linguistics, sentiment analysis, and semantic network analysis, contributions to this panel will examine how meaning is produced, negotiated, and contested in digital tourism ecosystems. Of particular theoretical interest is the way simulacra and hyperreality (Baudrillard) operate in tourism communication. When destinations are evaluated not against lived experience but against prior representations, the pragmatic act of reviewing becomes a site of image-reproduction rather than authentic exchange, with real consequences for how cultures are perceived and misperceived across difference.

Potential topics include, but are not limited to:

- Pragmatic strategies in online travel reviews and ratings
- Computational approaches to tourism discourse analysis
- Digital representations of culture and identity in tourism platforms
- Algorithmic curation and the making of tourist imaginaries
- Multimodal discourse in tourism (text, image, video)
- Hyperreality and contemporary tourism communication
- The pragmatics of tourism and the tourism of pragmatics
- Ethical dimensions of

representation in digital tourism discourse

- Construction of emotion and identity in digital tourism discourse
- Intentionality in digital tourism discourse

The panel is designed to accommodate paper presentations and discussion-oriented sessions, fostering methodological exchange and theoretical reflection in equal measure. A minimum of three presentations per 90-minute session is anticipated, with the possibility of extending to multiple sessions depending on the number and quality of submissions.

Our panel is organized under the auspices of the American Center for Interdisciplinary Research (ACIR), a nonprofit organization dedicated to fostering interdisciplinary engagement and collaborative knowledge exchange. We welcome submissions from scholars working in digital humanities, pragmatics, tourism studies, communication, and related fields. Established and emerging researchers alike are encouraged to submit, and younger scholars in particular are warmly invited to consider whether their work speaks to this panel's themes.

Digital humour and multimodal communication in WhatsApp interactions: Pragmatic practices, resources and methodological challenges (organized by *Esther Linares-Bernabéu*)

The increasing prominence of instant messaging applications has transformed everyday communication practices, giving rise to new forms of interaction in which verbal and multimodal resources are intricately combined. Among these platforms, WhatsApp offers a particularly rich environment for the study of digital humour, as users frequently employ emojis, stickers, GIFs, memes, images and other semiotic resources to create, negotiate and interpret humorous meanings.

This panel aims to explore the pragmatic mechanisms underlying humour in WhatsApp interactions, with special attention to the role of multimodality in the co-construction of humorous discourse. Drawing on recent developments in digital pragmatics, corpus pragmatics and multimodal discourse analysis, the panel seeks to examine how humour emerges through the interplay of linguistic, visual and interactional cues within digitally mediated communication.

The panel will address both theoretical and methodological issues involved in the analysis of digital humorous practices. In particular, it welcomes contributions focusing on the compilation and annotation of digital corpora, the pragmatic functions of multimodal elements, the sequential organisation of humorous exchanges, the management of face and politeness through humour, the construction of interpersonal relationships and identities, and the role of humour in guiding interpretation and preventing misunderstandings in online environments.

Contributions adopting different methodological approaches are encouraged, including qualitative discourse analysis, corpus-based studies, ethnographic perspectives, experimental designs and interdisciplinary frameworks combining pragmatics with sociolinguistics, communication studies or computational methods. Comparative studies involving different languages, cultures, age groups or digital platforms are also particularly welcome.

Potential topics include, but are not limited to:

- Pragmatic annotation and corpus-based approaches to digital humour;
 - The functions of emojis stickers, GIFs and memes in humorous interaction;
 - Textualised laughter and multimodal representations of amusement;
 - Humour, facework and (im)politeness in digital communication;
 - Generational and sociocultural variation in humorous practices online;
 - Sequential and discourse-structural aspects of humorous exchanges;
 - Identity construction and community building through digital humour;
 - Methodological innovations in the analysis of multimodal digital discourse.
-

The panel is intended as a forum for scholars interested in pragmatics, digital discourse, multimodality and humour studies. By bringing together researchers working from diverse theoretical traditions and methodological perspectives, it seeks to advance our understanding of how humour functions within contemporary digitally mediated interactions and to foster dialogue on emerging analytical challenges in this rapidly evolving field.

Discourse-pragmatic markers and discourse segmentation models: Testing approaches in the light of interactives (organized by *Reijirou Shibasaki, Salvador Pons Bordería*)

After successful panels on discourse-pragmatic markers at the 18th

and 19th International Pragmatics Conferences in Brussels (July 2023) and in Brisbane (June 2025), respectively, this panel intends to (re)examine discourse-pragmatic markers from a broader theoretical point of view, i.e. by comparing Thetical Grammar – and particularly, interactives (Heine 2023) – with models of discourse segmentation (Pons Bordería ed. 2014).

Heine (2023) examines what have been termed discourse-pragmatic markers, interjections, social formulae, etc., and categorizes them under a new label of interactives. Interactives are defined as invariable deictic forms that are “in some way set off from the surrounding text semantically, syntactically, and prosodically and can neither be negated nor questioned” (Heine 2023: 7).

A theory of interactives has the potential of integrating a wide range of discourse-pragmatic markers into a unified subject of research and thus deserves further study and explanation. According to Heine (2023: 18, 269, elsewhere), interactives are likely to appear at the left or the right periphery of an utterance, which serves as a test case to debate, assess or prove the validity of current discourse models (e.g. Koops and Lohmann 2015; Haselow 2019; Lohmann and Koops 2021; Pons Bordería et al. 2023; Higashiizumi and Shibasaki 2025).

For its part, discourse segmentation models (Roulet et al. 1985, 2001; Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1987; Briz and Grupo Val.Es.Co. 2003; Degand and Simon 2009; Cresti and Gramigni 2003; Ferrari and Borreguero 2015) aim at reaching a full segmentation of spontaneous conversations – or even written texts – beyond the traditional syntactic tools. This produces a

homogeneous segmentation of discourse markers as procedural elements with marked positional preferences reflecting their function, be it textual (text-to-text), modal (speaker's stance-to-text) or interpersonal (speaker-to-hearer). As a result, for instance, the left- vs. right periphery debate turns out to be epiphenomenal, as it assumes only one discourse unit (utterance) and only one initial position (Salameh, Estellés and Pons 2018). As a corollary, this approach assumes that monologic and dialogic, textual or modal functions show positional preferences within discourse units.

In conclusion, this panel groups together for the first time two exciting approaches to discourse-pragmatic markers in order to compare, test, and discuss their contributions to this classic battleground of Pragmatics.

Potential contributors are invited to submit their thought-provoking proposals on 1) how to deal with discourse-pragmatic markers as interactives, 2) how discourse-pragmatic markers are described in terms of discourse segmentation models; 3) other potential types of interactives than mentioned in Heine (2023), and 4) explore other related issues raised by these theories.

Discursive Injustice in Healthcare: Microaggressions, Silencing, and the Politics of Clinical Interaction (organized by *Maria Grazia Rossi, Cristina Ganz*)

A consistent part of studies on communication in medical settings has focused on the interactional challenges deriving from the asymmetry of knowledge and social roles, indicating such asymmetry as one of the primary causes of frequent suboptimal outcomes in professional-patient interactions (Bigi & Rossi, 2023). Scholarship has begun to examine a related but distinct set of phenomena: the ways in which clinical interaction becomes a site where discursive injustice is produced and sustained. Phenomena such as microaggressions (Sue, 2010; Freeman & Weekes Schroer, 2020; Freeman & Stewart, 2024) and epistemic injustices (Fricker, 2007; Carel & Kidd, 2014), are not occasional aberrations but recurrent features of exchanges shaped by race, gender, class, disability, and institutional asymmetry. While existing scholarship on these phenomena has largely relied on retrospective testimony or third-person description, this panel calls for theoretical, empirical, interaction-level investigation of how discursive injustice is produced, sustained, and resisted in real clinical dialogue.

In this panel, we claim that understanding discursive injustice in healthcare requires attention to both the micro-level of clinical dialogue and the broader structural conditions that shape whose voices are heard and whose words count. Drawing on pragmatic and discourse-analytic frameworks, as well as the theory of speech acts (Langton, 1993; Kukla, 2014; McGowan, 2026), we invite contributions that examine how injustice is enacted, recognised, and resisted in interaction.

We invite presentations addressing the following questions:

- What conceptual tools best capture the mechanisms through which discursive injustice is enacted in clinical dialogue?
- How can pragmatics-driven accounts address the interplay between microaggressions and epistemic injustices in clinical interaction?
- How do these phenomena reshape the doctor-patient trust relationship and patients' well-being?

Phenomena and contexts:

What forms does discursive injustice take in healthcare – dismissal of symptoms, asymmetric repair, failure of uptake, or microaggressive framing?What forms does discursive injustice take in healthcare – dismissal of symptoms, asymmetric repair, failure of uptake, or microaggressive framing?

Data and methods:What methodological approaches are appropriate for studying discursive injustice in naturally occurring clinical interaction?What are the ethical challenges of collecting and analysing such data, and how can patients' perspectives be incorporated without reducing them to testimony alone?We welcome contributions from researchers working on theoretical dimensions in pragmatics and the philosophy of language, on social epistemology at its intersection with medical discourse, and on empirical approaches to clinical interaction. We particularly encourage submissions that engage with interactional data – whether from primary care, hospital consultations, mental health settings, or other clinical contexts – as well as contributions that examine how structural and institutional conditions shape the micro-level of clinical dialogue. Contributions addressing questions of race, gender, disability, or other axes of marginalisation.

Disentangling the news. On the state of a linguistics of news production. (organized by Geert Jacobs, Daniel Perrin, Sofie Verkest)

This panel brings together new research on the language of newsmaking as well as on how newsmaking interacts with other institutional domains like health, business, politics, science and the arts. Exploring the contingencies of an age of post-journalism and GenAI, the panel goes beyond an exclusive focus on selected professionals in the newsroom towards integrating a wide range of other stakeholders – such as providers of AI tools and social media platforms – and how they partake in the complex, elusive and often hidden discursive processes that entangle the news.

In doing so, we propose a broad redefinition of the news, one that embraces the disorder characterizing today's constantly developing, heavily digitized and globalized mediascape and resists binary product-process or production-consumption simplifications; we adopt a broad, all-inclusive understanding of the news as a mixed and endless array of topics and discursive moves that fuel public debate.

The panel also invites methodological reflection, including scrutiny of the analytic power of a linguistic ethnographic perspective in disentangling the news, as well as debate on the options for an activist perspective, opening up the workings of the news to general scrutiny and how this can be instrumental in promoting knowledge transfer and transformation as part of the global democratic project in increasingly challenging political contexts.

In raising these issues, the panel is to be situated within the linguistics of news production as articulated in the 2011 NewsTalk&Text position paper but also as a response to more recent calls to explore the dynamics of textual trajectories in professional and workplace practice, including Lillis & Maybin's 2017. Like in their special issue the focus in this panel is on "the propensity of texts to be transferred, transposed and transformed by a wide range of text makers and users (e.g. designers, disseminators, users, interpreters) across different contexts, with different resultant meanings, significance and effects" (409). More widely, it is inspired by Bakhtin's notion of dialogicity (Bakhtin 1984 [1929]; Bakhtin 1981 [1935]) as well as

by work in linguistic anthropology on entextualization and recontextualization (Bauman and Briggs 1990).

Disfluency in action: Rethinking fluency in social interaction (organized by *Tomoko Endo*)

Traditionally, studies of language have tended to rely on written data (Linell 2005), which seldom becomes disfluent. From the perspective of speech production (cf. Levelt 1983), features of disfluency such as pauses, elongations, cut-offs, fillers, and repetitions have been treated as symptoms of trouble or error. In actual conversation, however, such features are so common that they cannot be ignored and need serious attention (Gilquin and De Cock 2013). Studies of naturally occurring interaction have shown that disfluent speech is often interactionally motivated and serves as an important resource for managing social interaction. For example, self-repair may be implemented to secure recipients' understanding or to address moral issues (Bolden et al. 2022; Jefferson 1974). Disfluency may also arise from the delicate nature of the topic and can occasion collaborative turn construction by recipients (Lerner 2013). In addition, fillers such as *uh(m)*

can be utilized for turn organization (Barns 2023), and some seemingly ill-formed grammatical constructions emerge in spontaneous interaction and become conventionalized carrying specific discourse functions such as topic management or stance-taking (Hopper 2001). These studies demonstrate that speakers may produce utterances that are designedly disfluent in order to manage emerging interactional contingencies.

The goal of this panel is to explore the range of interactional contingencies and outcomes associated with disfluency across contexts. In particular, disfluency should be analyzed at a broader level; not only within individual turns, but also across turns and even across sequences, since social action never occurs in isolation. This panel therefore investigates the intricate relationship between speech disfluency and interactional consequences, with the aim of reconsidering the notions of “fluency” and “disfluency” as interactional resources and/or achievements.

The panel invites contributions that investigate phenomena related to disfluency in any language. Target of analysis range from speech production issues such as pauses, elongations, cut-offs and repetitions, uses of fillers and discourse markers, and uses of grammatical constructions. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to, self- and other-repair, action formation, multi-unit turn construction, topic management, and sequence organization. Contributions may draw on data from casual conversation, institutional interaction, or interaction involving L2 speakers. While conversation analysis and interactional linguistics constitute the main focus of the panel, studies informed by other approaches are also welcome, provided that they are based on analyses of naturally occurring interaction.

Efficacious Words: Religion, Speech Acts and (Im)politeness in Historical Pragmatics (organized by *Annick Paternoster, Kim Ridealgh, Luis Unceta Gómez*)

This panel contributes to the next phase of Historical (Im)politeness Research and Historical Pragmatics: a move beyond segmented studies of individual periods and languages towards longer diachronies, contrastive research and renewed theoretical reflection on what counts as pragmatic action in historically and geographically distant linguacultures. A central question

is how religious beliefs, institutions and ritual practices have shaped what historical actors understood words to do in interaction and in social relationships.

We invite papers on any language, period or tradition that examine how religious frameworks structure pragmatic action. We are especially interested in words treated as actions able to bless, curse, bind, absolve, heal, protect, consecrate, excommunicate, prophesy or exorcise. Such cases challenge current speech act categories and suggest that, for many past cultures, declaratives and other efficacious utterances may have occupied a more central place than modern classifications allow.

A key aim is to connect micro-level, emic analyses with macro-historical questions about how speech acts emerge and move between religious, legal, medical, magical and everyday settings. Papers may ask when pragmatic acts become, or cease to be, religious; what evidence points to sacralisation, desacralisation or routinisation; and whether comparable patterns can be identified across ancient, classical and other pre-Christian traditions, Abrahamic and non-Abrahamic religions, and the religious, ritual and philosophical traditions of East and South Asia.

A particular stimulus for the panel is recent work on verbal efficacy and ritualised language, including Leslie Arnovick's *Verbal Medicines: The Curative Power of Prayer and Invocation in Early English Charms* (2024). This research invites historical pragmatics to take seriously utterances whose force is curative, protective, exorcistic or harm-averting. Work on blasphemy and harmful speech is equally important, showing that words could be evaluated as offensive, sinful or dangerous because of their perceived capacity to damage persons and communities.

Possible topics include address to God or other supernatural addressees; divine or supernatural beings as overhearers, witnesses or agents in curses, blessings, vows and imprecations; emic discourses on the power and danger of words; religiously anchored speech acts such as thanking, apologising, promising, swearing and greeting; and under-researched pragmatic acts such as oaths, charms, invocations, healing formulae, exorcisms, prophecies and divinations.

We particularly welcome longer-diachronic, contrastive, multilingual and multimodal work.

Emancipating grammatical concepts from English and Indo-European languages

(organized by *Tsuyoshi Ono, Ritva Laury, Natsuko Nakagawa*)

Standard grammatical concepts such as agreement, case, subject, direct object, phrases, clauses, and sentences are predominantly derived from the study of dominant Indo-European languages, including Latin, Greek, German, and English. It raises a crucial question: how can we ensure that these concepts are suitable for analyzing languages from different language families? A brief examination of representative non-Indo-European languages reveals significant differences compared to languages like English (e.g., Japanese v.s. English clauses). Some studies based on conversational data have begun to address this issue (e.g., Ewing 2021; Laury, Ono, and Suzuki 2021). Moreover, the influence of dominant languages and cultures on research in non-Western and non-US contexts has been highlighted recently both within and outside of linguistics (see Haspelmath 2023 for typology; Labrune 2024 for phonology; Otani et al. 2025 for general linguistics; Igarashi 2025 for sociology).

We propose organizing a cross-linguistic panel that focuses on grammatical concepts in the analysis of conversational data, challenging the straightforward application of standard concepts. Our goal is not to dismiss these traditional concepts. Instead, we aim to: 1) evaluate their appropriateness for analyzing the languages represented in the panel, 2) identify any shortcomings they may have, and 3) explore alternative concepts for analyzing these languages. We focus on both structure and use. We aim to consider how our findings may inform future efforts in relevant areas, including language documentation, contrastive analysis, typology, and universals.

We will invite participation in the panel through public advertisements (e.g., mailing lists) and by private contact with scholars. Our objective is to feature conversation data from languages with diverse genetic, typological, and regional characteristics, and to include both junior and senior scholars from various parts of the world.

Researchers working on Finnish, Indonesian, Japanese, Mano (Mande), Ryukyuan, Xibe (Tungusic), and Tibeto-Burman languages have so far shown interest in participating in our panel.

Emancipatory Pragmatics: Seeking Deeper Understandings (organized by *Scott Saft, Ayako Namba, Yuko Nomura*)

Emancipatory Pragmatics (EP) is an approach that since being introduced in 2007 has focused on discourse from non-western languages in order to gain a better understanding of the diverse ways that language is used across the globe. In exploring patterns of discourse, EP has at times sought to develop theoretical perspectives that do not derive from Euro-American language data. Most recently, EP researchers employed the Japanese concept of *ba*, most commonly translated as “field” in English, to reconsider how the notion of context is approached in Pragmatics, an endeavor which culminated in an edited volume applying *ba* not only to Japanese but also to discourse in Hawaiian, Korean, Mandarin, Thai, as well as German and English (Fujii et al. 2025). With that research now published, this panel seeks to expand the EP perspective by further exploring patterns of language usage and possibly developing new theoretical frameworks.

To do so, the panel seeks contributions from researchers working on data from non-western languages that may be difficult to explain via already existing frameworks in Pragmatics such as speech act theory, politeness theory, relevance theory, and conversation analysis, or that may invite reinterpretations from different perspectives. Contributions may advance new concepts, that include but are in no way limited to *ba*, to explain language usage. In previous EP research, for instance, Intachakara (2012) suggested that the Thai concept of *k^hwa:mkre:ŋteaj* (abbreviated as *KKJ*) can explain how politeness works in Thai and possibly other Asian languages. Likewise, contributions may focus on patterns of discourse in specific languages. For example, in a special issue on EP in the *Journal of Pragmatics*, (Sugawara 2012) reported extended overlapping in conversations in the African language *!Gui*, a finding that challenged many of the assumptions of one speaker at a time in research on turn-taking from the perspective of conversation analysis. Sugawara used this finding to suggest that the field of Pragmatics has yet to fully understand the diverse participation structures and interactional roles that humans are capable of in social interaction.

Since 2007, EP research has examined linguistic patterns in a variety of non-western languages that include IGui, Hawaiian, Korean, Japanese, Kilivila, Lao, Libyan Arabic, Mandarin, Mayan, Persian, and Thai. Researchers from the EP perspective believe that continued examination of language practices is the true key to understanding how humans throughout the world approach and engage in social interaction. This panel already has secured participation from researchers focusing on Hawaiian, Japanese, Libyan Arabic, Mandarin, Persian, and Korean, and is hoping for at least three further languages to be represented to give a total of nine presentations via three time slots. With such diverse representation, the panel, it is hoped, will advance our understanding of world language practices and in the process push the field of Pragmatics to deepen its appreciation of the capacity of humans to organize language and social interaction.

Emoji-Mediated Pragmatics in Digital Communication: Interfaces, Cultures, and Methods (organized by *Jing JIN, Yang YANG*)

1. Theme and Aim

In today's digital communication, emojis are no longer peripheral or merely decorative elements of written text. Rather, they have transitioned into sophisticated paralinguistic tools that encode, modify, and realize illocutionary forces at the intersection of cross-cultural conventions and digital platform affordances (Yus, 2025). Increasingly, emojis function as use-conditional expressives (Grosz, 2022) that directly alter the pragmatic weight of an utterance. They also bring about generational shifts in pragmatic baselines, with layered, ironic, and stance-marking uses widely observed among Gen Z (Abbasi et al., 2025).

Against this backdrop, this panel addresses a timely and theoretically significant issue in contemporary pragmatics: how emoji use reshapes the interpretation and production of utterances in the context of digital communication. By bridging linguistic and socio-cultural theories and engaging in sustained dialogue with current research on digital discourse, the panel aims to create a focused venue for examining how pragmatic meaning is constructed through emojis, whose use can be culturally variable, platform-sensitive, and interactionally strategic.

2. Major Topics

The panel welcomes theoretically informed and empirically grounded contributions from a broad range of perspectives, such as linguistic analysis, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, corpus-based research, multimodal analysis, experimental methods, and mixed-methods approaches. Relevant topics will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Syntax, semantics, and/or pragmatics of emojis in digital communication;
- Function of emojis in signaling, modulating, or reconfiguring speech acts and illocutionary force;
- Pragmatic choices of emojis shaped by institutional settings, role relationships, and platform-specific conventions;
- Role of emojis in relational work, including politeness, face management, stance-taking, alignment, and interactional delicacy;
- Intercultural and intergenerational variation in emoji interpretation and pragmatic norms; and
- Any other topics related to emoji-mediated pragmatics.

3. Value

Recognizing that research on emojis remains theoretically and methodologically fragmented across different traditions, the proposed panel seeks to advance a more integrated understanding of emoji-mediated communication by drawing the above-mentioned strands into conversation. By situating emoji use within broader sociohistorical and cultural ecologies, the panel will provide a forum illuminating how emergent norms of digital communication challenge stable assumptions about shared background knowledge and common ground in pragmatic theory.

References

Abbasi, M., Jamshed, N., & Bilal, R. (2025). Discourse analysis of emoji use in digital communication by the Millennials & Gen Z: A comparative endeavor. *The Journal of Cultural Perspectives*, 4(1), 80–108.

Yus, F. (2025). *Emoji Pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Evaluation in interaction: constructing referents and stances (organized by *Elena Battaglia, Caterina Mauri*)

Background and goals

This workshop aims to advance our understanding of evaluation as a fundamental dimension of human interaction, addressing how it is expressed, collaboratively constructed, and contributes to discourse organization.

We define evaluation as a modal attitude whereby speakers assess entities and states of affairs in terms of value rather than possibility and necessity (Nuyts 2025). Occasionally discussed as appreciative modality, this domain has received comparatively little attention within modality studies.

As research has increasingly shown that epistemic meanings are not merely internal states but are intersubjective and publicly negotiated (Pietrandrea 2018), we advocate for a similar paradigm shift in the study of evaluative meanings. Conversation-analytic research has indeed shown that evaluation routinely occurs in assessment pairs, sequence closure, and storytelling feedback as part of stance-taking.

Call for papers

We welcome papers based on spoken data from diverse languages, further questioning the interactional foundation of evaluation and its grammar. The workshop will revolve around three foci.

1) Linguistic strategies for evaluation.

Beyond well-studied lexical and morphological means (Grandi & Körtvélyessy 2015), evaluation is also associated to recurrent syntactic (co-)constructions, like right-dislocation (*c'est joli ça*, De Stefani & Horlacher 2017:20). Yet, a systematic account of evaluative resources is still lacking.

What linguistic constructions encode evaluative meanings? Are there emerging constructions gravitating towards (or away from) evaluative functions (e.g., response particles like Italian *va bene* ‘that’s good’)?

2) Patterns of evaluation in interaction.

Since evaluation necessarily involves an object of evaluation, understanding evaluative meanings also requires understanding how participants collaboratively construct what is made assessable in the first place (Mauri et al. 2021).

How do participants construct an assessable referent and negotiate their local understanding of an evaluative meaning? How do evaluation and reference construction interact in the unfolding of social action?

3) Towards an “evaluative engine”.

Parallel to the “epistemic engine” (Heritage 2012), assessment pairs appear to be driven by “symmetry of commitment” (Thompson & Couper-Kuhlen 2015:14), suggesting that the pursuit of a shared evaluative stance may shape the development of sequences.

What is the role of evaluation in the organization of interaction? To what extent does evaluation motivate reference construction and interactional trajectories, rather than simply accompanying them?

References

De Stefani & Horlacher (2017). Une étude interactionnelle de la grammaire: la dislocation à droite évaluative dans la parole-en-interaction. *Revue française de linguistique appliquée*, XXII(2),15–32. Grandi & Körtvélyessy (eds.) (2015). *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh University Press. Heritage (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1),30–52. Mauri, Gorla, Fiorentini (eds.) (2021). *Building Categories in Interaction: Linguistic resources at work*, John Benjamins. Nuyts (2025). *Modality in Mind*. CUP. Pietrandrea (2018). Epistemic constructions at work: A corpus study on spoken Italian dialogues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 128,61–81. Thompson, Fox & Couper-Kuhlen (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. CUP

Evidentiality at the syntax–semantics–pragmatics interface in Romance and beyond (organized by *Aoife Ahern, Jose Aménos-Pons*)

In research on evidentiality, the initial focus on languages that grammatically encode information source (Aikhenvald 2004, 2018, 2021) has subsequently widened. Studies analysing how evidential meaning is conveyed through the interaction of pragmatics, semantics and grammar have become increasingly abundant (Squartini 2001, 2008, 2018; Cornillie 2007; Albelda 2015; Cabedo and Figueras 2018), among which Romance languages, especially French (Dendale 2022 and references therein), have begun to gain prominence. This line of research has contributed knowledge on how languages grammaticalize discourse-level functions (such as illocutionary force and speaker commitment) and how the resulting forms interact with epistemic modality, reportativity, and inferential meaning in ways that resist reduction to any single level of linguistic analysis. Recent work illustrates how evidential interpretations emerge through verbal tense and

aspect, copular and pseudocopular constructions, complementiser systems, discourse markers, impersonal structures, and perspectivisation phenomena (Escandell-Vidal 2010, 2018a, 2022, 2024; Bermúdez 2005; Rodríguez Ramalle 2015; Pérez-Jiménez et al. 2018). Analyses based on Relevance Theory's ostensive-inferential model of pragmatics offer a promising approach to disentangling the interaction between explicit and implicitly expressed evidentiality (Ifantidou 2001; Papafragou et al. 2007; Ünal and Papafragou 2018). Its principled framework naturally accounts for regularities in the inferential processes leading to utterance information-source identification.

In this panel, focusing on phenomena operating at the syntax-semantics-pragmatics interfaces, research will be presented on the expression of evidentiality in a range of Romance languages and varieties, including work on contact varieties and adopting comparative perspectives. We welcome contributions addressing the mechanisms through which information source, speaker commitment and perspective are conveyed in languages lacking evidential paradigms. Theoretical debates concerning the relationship between evidentiality, epistemic modality, subjectivisation and perspectivisation (Traugott 1995; Boye 2010; McCready 2015), as well as work on the derivation of evidential interpretations from contextual enrichment, inferential processes and procedural meaning (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995; Escandell-Vidal and Leonetti 2011; de Saussure 2013) will all be prioritised.

Thus, the panel will welcome theoretical, descriptive, corpus-based, experimental and acquisitional contributions. Topics may include evidential interpretations of tense and aspect (Squartini 2001; Escandell-Vidal 2014, 2022), evidential discourse markers and complementisers (Cornillie and Gras 2015; Demonte and Fernández Soriano 2019), evidential effects in copular and impersonal constructions (Escandell-Vidal 2018b; Fernández 2008), dialectal and microparametric variation, grammaticalisation pathways, perspectivisation in discourse, and the acquisition of evidential strategies in first and second languages (Ahern, Amenós-Pons and Guijarro-Fuentes 2024). Comparative studies involving Romance and non-Romance languages are encouraged, as are studies focusing on Romance varieties in contact with genetically and typologically distinct languages.

Explaining the emergence of pragmatic markers: Cooptation, pragmaticalization, constructionalization? (organized by *Wiltrud Mihatsch, Inga Hennecke, Gunther Kaltenböck, Stefan Schneider*)

Pragmatic markers, a heterogeneous class of extra-clausal expressions including discourse markers, stance adverbials, interjections, and formulae of social exchange, occupy a peculiar position in linguistic analysis. While their functional properties are relatively well described, the mechanisms underlying their diachronic or synchronic emergence remain a matter of ongoing debate.

To explain their development, different processes have been proposed, especially cooptation, pragmaticalization, constructionalization, and grammaticalization. The framework of Discourse Grammar (e.g. Heine et al. 2013) assumes that their development involves cooptation, an instantaneous redeployment of sentence grammar material as interpersonal, discourse-managing elements, which may subsequently undergo grammaticalization. Pragmaticalization, on the other hand, treats the emergence of pragmatic markers as a distinct pathway, parallel to grammaticalization (e.g. Erman & Kotsinas 1993). Another approach, rooted in Construction Grammar, reframes the development as constructionalization (e.g.

Traugott & Trousdale 2013): the formation of a new form-meaning pairing with procedural meaning as a new node in the construct-i-con. The development of pragmatic markers has also been explained by drawing on the process of grammaticalization (e.g. Boye & Harder 2007). Emergent grammar (e.g. Hopper 1998) offers a framework for the use of pragmatic markers by relocating the locus of emergence from the diachronic dimension to the interactional moment itself.

This workshop brings together theoretical and empirical perspectives on how pragmatic markers arise. The focus is on the competing (but potentially complementary) explanatory frameworks of cooptation, pragmaticalization, and constructionalization. The workshop invites contributions that examine these mechanisms through diverse data types and across a range of languages and marker types in order to foster dialogue between different frameworks, including Discourse Grammar, grammaticalization theory, Interactional Linguistics, and usage-based Construction Grammar.

Possible research topics and questions

- Comparing frameworks: To what extent are they compatible or do they make conflicting claims about the emergence?
- Comparing pragmatic markers: Do different types of pragmatic markers favour different pathways?
- Cooptation and constructionalization: How does cooptation relate to Diachronic Construction Grammar?
- Cooptation and subjectification/intersubjectification: Are there points of convergence?
- Diachronic case studies: Tracing the emergence of discourse markers, parentheticals, comment clauses, etc. through corpus-based methods
- Synchronic variation: Does the emergence of pragmatic markers differ across registers, genres, and interactional contexts?
- Cross-linguistic scope: Does the formation of pragmatic markers operate uniformly across typologically different languages, or is its application language- or structure-specific?

References

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31, 3: 569–606.
- Erman, Britt and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. Pragmaticalization: the case of *ba'* and *you know*. *Studier i modern språkvetenskap* 10: 76–92.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva, and Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Shannon Bischoff and Carmen Jany (eds.). *Functional Approaches to Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 175–233.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1998. Emergent grammar. In Michael Tomasello (ed.). *The new psychology of language. Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 155–175.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Exploring the Complexity of Stance in Context (organized by *Hiroko Takanashi, Ryoko Suzuki, Yuko Iwata*)

Du Bois (2007) conceptualizes stancetaking as a sociocognitive and sociocultural act, as formalized in the stance triangle. This model captures three interrelated dimensions: speakers evaluate a shared object, position themselves, and intersubjectively align with one another at varying degrees and orientations through dialogic interaction. As such, the stance triangle has been widely adopted across fields such as pragmatics, discourse analysis, interactional linguistics, and corpus linguistics, where it serves as a powerful analytical framework.

However, the inherent complexity of stance has often led subsequent studies to emphasize only selected components of the model or to confine analysis to narrowly defined micro-contexts. Consequently, the broader sociocultural environments in which stance is embedded have not always been sufficiently explored. This limitation calls for a more integrative approach that attends to both interactional detail and wider contextual implications.

In naturally occurring discourse, the elements of stancetaking—stance subjects and a shared stance object—rarely appear in clearly delineated forms. Rather than involving only two subjects, stancetaking may encompass multiple participants, while the stance object can shift, evolve, or expand throughout the interaction. These fluid developments reflect the emergent and dynamic nature of stance. Importantly, such variability does not undermine the stance triangle model; rather, it highlights the need to reconsider how contextual factors shape its configuration in practice.

This panel reexamines Du Bois's theory by foregrounding stance as an interactive, sequential process situated within indexical and sociocultural contexts. By closely analyzing how stances emerge, unfold, and transform, the discussion aims to provide a more comprehensive account of their dynamic properties and their role in constructing social meaning and value systems.

Stance is fundamentally collaborative, as participants continuously negotiate and adjust their subjectivities in relation to one another. Beyond managing immediate interaction, this process contributes to the formation of social relationships and shared ideologies within communities. Drawing on data from diverse languages, including English and Japanese, and from real-world settings such as guided walking tours and family mealtime conversations, this panel aims to extend the theoretical scope of stancetaking research beyond micro-interactional analysis toward a more comprehensive understanding of stance as a socially consequential practice.

Food as a Bridge: Pragmatic Practices of Commensality, Belonging and Identity-Making (organized by *Luisa Marino, Anna Borghi*)

Food has long been understood as a symbolic and social practice through which communities organize meanings, boundaries and relationships (Douglas 1966; Fischler 1988; Belasco 1999; Barthes 2019 [1961]). It is also a powerful semiotic, affective, economic and interactional resource through which people build relationships, negotiate belonging, perform identities and manage difference (Brunner, Diemer and Schmidt 2018; Counihan, Van Esterik and Julier 2019; Rüdiger and Mühleisen 2020; Gordon and Tovares 2021; Marino forthcoming).

Food-related discourses and texts in the form of recipes, culinary memoirs, menus, labels, advertisements, social media content and corporate narratives, among others, all provide situated occasions in which meanings, values and ideologies are negotiated; common ground

is established; authenticity and trust are discursively constructed and social and cultural boundaries are both reinforced and contested (Lombardi Vallauri 2016; LeBesco and Naccarato 2018; Cesiri 2020; Fino and Cecconi 2021; Rüdiger 2021; Amideo 2022; Parasecoli 2022).

This panel explores food as a bridge across languages, cultures, communities, generations, markets and social environments, focusing on the pragmatic practices through which people enact commensality, negotiate belonging, construct identities and produce social, cultural and economic value. Rather than treating food as a static cultural object or merely as a commodity, the panel approaches it as a dynamic linguistic, interactional and socio-economic resource: something people talk about, offer, refuse, share, remember, translate, market, brand, evaluate, report on and contest in everyday, institutional, professional, corporate and digital contexts. In this perspective, food-related discourse may both foster recognition, solidarity and hospitality and work as a persuasive resource through which companies and institutions construct responsibility, sustainability, authenticity, ethical and health-related commitments and trust.

Against this backdrop, we invite contributions that examine how food and food-related discourse mediate social relations, identity, economic value and institutional credibility. Possible topics include, but are not limited to:

- the pragmatics of food and language- the language of food and/as identity;
- food and/as storytelling;
- food as a sociolinguistically meaningful resource;
- food and business discourse(s);
- the language of food and persuasion;
- food and/in Language(s) for Specific Purposes.

We particularly encourage empirically grounded contributions drawing on pragmatics; sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, multimodal analysis, corpus linguistics, translation studies, LSP research, and corporate communication studies.

Fostering metapragmatic awareness in second language teacher and assessor training
(organized by *Elena Nuzzo, Nicola Brocca, Diego Cortés Velásquez*)

The development of metapragmatic awareness – the capacity to consciously reflect on the underlying relationships between linguistic forms, communicative functions, and contextual factors (Ifantidou, 2014) – is of crucial importance in L2 education, given the inherently context-sensitive nature of pragmatics. Since context constitutes a dynamic and flexible point of reference, and clear-cut distinctions between correct and incorrect pragmatic behaviour are difficult to establish, instruction may more effectively focus on fostering learners' awareness (Timpe-Laughlin et al., 2015, p. 20). This is particularly relevant in teacher education, where prospective educators must also develop the ability to transmit such awareness to their learners (Nuzzo & Brocca, 2024).

In recent years, it has become increasingly evident that the sustainable integration of pragmatics into L2 curricula depends on equipping both pre-service and in-service teachers

with a solid grounding in pragmatic principles (González-Lloret, 2023; Glaser & Martínez-Flor, 2025). Teachers require not only a stronger theoretical understanding of L2 pragmatics, but also practical guidance on how to incorporate pragmatic competence into their teaching practices (Martínez-Flor, Sánchez-Hernández, & Barón, 2023). At the same time, although research on L2 pragmatics has expanded considerably, it has largely focused on learners, leaving teachers' perspectives, beliefs, and practices comparatively underexplored.

Addressing this gap, the panel brings together contributions that examine how L2 teachers conceptualize and develop metapragmatic awareness, as well as how this awareness informs their instructional choices. It presents evidence-based insights to support teachers in integrating pragmatics into their practice, encompassing both theoretical knowledge and practical pedagogical strategies.

Adopting an integrated perspective on teaching and assessment, the panel also addresses the metapragmatic awareness of L2 assessors and how it can be developed and supported through targeted training. In line with Messick's (1996) unified view of validity, which emphasizes the interpretability and consequences of score use, we argue that insufficient metapragmatic awareness may lead to construct underrepresentation or construct-irrelevant variance in the assessment of pragmatic competence. Therefore, effective assessment requires strengthening practitioners' theoretical knowledge of L2 pragmatics, alongside providing practical guidance on how to adequately evaluate pragmatic competence in test takers' performances.

Glaser, K., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2025). Guest editorial: L2 pragmatics in language teacher education. *System*, 131, 103581.

González-Lloret, M. (2023). Foreword. In: A. Martínez-Flor, A. Sánchez-Hernández, J. Barón (Eds.), *L2 pragmatics in action. Teachers, learners and the teaching-learning interaction process* (pp. xvii-xxii). Benjamins.

Ifantidou (2014). Pragmatic competence revisited. In: E. Ifantidou (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence and relevance*, vol. 245 (pp. 125-150). Benjamins.

Martínez-Flor, A., Sánchez-Hernández, A., Barón J. (Eds.), *L2 pragmatics in action. Teachers, learners and the teaching-learning interaction process*. Benjamins

Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. *Language Testing*, 13, 241–256.

Nuzzo, E., & Brocca, N. (2024). Raising the (meta)pragmatic awareness of non-native pre-service teachers of L2 Italian with a telecollaborative data-driven learning project on formal email writing. *System*, 127, 103518.

Timpe Laughlin, V. T., Wain, J., & Schmidgall, J. (2015). Defining and operationalizing the construct of pragmatic competence: Review and recommendations. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2015(1), 1-43.

Gendered language practices: between convergence and polarization (organized by *Renata Enghels, Marlies Jansegers*)

Long-standing debates on gender and language have often oscillated between two poles: the search for stable differences between women's and men's linguistic behaviour, and the critique of such differences as context-dependent, ideologically loaded or empirically

overstated (Lakoff 1975; Tannen 1990; Coates 2015). Corpus-based work has shown that gender differences may be small but systematic, while emphasizing the importance of context, communicative goals and social relations (Newman et al. 2008). At the same time, social and digital developments suggest that gendered identities are becoming highly polarized. Online environments in particular have fostered renewed forms of masculinist self-positioning, anti-feminist discourse, re-traditionalized femininity and gender-based antagonism. Recent studies on the manosphere, manfluencers and tradwife influencers show how gender ideologies circulate through platforms such as Reddit, TikTok and Instagram, where they are embedded in practices of self-help, authenticity, affect, mockery, advice-giving and ideological positioning (Krendel 2022; Lott et al. 2025; Pilyarchuk and Graf 2026).

Rather than treating gendered discourse only as discourse about women, men or other gendered groups, this panel focuses on how speakers and users perform gendered identities through linguistic resources. We invite contributions on gendered pragmatic practices across interactional, political and digital contexts. Relevant phenomena include:

- speech acts such as apologies, compliments, requests, complaints, insults;

The panel is interested in studies connecting micro-level pragmatic choices to processes of social change, convergence or divergence between female and male speech, and polarization. We welcome corpus-based, qualitative, quantitative, experimental, and microdiachronic approaches, as well as contributions that explore intercultural variation or compare offline and online settings. Likewise, we welcome diverse data: case studies may address everyday conversations, political discourse, social media practices, manosphere and tradwife content, feminist counter-discourses, or other contexts in which gendered identities are interactionally salient.

Contributions on all languages and frameworks are welcome. By bringing together research on gender, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and digital communication, the panel bridges empirical traditions that have often remained separate, such as variationist work on gendered language use, pragmatic research on interactional practices and critical approaches to gender polarization.

References

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. William Morrow.

Coates, J. (2015). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Newman, M. L., Groom, C. J., Handelman, L. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Processes*, 45(3), 211–236.

Krendel, A., McGlashan, M., & Koller, V. (2022). The representation of gendered social actors across five manosphere communities on Reddit. *Corpora*, 17(2), 291–321.

Lott, K., Murumaa-Mengel, M. & Marling, R. (2025). Mainstreaming the manosphere: discourses of contemporary masculinity among Estonian manfluencers. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1–11.

Pilyarchuk, K., & Graf, E.-M. (2026). From “I’ve always wanted to be a homemaker” to “Feminism is cancer”: Performing tradwife identity in Instagram Reels. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 70.

Generative AI in L2 Pragmatics: Theoretical Foundations, Empirical Realities, and Pedagogical Applications (organized by *Marta Gonzalez-Lloret, Julia Baron Pares*)

As generative AI (GenAI) continues to evolve, its intersection with Interlanguage (L2) Pragmatics research, teaching, and assessment requires an open yet critically reflective exploration. This panel investigates the capabilities and limitations of Large Language Models (LLMs) in understanding and producing contextually appropriate, sociopragmatic communication.

Current research highlights that LLMs offer significant practical applications for L2 pragmatics. They can provide context-specific situations, generate diverse dialogic materials on demand, and alleviate teacher fatigue through automated feedback. However, GenAI faces profound limitations in its current state. LLMs struggle to process prosodic cues, have difficulty interpreting figurative language such as implicature and sarcasm, and often overgeneralize cultural patterns, producing stereotypes instead of demonstrating authentic social awareness. Because GenAI lacks an embodied social identity and operates on statistical probability rather than lived experience, it cannot fully replicate genuine human interactional dynamics, such as overlaps, pauses, back-channeling, and emergent self-repair. Consequently, adopting GenAI in educational settings requires significant human mediation and a strong focus on critical AI literacy.

To address these potentials and challenges, this panel invites empirical investigations and pedagogical frameworks that explore core issues in interlanguage and instructional pragmatics. We welcome submissions from researchers and educators that address, but are not limited to, the following themes:

- Pedagogical Mediation: The instructional skills required to navigate AI-generated pragmatic mismatches and successfully integrate GenAI into the classroom.
- Critical AI Literacy: Strategies for teaching students to critically interrogate LLM outputs, particularly regarding the reinforcement of cultural stereotypes and the absence of genuine emotion.
- Learning Outcomes: The durability and long-term retention of pragmatic learning when using AI as an interlocutor compared to human peer interaction.
- Automated Assessment: The validity and reliability of using LLMs as judges or raters for highly contextualized intercultural-pragmatic competence versus traditional human evaluation.
- Embodied AI Environments: The potential integration of LLMs with Virtual/Extended Reality (VR/XR) and Emotion AI to create authentic, multimodal embodied interactional environments for L2 learning.

By bringing together diverse perspectives, this panel will map out future venues for AI research that can rigorously inform the field of L2 pragmatics.

We look forward to proposals within these topics but we also have access to a cohort of leading experts in the L2 pragmatics community who are at the forefront of this technological shift and to whom we will invite to submit if the panel is selected for the conference. We can assure that the panel will feature exceptionally high-quality contributions and the latest seminal research in the field.

Grammar of authority (organized by *Seppo Kittilä, Chingduang Yurayong, Sami Honkasalo, Richard Kerbs*)

Systematic studies of language and power have continued for several decades, not only in linguistics but also in other humanities and social scientific disciplines (e.g. Foucault 1969, 1971; Fairclough 1989). The discussion has retained its relevance for understanding human behaviour from ancient to modern society, considering repetitive patterns of social interaction and geopolitical turmoil around the globe. Hitherto, many approaches from diverse disciplines have tackled this topic from the perspective of rhetoric and discourse, particularly in critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 1995). However, not many studies have focused on language structure beyond lexical choice to identify apparent associations between linguistic resources and acts performed to claim or maintain power. This research gap motivates us to host discussion on the grammar of authority, as recent advances in language description and typology have unveiled a variety of linguistic categories that hold potential relevance, including epistemicity, evidentiality and egophoricity (Aikhenvald 2015; Bergqvist & Kittilä 2020), engagement and interactional asymmetry (Evans et al. 2018; Grzech et al. 2020). For example, the use of direct evidentials is associated with high authority, and we may either increase or decrease the degree of responsibility that we are willing to take for our claims by using reportatives or zero-marking, or resorting to general knowledge or folklore (Kittilä 2019, 2020, 2026). The dynamics of power and authority permeate the whole linguistic system. From the perspective of language use, authority can be expressed through numerous strategies ranging from phonological (e.g., patterns of prosody) and lexical (e.g., freedom fighter vs. rebel) to grammatical strategies (e.g. realis vs. irrealis moods; active vs. passive). Beyond these, non-verbal language behaviour (e.g. gestures and movements) can also contribute to the expression of authority (Kirch 1979). Diverse usage of these linguistic strategies emerges from a diachronic mechanism in which these strategies have been conventionalised in specific meanings and context related to power through discourse convention and social practices (Koch 2008; Fetzer 2010). This interconnection emphasises needs to account for both detailed description of language structure and understanding of contextual ecology in which a specific authority-related linguistic phenomenon has evolved. In this panel, we invite both theoretical and empirical studies of how language structure and usage can be conventionalised into expressions of authority. Topics that deal with lexical choices alone are not a part of our workshop, because our focus lies on grammatical aspects of authority expression and their interplay with related linguistic categories. We are open to all aspects of language behaviour, including phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse, and non-verbal communication, which contribute to the pragmaticisation of specific language features. We also encourage cross-disciplinary research that builds bridges between pragmatics and related fields within linguistics and beyond, such as communication studies, cognitive sciences, psychology, and comparative

cultural studies. Furthermore, consideration and inclusion of phenomena related to ethnic and linguistic minorities for broader relevance at a theoretical level are particularly welcome.

Habermas Reconsidered: Democracy and the Pragmatics of Political Discourse in the 21st Century (organized by *James Slotta, Greg Thompson*)

Few students of pragmatics have had the impact of Jürgen Habermas, who died this past March. His accounts of the public sphere, communicative rationality, and the discursive foundations of democracy placed the nature of public discourse—its contextual characteristics, genres, media, and effects—at the heart of contemporary political thought. Yet among those who investigate the pragmatics of “actually existing” political discourse—anthropologists, sociologists, historians—Habermas’ pragmatic vision of democratic discourse has been the object of sustained critique more than constructive elaboration. Indeed, the blindspots and deficiencies of Habermas’s vision have been so thoroughly laid bare that his discussions of the pragmatics of public discourse are often treated as little more than an expression of their author’s own liberal universalist ideology.

In the wake of his recent passing, this panel argues that it is time to reconsider Habermas’ work. In an era in which democracy appears to be under threat from discourses and discursive conditions of many kinds—propaganda, misinformation, deepfakes, social media, and echo chambers, to name a few—Habermas’s attention to the pragmatics of democratic discourse seems like a legacy worth taking more seriously. Beginning from Habermas’s crucial insight—that the pragmatics of discourse play a key role in enabling democratic governance to thrive—panelists will explore how actually existing political discourse in the 21st century can be illuminated by some of the analytics Habermas developed. These include the pragmatics of argumentation and other privileged genres of public sphere discourse, the role of metadiscourse in constructing public spheres, the interplay of liberal ideals and speech practices, and the pragmatics of understanding (*Verständnis*). The aim is not to gainsay the many illuminating critiques of Habermas’s oeuvre, but to sift through his work to identify elements that can be profitably brought to bear to understand the pragmatics of contemporary governance.

We plan to share this call for papers widely to attract a diverse group of participants.

Handling Different Voices in Science Communication: From linguistic polyphony to artificial agents (organized by *Kerstin Fischer, Annette Leßmöllmann, Francois Nemo*)

Current societal challenges require complex solutions, and accordingly, science communication has to resist giving easy answers. Instead, the complexity and polyphony of societal discourse needs to be accounted for and represented while avoiding overwhelming the recipients. This panel integrates two lines of research: On the one hand, recent technological developments allow for new forms of dialogical, interactive communication, for instance, through chatbots or social robots, opening up new opportunities for science communication; on the other, research on the linguistic and prosodic dimension of argumentation and on different signalling systems is evolving, notably in the modelling of polyphony as virtual dialog within utterances. The panel aims at integrating these two lines of research to inform science communication methods and processes and to develop pathways for complex, polyphonic artificial agents useful for communicating complex lines of argumentation and building polyphonic argumentative frames.

We therefore invite contributions that address, for instance:

- communicating complex lines of argumentation about pressing and controversial societal issues, such as climate change, democracy or AI
- using artificial agents for science communication
- designing science communication dialog
- linguistic marking of polyphony and argumentation
- prosody, modal particles and other elusive linguistic phenomena as polyphonic signalling systems
- cognitive and linguistic framing of comparison sets and questions under discussion, including prosodic focus and other types of prosodic modulation.

Honorifics and Related Phenomena across Languages and Cultures (organized by *Yasuko Obana, Lucien Brown*)

Honorific phenomena, whether lexical or structurally integrated, are regarded as the linguistic means of signalling the social or situational relationships that speakers recognise or seek to establish between themselves and other interactants and/or people relevant to the interaction. Conventionally, honorifics are associated with social hierarchy, respect for age, and formality. However, they are not just designed for politeness. They can be contextually impolite when they are manipulated as a tool to attack, ridicule or silence an opponent.

The last four decades have witnessed extensive research on honorifics across pragmatics, sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics, with different perspectives disclosing varied characteristics. For instance,

- Honorifics are viewed as an ideological index of social relations and personhood, and a socially recognized register encoding values such as hierarchy, respect, and identity (Agha 1993; Irvine 1998; Koyama 2011; Silverstein 1979).
- Honorifics are conceptualised not as strategies, but as linguistic manifestations of *wakimae* (Ide 1989) or deference (Hwang 1990), or as an indexical form of politeness (Brown 2011), ritual (Kádár & Mills 2013) or markings embedded within strategically constructed utterances (Obana 2017).
- Honorifics operate through the same schematic mechanisms as politeness strategies in general (Brown & Levinson 1987; Fukada & Asato 2004; Pizziconi 2011; Pizziconi & Christie 2017).
- Rather than following static norms, honorifics are used dynamically to indicate speakers' motives, emotions, and social identity, particularly through speech level shifts (e.g. Barke 2011; Cook 2008; Ikuta 1983; Okamoto 1999; Saito 2010; Yoon 2015).
- Rather than being a "closed sets" of linguistic forms, honorifics fit within wider patterns of register shifting (Kim et al. 2021) and are accompanied by distinct prosody (Idemaru 2019) and multimodal features (Brown et al. 2022).

However, many of these assumptions remain contested or require more investigation to clarify the nature of honorifics. The panel also invites contributions that explore the elaboration of honorific systems in individual languages, contrastive studies across languages, and new approaches to honorific phenomena. The following are just a few possible directions for enquiry:

- Are honorifics best understood as expressives as claimed by Kim & Sells (2007), McCready (2019) and Potts (2007)?
- What insights can be gained from honorific systems in individual languages? Korean and Japanese, for example, are often contrasted in terms of absolute and relative honorifics, but what other distinctive phenomena deserve attention?
- Can honorifics in speech level shifts be treated in the same category as

conventional honorifics, or differently as claimed by Obana & Haugh (2023)?

How important are prosodic and multimodal features that accompany honorific phenomena?

To what extent is it productive to broaden the study of honorifics beyond languages with grammatically systematised honorifics? For instance, honorific pronouns and nouns in many European languages and lexical honorifics in Chinese and Tongan equally index social relationships. Can such phenomena be analysed in the same way as grammaticalised honorifics?

We welcome contributions examining a wide range of languages and diverse uses of honorifics, with the aim of deepening our understanding of honorifics as a cross-linguistic phenomenon.

How to increase “interactional awareness”: From conversation analytic research to impact (organized by *Pentti Haddington, Elizabeth Stokoe*)

Over the past six decades, with recordings from real-life and real-time interactions, Conversation Analysis (CA) has shown how talk and multimodal behaviour are used to construct stable practices and underlying normative organisations of interaction. At the same time, there is scarce work exploring how CA uses its findings, concepts and methodological principles to reach out beyond its own community to address concrete issues and challenges that people encounter in interaction (see, however, Antaki, 2011). What CA offers is a research base for developing what we might call “interactional awareness”: a CA-grounded counterpart to “situational awareness”, in which people are shown what they actually do – both in terms of what works and what does not – rather than what they imagine they do. More knowledge on this is needed as the importance of interpersonal and interactional skills increases in the contemporary world: in the 21st century, interactions have become more complex, being intimately connected to the global megatrends of digitalisation, safety and security, changing education, aging, and well-being (e.g., Haddington & Stokoe, 2023).

This panel brings together CA scholars with sustained experience of engagement and impact beyond academia, whose collective work demonstrates the value for practitioners across sectors of grounding interactional awareness in CA research. The talks explore how CA work can be turned into concrete outcomes that sharpen practitioners’ interactional awareness and raise the profile of social interaction as a domain of expertise in the contemporary world. The studied contexts come, for example, from industry, healthcare and crisis training. The talks address the following questions:

What does “interactional awareness” mean from a CA perspective? How does it differ from lay or adjacent-field notions of communication skills?

What are the pathways from initial contacts with collaborators, partners, beneficiaries, and so on, via data collection and research, to engagement and impact?

How is the basis of CA thinking – that conversations, multimodal interactions, social activities and task accomplishments are highly coordinated joint accomplishments — communicated to non-academic partners in ways that are engaging?

How are CA’s specialised terminology, tools (e.g., transcriptions) and findings “translated” for non-CA audiences?

How are CA findings turned into actionable insights that are relevant for the studied communities and can be talked about or trained as concrete skills?

What models or solutions have been

used to train interaction that is informed by CA research?How is the impact of knowledge mobilization based on CA research evidenced and evaluated?

References

Antaki, C. (Ed.). (2011). *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Haddington, P., & Stokoe, E. (2023). Social interaction in high stakes crisis communication. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 208, 91-98.

Human Creative Practices in Interaction with LLM-based Assistants (organized by *Hendrik Buschmeier, Clara Lachenmaier, Ole Pütz, Birte Schaller*)

Assistants based on large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable uptake as a new medium marketed as conversational partners. On the surface, they present as fluent, responsive, and contextually aware in written and increasingly in spoken conversation. Yet beneath this appearance lies a fundamental asymmetry: LLM-based chatbots do not interact the way humans do and this in turn influences how we interact with them. Due to engineering decisions, selection of training data, reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF), installation of guardrails, design objectives to comply, these models tend to hallucinate (Ji et al., 2023), over-accommodate (Lachenmaier et al., 2025), or show sycophantic behaviour (Wang et al., 2026). Empirical work both in computational linguistics as well as ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (Stokoe et al., 2024) has begun to demonstrate that, at the interactional level, human–LLM exchanges deviate systematically from human interaction, e.g., in how communicative trouble is handled (Pütz and Esposito, 2024; Lachenmaier et al., 2026) or how the interaction is contextualized (Pütz, 2026). Recent studies have shown that some of these limitations can be circumvented by changing wording or grammatical structure of prompts (Wang et al., 2026). Due to the models' black-box nature, however, such strategies cannot be introduced systematically, but must be discovered by users in an explorative way, making use of the human ability of being linguistically creative (Vogel et al., 2026). For this panel, we seek interdisciplinary contributions from the fields of computational pragmatics, interactional pragmatics, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, presenting empirical results on human creative practices in interaction with LLM-based chatbots or voice assistants. The focus of the panel is on how users overcome the above mentioned limitations, restrictions, and pitfalls, by adapting their communication techniques to the models' characteristics. For example, how do they formulate prompts and messages to chatbots (e.g. by engaging in role play, flouting pragmatic maxims, deceiving, being polite)? More generally, how do they invent and disseminate practices that probe and exploit models' affordances and peculiarities?

Ziwei Ji, et al. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730> Clara Lachenmaier, et al. 2026. Talking to a know-it-all GPT or a second-guesser Claude? How repair reveals unreliable multi-turn behavior in LLMs.

<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2604.19245> Clara Lachenmaier et al. 2025. Can LLMs ground when they (don't) know: A study on direct and loaded political questions.

<https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.728> Ole Pütz and Elena Esposito. 2024.

Performance without understanding: How ChatGPT relies on humans to repair conversational trouble. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813241271492>

Ole Pütz. 2026. Co-textual dopes: How LLMs produce contextually appropriate text in chat interactions with humans without access to context. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.70036>

Elizabeth Stokoe, Saul Albert, Hendrik Buschmeier, and Wyke Stommel. 2024. Conversation analysis and conversational technologies: Finding the common ground between academia and industry. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813241267118>

Ralf Vogel, et al. 2026. Linguistic creativity in communication. Conceptions and challenges. LINCC-WP 1, Bielefeld University.

Keyu Wang, et al. 2026. When truth is overridden: Uncovering the internal origins of sycophancy in large language models. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i39.40645>

Inference, Cognition and Human-AI Interaction (organized by *Kate Scott, Ryoko Sasamoto*)

The emergence, development and widespread use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Large Language Models (LLMs) raises important questions for the field of pragmatics and the study of communication. These issues are particularly significant for those approaches to communication and interaction which focus on the role of human cognitive processes and intentions (such as Gricean and relevance-theoretic analyses).

We invite papers which engage with issues, challenges, possibilities and applications that arise from the interaction between inferential and cognitive approaches to pragmatics and artificial intelligence. This might include theoretical approaches to human-AI interactions, experimental and empirical work on AI discourse, and analyses of AI generated texts and responses. Issues that might be considered include (but are not limited to) the following:

How might theories of speaker production and hearer interpretation processes apply in contexts where one (or more) of the interlocutors is non-human, and, therefore, has no communicative intentions or expectations? Do human cognitive processes function differently when processing language-based outputs from AI than they do when interpreting human utterances (and other ostensive communication)? Do pragmatic inferential processes such as context selection, abductive reasoning, and the construction of mental representations operate differently when hearers or readers know that a text has been generated by AI rather than by a human communicator? How are cues that would normally support the attribution of mental states to an author, such as style, hedging, emotion, or expressions of personal experience, interpreted when produced by systems that lack beliefs, intentions, and subjective experience? What are the implications for applied pragmatic fields (for example, language learning and acquisition, translation and interpreting, or clinical applications) of AI generated texts and human-AI interactions? How have human speakers adapted their utterances to accommodate the “abilities” of LLM programmes in human-AI interactions? To what extent can LLMs be viewed as modelling or approximating pragmatic inferential processes, and what can their successes and failures reveal about the nature of human pragmatic competence?

Other areas of inferential and cognitive pragmatics that deserves to be revisited in light of human-AI interaction include (but are not limited to):

- Characterisation of the speaker and/or addressee/audience.
- The role of intentions in the interpretation of non-human generated text.
- Emotional responses to

AI generated utterances

- Implicature generation and understanding in human-AI discourse
- Epistemic vigilance
- Cognitive pragmatics and the ethics of human-AI interaction.
- Attribution of mental states, emotions, and experiential knowledge to AI systems.
- The interpretation of expressive, experiential, and non-propositional effects (e.g. onomatopoeia, affective language, impressionistic expressions, and other forms of weak communication) in AI-generated discourse.
- Mutual manifestness, common ground, and the dynamics of salience in interactions where communicators do not share persistent cognitive environments
- Irony, metaphor, and other forms of figurative language in human-AI communication.

We anticipate that the papers included in this panel and the discussions that are generated from it will support the future development of a cognitive pragmatic special interest group with a focus on human-AI interaction

Integrating conversation analysis and semantics into new perspectives (organized by *Yida Cai*)

The panel aims to provide an opportunity to discuss how conversation analysis (CA) and semantics can be integrated to study linguistic phenomena more deeply from various perspectives. Within Interactional Linguistics (IL), CA is the primary method used, which focuses on how linguistic resources operate in the formation of action and the sequential organization of interaction to achieve common understanding between interlocutors (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018). However, as Deppermann and De Stefani (2023) indicate, semantics is rarely discussed as the object of study in CA and IL, although interlocutors' understanding and the practices of meaningful action are stated as their predominant objects of study. Many scholars have begun to consider the advantages of combining CA and semantics, put it into practice from various perspectives, and illustrate how their integration can provide a more comprehensive understanding of linguistic phenomena.

Interactional Semantics is an area of research gaining increasing interest, and in which CA and semantics are intertwined to investigate how interlocutors negotiate and clarify local meaning in interactional contexts from diverse viewpoints, including meta-semantic practices and interactional histories (Deppermann 2024). As Deppermann (2024, p. 126) states, Interactional Semantics can help us capture how meanings are manifested, changed, and otherwise shaped during interactions. The aim of exploring how meanings are organized in interaction also motivates, for instance, the Occasioned Semantics approach, which systematically examines conversational meaning from diverse perspectives, such as generalization and specification (Bilmes 2011). In addition, CA and semantics have been integrated to promote methodology for capturing a deeper understanding of language use in interaction. For instance, Spiess (2025) illustrates how frame semantics can be integrated with CA to support the interpretation of identifying actions.

This panel encourages both interactional linguistics and semantics researchers to discuss the compatibility of CA and semantic perspectives, focusing on how CA and semantics can be combined in various ways to deepen understanding of language use and the meanings that arise in interaction. The panel is open to papers on all perspectives on combining CA and semantics, including, but not limited to, how meanings in interaction can be investigated from both interactional and semantic perspectives, and how methodology can be developed by integrating CA with a specific semantic analysis approach.

References

Bilmes, Jack, 2011. Occasioned Semantics: A Systematic Approach to Meaning in Talk. *Human Studies* 34, 129–153.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, Selting, Margret, 2018. *Interactional linguistics. Interactional Linguistics: Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Deppermann, Arnulf, 2024. What do you Understand by X? Semantics in Interactional Linguistics. In: Selting, Margret, Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar (Eds.), *New Perspectives in Interactional Linguistic Research*. John Benjamins (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 36), Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Deppermann, Arnulf, De Stefani, Elwys, 2023. Meaning in Interaction. *Interactional Linguistics* 3 (1–2), 1–12.

Spieß, Oliver, 2025. Frames are for Talking: Modeling Interactants' Co-Constructed Semantic and Pragmatic Structures. *Journal of Pragmatics* 246, 170–187.

Interacting with AI in a second language: CA perspectives on language learning and development of interactional competence (organized by *Alexandra Gubina, Teppo Jakonen*)

Recent developments in artificial intelligence (AI), especially large language model (LLM)-based conversational systems such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and language-learning chatbots, mark a turning point in second language (L2) learning and teaching research (Kohnke et al., 2023). These technologies are increasingly used in areas such as teacher education, writing support, assessment, and human-AI collaboration (e.g., Barrot, 2023; Eguchi et al., 2025; Ji et al., 2023; Sert, 2025). A particularly prominent application of these technologies is their use as interactional partners to support the development of L2 speaking skills/competence (Jeon & Lee, 2023; Jeon et al., 2024). Previous research has mainly examined their pedagogical potential, including adaptive support, learner engagement, and possible effects on language development (e.g., Athanassopoulos et al., 2023; Karataş et al., 2024). However, most of these studies rely on learners' perceptions rather than analyses of interactional processes, while oral skills and interactional competence (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011) remain underexplored, particularly in languages other than English (Lee et al., 2026). Furthermore, only few studies have adopted conversation-analytic approaches to learner-AI interaction (e.g., Choi & Oh, 2026; Voss & Waring, 2025; cf. Mlynář et al., 2025; Stokoe et al., 2024). As a result, we know little about what L2 speakers and learners actually do when interacting with AI-based conversational systems in real time.

This panel responds to these gaps by placing interaction between L2 speakers and learners and AI at the centre of investigation from a conversation-analytic and interactional-linguistic perspectives. It invites contributions that examine how L2 speakers and learners accomplish social actions in interaction with a broad range of AI-based conversational technologies, including LLM-based systems (e.g., ChatGPT or Gemini), chatbots, AI tutors, speech-based tutoring systems, AI assistants such as Siri, social robots, and Embodied Conversational Agents, and how their practices develop over time. The panel addresses the following questions: How are interactions between L2 speakers and learners and different AI-based

conversational systems sequentially organized? Which interactional practices and action sequences do L2 speakers and learners employ when interacting with conversational AI systems, and how are these shaped by the AI's output and system-specific features? How are learning opportunities interactionally accomplished in learner-AI encounters? How are such moments sequentially occasioned and oriented to by participants? Which changes in L2 speakers' and learners' interactional practices can be observed across repeated learner-AI interactions, and how are these practices indicative of development of interactional competence (e.g., diversification, stabilization, or recalibration of resources; see Pekarek Doehler/Pochon-Berger, 2011)?

By inviting research on the interactional accomplishment of collaboration between AI and L2 speakers and learners, this panel aims to provide empirically grounded insights into the role of AI-based conversational systems as interactional partners and to contribute to debates on interaction, learning, and agency in human-AI communication.

Interactional expressions as sources of pragmatic markers (organized by *Haiping Long, Seongha Rhee, Reza Kazemian, Bing Zhu*)

A common distinction in linguistics is between transactional uses of language, which serve the communication of information, and interactional uses, which express attitudes and social relationships (Jakobson 1971; Brown and Yule 1983; Hyland 2005). Within the latter domain, Heine (2023) identifies a range of interactional expressions, including attention signals (Hey!), directives (Look!), evaluatives (Great!), interjections (Oh), response elicitors (What?), response signals (Yes), social formulae (Hello), and vocatives (Jesus).

Although authentic human communication involves both transactional and interactional uses of language, interactional expressions have long remained peripheral in linguistic research. Recent theoretical work on natural discourse has renewed interest in them, with much of the literature focusing on their recurrent role in signaling speaker stance and speaker-hearer alignment (Ginzburg 2012; Widlok 2016; Wiltchko 2021; Heine 2023; Dingemanse 2024). Yet, apart from Heine (2023), little attention has been paid to their emergence, and even less to their subsequent development in natural discourse.

Pragmatic markers “signal what the speaker/writer (SP/W) intends the addressee/reader (AD/R) to understand regarding such factors as: (a) SP/W's (represented) social relationship with the interlocutor (please), (b) SP/W's degree of epistemic certitude regarding the upcoming discourse segment (of course), and (c) the relationship between discourse segments that SP/W intends to convey (but, by the way)” (Traugott 2022: 60).

The development of pragmatic markers has long attracted attention in discourse studies, with much scholarship tracing their origins to transactional uses of language (e.g., Traugott 1995, 2022; Brinton 1996, 2008, 2017; Traugott & Dasher 2002; Fischer 2007; Heine et al. 2021). By contrast, their emergence from interactional uses of language remains underexplored. To our knowledge, apart from a few recent contributions (Long 2025; Long & Zhou 2025; Pardo Llibrer 2025; Zhu 2025), this pathway has received little systematic investigation (Traugott 2025: 281).

This panel aims to address this gap by examining the processes through which interactional expressions develop into pragmatic markers. We invite contributions that explore these developments across the world's languages. We particularly welcome studies on languages

with rich historical records (e.g., English, Spanish, Greek, Chinese, and Japanese), as well as research on language use in digital environments such as the internet and social media. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Which categories of interactional expressions (Heine 2023) may develop into pragmatic markers, and what kinds of changes accompany this process? Does this development involve mechanisms typically observed in changes of transactional language use, such as metaphorical transference, analogy, and pragmatic inferencing?
- (2) Do interactional expressions show cross-linguistic similarities in their development into pragmatic markers? Do comparable developmental pathways emerge across languages? More broadly, what typological implications might such developments have?
- (3) Do these developments follow unidirectional or bidirectional patterns? If bidirectional changes occur, what mechanisms may account for them?
- (4) What developmental pathways link interactional expressions to pragmatic markers? Can these changes be adequately explained within existing frameworks, such as grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, and constructionalization, or do they require new theoretical perspectives?

Interaction-regulating particles (organized by *Rein Ove Sikveland, Jan Svennevig, Marja Etelämäki, Paweł Urbanik*)

This panel welcomes papers that take an interactional approach to particles in talk-in-interaction by analyzing recordings of social interaction. By particles we mean uninflected lexical items such as interjections, modal particles and fixed multi-word expressions which primarily have interactional and discursive functions. Previous research has shown how particles acquire meaning within certain sequential and action environments, and thereby play a central role in regulating the interaction (see e.g., Auer & Maschler, 2016; Heritage & Sorjonen, 2018; Betz, Deppermann, Mondada & Sorjonen, 2021).

For this panel, we welcome papers that address how particles are used to regulate the interaction in one way or another. Such particles include, but are not restricted to ‘dialogue particles’, i.e., continuers, repair initiations and receipt tokens; and ‘expressives’, i.e., particles that give information about the speaker’s affective stance. Relevant questions include:

- How are specific particles used in creating links between actions and sequences of actions?How are specific particles tied to expressing a speaker’s stance?What is the systematic relationship between particle design (phonetic, prosodicmultimodal) and interactional function?How are particles combined with non-lexical resources (such as gesture, gaze, or vocalizations) to form multimodal gestalts in interaction?What can cross-linguistic studies reveal about the interactional function(s) of particles?

We welcome in particular papers that explore particles in languages for which there are few previous studies, and/or less explored aspects of particle use in more extensively explored (e.g., English) languages, and/or take a comparative perspective on particles. We welcome contributions across spoken and signed languages.

Reference list

- Auer, P., & Maschler, Y. (2016). *NU / NÅ. A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond*. De Gruyter.
- Betz, E., Deppermann, A., Mondada, L., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (2021). *OKAY across languages: Toward a comparative approach to its use in talk-in-interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.34>
- Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (Eds.). (2018). *Between turn and sequence: Turn-initial particles across languages*. John Benjamins.

Intercommunity Interaction, Meaning-Making, and the Role of Pragmatics (organized by *Urjani Chakravarty, Gulab Chand*)

The current communication pattern worldwide is marked by two key features: digital connectivity and civic unrest. Communities co-produce meaning through nuanced, often contested communicative acts that range across generational, cultural, and ideological boundaries. This panel proposes that intercommunity interaction is not merely an information exchange but a dynamic space of pragmatic negotiation, in which utterances are determined by context, implicature, and social intent (Levinson, 2023).

Drawing on contemporary socio-pragmatic theories, we claim understanding how meaning is made across communities (especially during activism) demands an intergenerational focus. Inter-generational interaction occupies a unique communicative space where pragmatic competencies diverge most visibly. Community members from different age brackets bring distinct epistemic abilities to shared discursive events, whether in town halls, online forums, or protest marches. Coupland (2014) demonstrate that intergenerational talk is frequently marked by misaligned presuppositions and divergent relevance structures, producing what he terms “pragmatic friction.” Far from being merely disruptive, such friction becomes generative: it compels interlocutors to renegotiate shared meaning, producing new discursive norms that neither generation could have practiced alone.

Activism in any society mobilizes language to reframe injustice, build solidarity, and provoke institutional response (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). Regularly, many intergenerational activists’ coalitions, as seen in recent climate justice and anti-austerity movements. The pragmatic challenge underscores the need for elder activists trained in deliberative rhetoric to co-construct meaning with younger participants who are comfortable with digital multimodality and ironic intertextuality (Zappavigna, 2022). The result is a hybrid activist register that is neither wholly traditional nor entirely emergent.

Meaning-making in intercommunity contexts is further complicated by what Blommaert calls “truncated repertoires”, the partial, uneven linguistic resources that participants bring to interaction (2010). Pragmatic inference, in multicultural and inter-generational activist spaces, are locally renegotiated rather than universally assumed, demanding metalinguistic awareness from all participants (Eckert, 2017; Kecskes, 2023). This panel will further examine how communities develop what we call as “pragmatic solidarity”, a shared commitment to interpretive charity and meaning co-construction, even across significant communicative distance. Ultimately, it repositions pragmatics not as a descriptive tool but as a civic resource. The few themes include, but are not limited to:

Intergenerational Pragmatics and Negotiation

Activist language and Community mobilization

Intercultural pragmatics and meaning Co-Construction

Pragmatic solidarity and Collective sense-making across communities

Multimodality and emergent Intercommunity discourse

References

Blommaert, J. (2010). The sociolinguistics of globalization. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845307>

Coupland, N. (2014). Age in social and sociolinguistic theory. In Sociolinguistics and social theory (pp. 185-211). Routledge.

Eckert, P. (2017). Age as a sociolinguistic variable. The handbook of sociolinguistics, 151-167.

Kecskes, I. (Ed.). (2023). The Cambridge handbook of intercultural pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (2023). Gesture, spatial cognition and the evolution of language. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 378(1875).

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). Methods of critical discourse studies (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Zappavigna, M. (2022). Weaponising quotation for humorous ridicule: Ambient affiliation, evaluative hashtags, and parodic resonance in political social media discourse. Journal of Pragmatics, 191, 98–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.12.003>

Interpersonal pragmatic approaches to human-AI interaction (organized by *Thomas Messerli, Marta Andersson*)

Generative AI chatbots have created a new domain of language use, where users increasingly engage with LLMs as quasi-social others (Andersson 2025 and references therein). Today's LLM-powered chatbots produce speech acts, perform relational work, and display interactional patterns that resemble human communicative behaviour while diverging from it in systematic ways (Andersson & McIntyre 2025; Hu et al. 2026; Lazebnik et al. 2025). Users respond to and reshape these patterns, giving rise to new forms of discursive and pragmatic practice (Elsweiler et. al, 2025; Kirk et al. 2025).

Within emerging AI-language across disciplines, interpersonal pragmatics (see, e.g., Haugh et al. 2013; Locher 2013; Locher & Watts 2005) is only beginning to address this new interactional domain. However, human-AI interaction raises fundamental questions of importance also for the understanding of core pragmatic concepts. What does relational work look like when one participant is simulating? How are identities constructed (Bucholtz &

Hall, 2005) when one interlocutor is not typically thought of as having social objectives or being held accountable for interpersonal discourse? How do social and discursive norms emerge and shift in a context where interactional behaviour is shaped by training data, reinforcement learning and optimization for user alignment rather than lived experience? What are the consequences of sustained engagement with AI for users' own pragmatic practices in human-human contexts?

This panel positions human-AI interaction as a new site for familiar pragmatic phenomena and as a testing ground for interpersonal pragmatics specifically. As chatbot systems become more personalized and socially consequential, human-AI communication invites us to revisit concepts such as relationality, identity, participant roles, and face under new conditions, in which AI increasingly enters the social and psychological space once reserved for human connection (Andersson 2025; Kirk et al 2025). Our panel brings together scholars who address human-AI interaction from an interpersonal pragmatic perspective. By human-AI interaction, we broadly refer to any type of engagement between human interlocutors and generative artificial intelligence. This includes conversation- or discourse-analytic perspectives, competence-focused approaches, and those zooming in on more isolated pragmatic patterns. We welcome contributions that examine the pragmatics of human-AI discourse in any language. Topics include but are not limited to:

- (im)politeness and face management in human-AI interaction
- relational work (reciprocity, asymmetry, participation) by and towards AI systems
- identity construction, self- and other-positioning in human-AI conversation
- pragmatic accommodation and convergence between humans and AI
- speech acts in human-AI discourse
- perception of and stance towards pragmatic and linguistic abilities of AI chatbots
- cross-linguistic and multilingual perspectives on human-AI interaction

We encourage contributions on human and AI language within interaction, rather than AI-generated language in isolation. Empirical approaches grounded in corpus data, experimental designs, and conversation-analytic or discourse-analytic methods are particularly welcome. We also invite contributions that reflect on the theoretical implications of human-AI interaction for interpersonal pragmatics as a field.

Intervening in trouble in interaction: Resources, practices, ideals (organized by *Melisa Stevanovic, Minna Nevala*)

Intervening in situations of “trouble” is a pervasive feature of social life across both mundane and institutional settings. Trouble may arise within interaction—for example, when contributions are heard as inappropriate or misaligned—or concern issues brought into interaction, such as problems in performance, behavior, or well-being. In both cases, intervention involves delicate judgments about relevance, timing, rights, and responsibilities, while risking social relations and face.

This panel invites contributions on both troubles emerging within interaction and those introduced into it. Relevant contexts include various institutional settings as well as everyday face-to-face and online encounters, where participants intervene by evaluating tone, appropriateness, or norm violations. The panel focuses on three dimensions: resources

(linguistic and multimodal means), practices (the sequential accomplishment of intervention), and ideals (norms shaping who intervenes, when, and how).

Previous research has shown how trouble is managed in interaction, from resolving problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding (Schegloff et al., 1977) to intervening in others' conduct in contexts such as performance appraisal interactions (Clifton, 2012). In institutional settings, professionals intervene by promoting behavior change in healthcare (Albury et al., 2019) and addressing conflicts in education (Korpela et al., 2022). In everyday settings, third-party intervention has been found to inhibit impoliteness reciprocity (Culpeper et al., 2025), as well as to express intragroup marginalization (Limatius & Nevala, 2024).

Simultaneously, interventions are shaped by broader social structures and cultural expectations. Participants' relative positions of power affect both their capacity to intervene and the uptake of their actions (Stevanovic, 2018). Moreover, discourses of "open communication" promote direct intervention while obscuring unequal access to interactional resources and the risks faced by less powerful participants (Weiste et al., 2024). The relevance and consequences of intervention are thus closely tied to social hierarchies and shared norms.

References

- Albury, C., Hall, A., et al. (2019). Communication practices for delivering health behaviour change conversations in primary care: A systematic review and thematic synthesis. *BMC Family Practice*, 20(1), 111.
- Clifton, J. (2012). A multimodal analysis of managerial discourse in performance appraisal interviews. *Journal of Business Communication*, 49(3), 263–289.
- Culpeper, J., Tantucci, V., & Field, E. (2025). Impoliteness reciprocity online. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 242, 216–236.
- Korpela, R., Kurhila, S., & Stevanovic, M. (2022). Apologizing in elementary school peer conflict mediation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 55(1), 1–17.
- Limatius, H. & M. Nevala. (2024). Intragroup marginalization in social media: Self- and other-reference on a plus-size fashion brand's Instagram page. In M. Nevala & M. Palander-Collin (eds.), *Self- and Other-Reference in Social Contexts*. 114–137. John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.
- Stevanovic, M. (2018). Social deontics: A nano-level approach to human power play. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 48(3), 369–389.
- Weiste, E., Stevanovic, M., et al. (2024). "You should have addressed it directly": The ideals and ideologies of managing interaction problems in healthcare work. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 38(9), 313–328.

Interventionist Pragmatics and Bridge-Building in Africa: Language-Based Interventions for Peace, Security and Social Cohesion (organized by *Ayo Osisanwo, Sunday Adegbenro, Matthew Alugbin*)

Africa's contemporary sociopolitical landscape is characterised by communicative challenges that threaten social cohesion and sustainable development. African societies grapple with issues of insecurity, terrorism, violent extremism, kidnapping, electoral tensions, ethnic and religious polarisation, online hostility, misinformation, communal conflicts, migration-induced tensions, and rising distrust between citizens and institutions. These challenges are not solely political or economic in nature; they are also shaped and sustained through communication. They are produced, negotiated, intensified, and sometimes resolved through language and interaction. While pragmatic scholarship has made significant contributions to understanding discourse, identity construction, conflict communication, and ideological positioning, less attention has been paid to translating pragmatic insights into practical interventions that address contemporary social problems. Interventionist Pragmatics, an emerging research orientation that focuses on applying pragmatic knowledge to address communicative challenges and promote peace, security, trust, inclusion, and social cohesion, is proposed as the central focus of this panel.

The panel positions language as a strategic reserve for bridge-building and social transformation. It seeks to explore how pragmatic theories, methods, and findings can contribute to conflict prevention, peacebuilding, reconciliation, crisis communication, civic engagement, intercultural dialogue, and the strengthening of democratic and community relationships across African societies. The African continent's rich multilingual traditions, indigenous conflict-resolution mechanisms, communal value systems, and evolving digital communication environments offer a particularly fertile site for inquiry into how language-based interventions can facilitate dialogue across social, political, cultural, and ideological divides. The panel welcomes theoretical, methodological, empirical, and practice-oriented contributions that examine how pragmatic approaches may be employed to address communicative challenges and promote positive social change within the African continent. Such papers may address, among others, insecurity, terrorism, conflict communication, public trust, election discourse and democratic participation, hate speech and counter-discourse strategies, social media interventions and misinformation, community dialogue and grassroots peace talk, interethnic/cultural communication, peacebuilding and religious dialogue, multilingualism and social inclusion, and youth engagement and communicative activism.

Research Questions

What theoretical and methodological foundations can underpin the emergence of Interventionist Pragmatics as a socially transformative research paradigm? How are insecurity, conflict, polarisation, and social fragmentation discursively produced, negotiated, challenged, and transformed in African contexts? What pragmatic resources and communicative interventions are most effective in fostering peace, security, trust, inclusion, and social cohesion? How can indigenous African systems of communication, mediation, consensus-building, and conflict resolution inform contemporary approaches to bridge-building and social transformation?

Theoretical Framework

This panel adopts an integrated framework anchored in Interventionist Pragmatics and informed by Speech Act Theory, Politeness and Impoliteness Theory, Critical Discourse Analysis, Conflict Transformation Theory, Social Identity Theory, and African Indigenous Communication Systems. The framework facilitates the analysis of language-related social fragmentation and the design of communicative interventions that foster peace, trust, inclusion, and social cohesion.

Expected Contributions

This panel extends pragmatics beyond analysis to intervention, impact, and societal relevance. Aligning with the conference theme, Building Bridges, it explores how communicative interventions can foster trust, reduce antagonism, strengthen democratic participation, promote peaceful coexistence, and demonstrate the transformative potential of pragmatics in society.

Investigating transcultural pragmatics: Theory and methodology (organized by *Marie-Luise Pitzl-Hagin*)

The study of pragmatics with or from ‘a cultural perspective’ constitutes a long-standing research tradition. Early approaches, like Blum-Kulka and Olshtain’s Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP), sought to establish “similarities and differences in the realization patterns of requests and apologies cross-linguistically” (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984: 197, *italics in original*). The aim for scholars in cross-cultural pragmatics is to describe “cross-cultural variability” (*ibid.*) by comparing pragmatic behavior across different languages.

Cross-cultural approaches were soon supplemented by a growing body of research on intercultural communication, which studies interaction in communicative situations among individuals with different regio-cultural backgrounds (see e.g. Sarangi 1994, Zhu 2014). One prime example are multilingual contexts in which English functions as a lingua franca (ELF) and is used in translanguaging practices alongside other language(s). Drawing on methodologies like conversation analysis and corpus linguistics, the study of pragmatics in ELF interactions is closely entwined with intercultural communication research (see e.g. Pitzl-Hagin, Riegler & Osimk-Teasdale 2026) and a substantial body of research findings has emerged over the past decades.

Yet, scholars investigating intercultural communication and ELF contexts increasingly challenge the assumptions of ‘in-between-ness’ implied in ‘inter’cultural communication and suggest transcultural communication as the more appropriate term and approach (see e.g. Baker 2022). This conceptualization aligns particularly well with the transient nature of many transcultural encounters. It has therefore been suggested that it is time for scholars to start investigating transcultural pragmatics (Pitzl 2022, Baker 2026).

Taking this paradigm shift towards transcultural pragmatics seriously, however, brings a number of theoretical and methodological challenges. This panel invites contributions that address these challenges in theory and methodology and offer productive ways forward. Following the conference theme, this panel intends to build bridges between theory and methodology, inter- and transculturality, pragmatics and transcultural communication, ELF research and other multilingual contexts, empirical description and theorization of methods used to obtain these.

References

- Baker, Will. 2022. *Intercultural and Transcultural Awareness in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108874120>.
- Baker, Will. 2026. Pragmatics and transcultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *RELC Journal*. 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882261445115>.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Elite Olshtain. 1984. Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5(3). 196–213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196>.
- Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2022. From cross to inter to trans – *cultural pragmatics on the move: The need for expanding methodologies in lingua franca research. In Ian Walkinshaw (ed.), *Pragmatics in English as a lingua franca: Findings and developments*, 55–80. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501512520-004>.
- Pitzl-Hagin, Marie-Luise, Riegler, Stefanie & Ruth Osimk-Teasdale. 2026. Inter-/Transcultural Communication and (English as a) Lingua Franca. *Reference Module in Social Sciences*. 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95504-1.01137-6>.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 1994. Intercultural or not? Beyond celebration of cultural differences in miscommunication analysis. *Pragmatics* 4(3). 409–427. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.4.3.05sar>.
- Zhu Hua. 2014. *Exploring intercultural communication: Language in action*. London: Routledge.

Language and Politics – Cross-Linguistic Perspectives (organized by *Juliane House, Daniel Kadar*)

The aim of this panel is to bring together leading experts working on the pragmatic study of language and politics. In particular, our goal is to approach how cross-linguistic perspectives can promote deeper understanding of politically relevant notions and actions, which may be controversial outside of their immediate context. Such controversies often turn out to be influenced by ethnocentric views: it is often assumed that expressions (such as ‘nationalism’) and speech acts (such as an Apology realised by politicians) have universal meanings across linguacultures, whereas in real life they often significantly vary due to their different historical trajectories. This is why a cross-cultural comparative perspective may provide an important tool through which language and politics can be examined in a more objective way, as the organisers of the proposed panel have also argued in a recent book (see House and Kadar 2025). The present panel aims to provide a meeting point for experts to promote research in this area.

Apart from invited participants, the panel will also be open for scholars with interest in the subject discussed: we will advertise the panel on various forums, including LinguistList.

In this panel, we will jointly explore possible future directions of collaborative research. Such a collaboration may be particularly important and timely in the context of current global crises. We also hope to promote joint research between the participants of the project, including young scholars, through a journal special issue.

The panel will feature Professor Zohar Kampf, a leading expert in the field, as an invited Discussant. Professor Kampf will be asked not only to comment on the contents of each paper but also to lead a longer Discussion following all the presentations. In order to make sure that sufficient time is available for this Discussion, we will plan each contribution for 15 minutes, to be followed by a Q&A session of 5 minutes.

References

House, J., and Kadar, D. (2025). *Language and Politics: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Language, Conflict, and Aggression in Contemporary Communication (organized by *Maria Sifianou, Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich*)

Conflict and aggression are constitutive dimensions of human communication. Through language, interactants disagree, provoke, attack, and counterattack, while also justifying, mitigating, resolving, and reframing conflictual acts. Language does not merely reflect conflict; it actively shapes its dynamics. It is through lexical choices, prosody, and discourse patterns that conflict is enacted, negotiated, and evaluated (Bousfield 2008; Culpeper 2011; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2024).

Over the past two decades, the study of conflict and aggression in language has developed into a vibrant interdisciplinary field within pragmatics and beyond, aligning closely with the core concerns of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA). Foundational frameworks such as (im)politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1987; Culpeper 2011), relational work (Locher and Watts 2005), conversation analysis (Hutchby 1996), and discursive psychology (Edwards and Potter 1992) have significantly advanced our understanding of how conflict is interactionally organised. These approaches converge in viewing conflict talk not as a breakdown of cooperation, but as a socially structured mode of interaction characterised by systematic practices of stance-taking, alignment, disalignment, and moral evaluation. Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic research further demonstrates that notions such as “aggression,” “impoliteness,” and “offense” are culturally situated and indexically variable (Kádár and Haugh 2013).

The significance of examining linguistic conflict has intensified in the context of digital communication. Online environments have amplified the visibility and circulation of verbal aggression, including trolling, flaming, hate speech, cyberbullying, and polarised political discourse (Carvallo et al. 2024; Hardaker 2013; Mosgaard Andreassen 2024; Vilar-Lluch 2023). These mediated contexts challenge traditional analytical categories by blurring boundaries between play and hostility, private and public discourse, and individual and collective voice, while introducing new multimodal and algorithmically shaped forms of interaction.

In line with the interdisciplinary ethos of IPrA, we aim to provide a forum for exploring how conflict and aggression are linguistically and discursively constructed across contexts, as well as how they are perceived, evaluated, and regulated. We particularly welcome contributions that engage with emerging communicative environments, including human–machine interaction, AI-mediated discourse, platform-specific norms of (im)politeness, and the off/online nexus in the sense of how conflicts initiated online may have offline repercussions and vice versa. Furthermore, submissions that engage with underrepresented languages,

contexts, or modalities, and those that critically reflect on the epistemological and ethical challenges of researching conflict and aggression are especially encouraged.

We invite papers addressing (but not limited to) the following themes:

- Linguistic and multimodal realizations of conflict and aggression
- (Im)politeness, relational work, and the moral order in conflict interaction
- Stance-taking, alignment, and affect in adversarial discourse
- Conflict in digital and social media environments (e.g., trolling, cancel culture, algorithmic amplification)
- Conflict and aggression in human–AI interaction and chatbot communication
- Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives on aggression and offense
- Conflict in institutional, professional or political discourse
- Ethical and societal implications of studying and representing verbal aggression
- The aftermath of conflict
- The metapragmatics of conflict

Linguistic minorities using the majority language: Emotions and attitudes associated with language use (organized by *Saija Merke, Jaana Kolu, Jenny Stenberg-Sirén, Karita Suomalainen*)

This panel focuses on minority language speakers, and the emotions and attitudes associated with the use of a majority language. The workshop focuses on Nordic countries in which the majority language is learned as a second – and sometimes even first – language by members of a linguistic minority community. For example, in Finland, Finnish and Swedish are both national languages, but Swedish speakers constitute a linguistic minority. For them, Finnish is a compulsory school subject. In higher education as well, students who have attended Swedish-speaking schools are required to study Finnish and demonstrate proficiency in the language.

Although the Finnish-language skills of the Swedish-speaking population have generally been considered good, national reports on Swedish-language education and language learning (e.g. Toropainen 2010; Nummela & Westerholm 2020; Åkerlund et al. 2022; Juurakko-Paavola 2024) have long highlighted a growing polarization between bilingual young people with strong Finnish skills and young people in Swedish-speaking areas who rarely use Finnish in everyday life. These speakers often have some kind of idealized model of a “perfect Finnish speaker,” and comparing themselves to this model can cause embarrassment and fear - which in turn inhibits language use both in and outside the classroom (Haapala 2025).

We invite papers that explore how speakers of minority languages experience situations in which they need to use the majority language. Such situations may lead to experiences of either success or distress. For one part, we are interested in the ideologies, beliefs, and

attitudes that shape and influence attitudes toward language use, individuals' perceptions of their own linguistic skills, and their motivation for language learning. For the other, we are interested in exploring how emotions concerning linguistic skills and language are expressed and handled in interaction (Merke 2012).

We welcome contributions employing a wide range of methodological approaches. The panel is organized by the FinT research group (Åbo Akademi), the Modersmål och fäders land research group (University of Helsinki), and the School of Humanities at the University of Eastern Finland.

References

Haapala, J. (2025) Oppimisen mahdollistajia ja esteitä. Suomenruotsalaisten asiantuntijatyöntekijöiden kokemuksia suomen kielen käytöstä ja oppimisesta. *Sananjalka* 67, s. 194–217.

Juurakko-Paavola, T. (2024) Selvitys toisen kotimaisen kielen ylioppilastutkinnon pakollisuuden poistamisen vaikutuksista Suomen kielitaidon kannalta. Utredning om vilka konsekvenser slopandet av det andra inhemska språket som obligatoriskt ämne i studentexamen har för språkkunskaperna i Finland. Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö.

Merke, S. (2012) Kielenopiskelu ja tunteet. Affekti jäsentämässä opiskelijoiden aloittamia kysymyksiä vieraan kielen oppitunneilla. *Virittäjä* 116(2), s. 198–225. –

Nummela, Y. & A. Westerholm (2020) ”Det är bra att börja i tid”. Undervisningen i finska i de svenskspråkiga skolorna. Opetushallitus: Rapporter och utredningar 2020:5. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/det_ar_bra_att_borja_i_tid.pdf

Toropainen, O. (2010) Utvärdering av läroämnet finska i den grundläggande utbildningen 2009. Inlärningsresultaten i finska enligt A-lärokursen och den modersmålsinriktade lärokursen i årskurs 9 våren 2009. Uppföljningsrapporter 2010:1. Opetushallitus. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/129700_utvardering_av_laroamnet_finska_i_den_grundlaggande_utbildningen1.pdf

Åkerlund, C., J. Marjanen & E. Peltola (2022) A-finska kunskapsutveckling från åk 6 till åk 9. Nationella centret för utbildningsutvärdering, Publikationer 24: 2022. Nationella centret för utbildningsutvärdering. <https://www.karvi.fi/sv/publikationer/finska-kunskapsutveckling-fran-ak-6-till-ak-9>

Managing topical/activity transitions in spoken and written historical data: Perspectives on the use of linguistic and discursive resources (organized by *Anna Vatanen, Mikko T. Virtanen, Tiia Winther-Jensen*)

Organizing discourse and interaction is part of all language use. Speakers and writers regularly need to indicate a transition to a new (or back to a previous) topic or activity. Such transitions have been examined in several research traditions under the umbrella of Pragmatics. For example, in Conversation Analysis, transitions between activities have been a steady focus of interest. Studies have investigated, e.g., various resources to accomplish activity transitions in institutional encounters (Robinson & Stivers 2001; Deppermann, Schmitt & Mondada 2010) and in family interaction (Goodwin & Cekaite 2018), as well as pre-expansions and other pre-sequences (e.g., Schegloff 1990, 2007), such as pre-

announcements (e.g., Terasaki 2004), to indicate transitions into sequences of talk which implement social actions (or activities). In addition, also transitions between topics have been investigated in Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics, where research has found that various linguistic elements – from particles to fixed phrases and clausal constructions – are used for indicating the beginning of a new topic (e.g., Button & Casey 1984, 1985; Virtanen, Vepsäläinen & Koivisto 2021), the closure of a topic (e.g., Maynard 1980; Button 1990; Drew & Holt 1998), or, for instance, that what comes next is detached from prior talk (these elements are also called ‘misplacement markers’; see Buck 2024 and references therein).

Another important research area is metadiscourse research, where interest has lied upon the ways in which writers or speakers organize and clarify the current evolving discourse in terms of its topic and content, structuring and purpose, participant roles and so forth (e.g., Ädel 2006; Hyland 2017; Mauranen 2023). Studies in this field have discovered, for example, that certain clausal constructions, such as the so-called dialogical passive in Finnish (e.g., *kysytäänpä asiantuntijalta* ‘let’s ask an expert’), are employed as transition sentences to open or close a topic and/or activity and, further, to evoke a sense of joint undertaking between the writer and reader (Makkonen-Craig 2011).

Most of the previous literature in the above-mentioned traditions has focused on present-day data. Research in Historical Pragmatics and related disciplines, on the other hand, has emphasized other types of questions concerning linguistic and discursive phenomena, and the topics described above have been under-represented (note, however, some studies on discourse markers in historical data, e.g., Brinton 2023 and references therein). This panel thus invites contributions that study historical data using functional, usage-based, data-driven methods and focus on how language users manage topical/activity transitions. Historical data may mean, for instance, data that dates back to the first half of the 20th century, or the previous centuries. The panel will examine both spoken and written data as well as their interface; also comparative studies are encouraged (e.g., spoken vs. written; diachronic studies). Potential methodological approaches include, but are not limited to: Conversation Analysis, Interactional Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, Historical Sociolinguistics, and Historical Pragmatics. The scholars who have already expressed interest in contributing to the panel work on the following languages: Finnish, Veps, Japanese, and English.

Material and imagined objects in instructional activities (organized by *Koyuki Mitani, Lin Chen*)

Objects of various sorts figure prominently in the situated organization of social action in everyday and institutional activities (Nevile et al., 2014; Day & Wagner, 2019). In instructional contexts, objects have been shown to play a crucial role in organizing teaching and learning, including activities such as driving instruction (Deppermann, 2018), dance lessons (Keevallik, 2014), cooking lessons (Mondada, 2014), craft education (Ekström & Lindwall, 2014), and surgical training (Koschmann & Zemel, 2014). Instructional settings are perspicuous sites for examining objects in interaction because they make visible object-related competences that are taken for granted in everyday practice. That is, normative ways of recognizing, referencing, using, and handling objects are made publicly available as instructors guide novice participants through the instructed activity.

Adopting the praxeological perspective of multimodal conversation analysis, this panel builds on a large body of research that illuminates how differently structured material objects are implicated in the formation of instructive and corrective action across diverse settings. It also extends an incipient line of studies that reveal how objects without a physical presence are interactionally invoked through practices such as verbal descriptions, whole-body enactments, and depictive gestures grounded in a “haptic epistemology” (Streeck, 2009). In particular, the panel will explore how imagined objects (Keevallik, 2014) are occasioned and generated in situ as instructional practices to render specialized practical knowledge and manual know-how (Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2025) visibly instructable.

Contributions to the panel will explore how material and imagined objects are implicated in achieving instructed and instructive action (Lynch & Lindwall, 2023) across highly diverse settings, including insurance sales training, tea ceremony lessons, cooking classes, and pre-experimental instructions conducted by first and second language speakers of Chinese (Mandarin, Taiwanese Southern Min), English, Japanese, and Korean. One overarching question will be how instructors recipient-design their corrective and instructive action in response to the instructee’s conduct (Deppermann, 2018).

Metaphor-based Othering and Pragmatic Aggression in Public Discourse (organized by *Olga Mennecke*)

The panel examines how metaphors anchor and endorse othering and aggression by constructing out-groups as threatening, deviant and thus as justifiable targets of hostility in public discourse. It approaches othering as the figurative construction of an out-group as morally excluded, whereby metaphors assign to others a nature or agency that empowers in-group offence, derogation and aggression (Kövecses 2024; Kövecses and Douthwaite 2023).

From a cognitive-pragmatic perspective, metaphor is understood as a figure of iconic and analogical reasoning (Panther 2022) and as a case of pragmatic broadening in which a lexically encoded concept is contextually expanded toward a metaphorical interpretation (Carston 2012). This inferential view is central to the panel’s focus: metaphorical mappings shape how out-groups are evaluated and make particular forms of action toward them appear plausible or justified. By mapping out-groups onto animals, parasites, demonic forces, diseases or other threats, metaphors may render exclusion, containment or eradication as legitimate responses. These mappings are shaped by discourse context, speaker authority and ideological positioning, and frame social and political issues in ways that naturalise particular value judgments. The panel is therefore especially interested in how such mappings operate within illocutionary acts such as accusations, insults and threats, and how they orient perlocutionary uptake toward hostile interpretations and responses (Langton 2012).

In line with the conference theme “Building Bridges,” the panel invites theoretical, empirical, and methodological contributions on metaphor-based othering across languages and public genres, ranging from political speeches and wartime sermons to media and social media discourse. Possible topics include, but are not limited to, the following questions:

- How are deviant out-groups metaphorically constructed as enemies in different public contexts?
- How do metaphors contribute to dehumanisation, delegitimation or moral exclusion?
- How do metaphorical mappings shape illocutionary acts and orient their uptake toward derogation and aggression?
- How do speaker status, institutional

authority, genre conventions, audience design and ideological positioning condition metaphorical choices that enable or intensify othering?

Comparative, multilingual and interdisciplinary perspectives are particularly welcome. By making visible the metaphorical mechanisms through which othering and aggression are produced, the panel seeks to foster critical awareness of how language sustains antagonism and how such awareness may support less hostile, more reflective and bridge-building forms of public communication.

References:

Carston, Robyn. 2012. „Metaphor and the literal/non-literal distinction“. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*, eds. Keith Allan and Kasia M. Jaszczolt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 469–492.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2024. „The Conceptualization of Violence: A Brief Note“. In *Linguistica Cognitiva: Pesquisas e Tendências*, eds. Ana Christina Pelosi and Monica Fontinelle Carneiro. São Luís: Diálogos Críticos: Cultura, Direito e Sociedade, 175–90.

Kövecses, Zoltán, and John Douthwaite. 2023. „The Metaphoric and Metonymic Conceptualisation of the Other“. In *The Linguistics of Crime*, eds. John Douthwaite and Ulrike Tabbert. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16–38.

Langton, Rae. 2012. „Beyond Belief: Pragmatics in Hate Speech and Pornography“ eds. Ishani Maitra and Mary Kate McGowan. *Speech and Harm: Controversies Over Free Speech*: 72–93.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe. 2022. *Introduction to Cognitive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Methodologies of data collection in pragmatics: elicited, introspective, interactional and corpus-based evidence (organized by *Elisabetta Santoro, Borbala Samu, Adriana Porcellato*)

Pragmatic research is built on data, yet what counts as “data” in pragmatics remains a theoretically and methodologically sensitive question. Speech acts, evaluations of appropriateness, interactional moves, relational work and metapragmatic comments are not simply “found” in language use; they are made observable through specific methodological choices. This panel invites contributions that critically examine how different data collection methods influence the kind of pragmatic evidence researchers obtain and the types of phenomena they can describe, compare and interpret.

The panel takes as its starting point the experience of the Research Group “Pragmática (inter)linguística, cross-cultural e intercultural” (GPP), which investigates requests across languages and cultures through a triangulated design combining Written Discourse Completion Tasks, Multiple Choice Discourse Completion Tasks, role plays, real plays, perception questionnaires, retrospective interviews and think-aloud protocols. This experience raises broader questions that concern the field as a whole: What kind of pragmatic evidence is produced by elicited, experimental, introspective, observational or corpus-based methods? How do different methods model context, social distance, degree of imposition, participant roles and sociolinguistic variables? How can researchers compare data across

languages and cultures without reducing contextual complexity? What is gained and what is lost when moving from controlled elicitation to interactional data, from written responses to spoken performance, or from analyst-driven coding to participants' own metapragmatic accounts?

We welcome papers that address methodological issues in cross-cultural, intercultural, interlanguage, variational, interactional, corpus and digital pragmatics. Contributions may focus on requests, compliments, apologies, refusals, evaluations of (im)politeness or other pragmatic phenomena, but should foreground the methodological implications of the data collection procedure adopted. We particularly encourage studies that compare methods, reflect on triangulation, discuss annotation and coding practices, address ethical and practical constraints, or propose innovative combinations of quantitative and qualitative approaches.

The panel is intended to bring together members of the GPP and a wider international group of scholars working on pragmatic methodology, including researchers using DCTs, role plays, naturally occurring interaction, ethnographic data, perception tasks, retrospective interviews, think-aloud protocols, digital data and pragmatic corpora.

Selected references

Jucker, Andreas H., Klaus P. Schneider & Wolfram Bublitz (eds.). 2018. *Methods in Pragmatics*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kasper, Gabriele & Merete Dahl. 1991. Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13(2). 215–247.

McKinley, Jim & Heath Rose (eds.). 2020. *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London/New York: Routledge.

Santoro, Elisabetta, Luiz Antônio da Silva & Maria Zulma Kulikowski (eds.). 2021. *Estudos em Pragmática: atos de fala em português, italiano, espanhol e inglês*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas.

Multilingualism and Dementia in Interaction: Approaches to Communication, Care, and Inclusion across languages (organized by *Carolyn Schneider Ward, Katrin Karl*)

This panel explores the intersection of multilingualism and dementia interaction from pragmatic, interactional, and discourse-oriented perspectives. As aging populations and multilingual societies continue to grow worldwide (Navaneetham and Arunachalam 2025), communication involving multilingual persons living with dementia has become an increasingly important (Schneider Ward, Karl & Rzitki 2026; Schneider 2023; Karl 2021), yet still under-researched area.

We aim to bring together researchers working on multilingualism and dementia across different linguistic, cultural, institutional, and methodological contexts. We particularly welcome contributions that investigate how multilingual repertoires are negotiated, maintained, shifted, or reconfigured in interaction involving persons living with dementia, caregivers, family members, clinicians, or institutional staff. We are interested in how interactional practices may foster or hinder participation, mutual understanding, and social inclusion in multilingual dementia contexts.

Further, this panel seeks to build bridges between pragmatics and neighboring disciplines such as sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, interactional linguistics, conversation analysis, applied linguistics, clinical linguistics, aging studies, dementia studies, and healthcare communication. In doing so, it aims to contribute to ongoing discussions on ethical and methodological challenges in research with vulnerable populations, including questions of informed participation, data transparency, multimodality, comparability, and person-centered approaches to data collection and analysis. Possible topics include, but are not limited to:

- multilingual interaction in dementia care settings (informal, formal, institutionalized)
- intercultural pragmatics and cross-linguistic perspectives
- code-switching, translanguaging, and language choice in dementia interaction
- linguistic (a)symmetry, linguistic (in)equity
- repair, alignment, stance, and participation
- narrative, memory, and affect in multilingual interaction
- interactional constructions of identity and personhood
- caregiver–patient and family interaction
- multimodal pragmatics and embodied interaction
- ethical and methodological challenges in multilingual dementia research
- collaborative and interdisciplinary approaches to dementia communication

We envision the panel as an interdisciplinary forum for exchange on how pragmatic and interactional approaches can deepen our understanding of multilingual dementia interaction and contribute to more inclusive communicative practices in research and care contexts.

References

Karl, Katrin Bente, ed. 2021. *Mehrsprachige Pflegebedürftige in deutschen Pflegeheimen und das Projekt UnVergessen: Studierende an der Schnittstelle von Forschung und Gesellschaft*. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-33868-8>.

Navaneetham, Kannan, and Dharmalingam Arunachalam. 2025. “Global Population Aging, 1950–2050.” In *Handbook of Aging, Health and Public Policy*, edited by Sunil I. Rajan. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-78427_154.

Schneider Ward, Carolin., Karl, Katrin. B., & Rzitki, Aldona. 2026 in press. *Researching dementia in multilingual contexts: Approaches, challenges, and solutions*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Schneider, Carolin. 2023. *An Ethno-Social Approach to Code Choice in Bilinguals Living with Alzheimer’s: “In English or in Spanish? I Speak Both Languages.”* Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-46483-6>.

Multimedia and Multimodal Representations of Food: Pragmatic Perspectives on Identity and Space (organized by *Daniela Cesiri, Takako Kawabata*)

Food is rarely just sustenance in media discourse; it is a complex semiotic system used to negotiate identity, alterity, and cultural prestige. Simultaneously, enogastronomic promotion has emerged as a strategic pragmatic tool to manage the pressures of overtourism by redistributing visitors toward less crowded, peripheral destinations. This panel seeks to bridge these two dimensions, exploring the pragmatic implications of food representation across media and its role in shaping the spatial and social movements of the modern traveler.

From a pragmatics perspective, food discourse functions through complex speech acts of invitation, persuasion, and distinction. These representations often rely on indexicality, where specific ingredients or aesthetic presentations serve as shortcuts for complex cultural values or markers of “localness” and “tradition”. By analyzing food as a discursive, multimodal, and multisensorial tool, this panel aims to uncover how media representations – ranging from cookbooks and manga to social media and official tourism portals – shape our pragmatic competence in intercultural encounters and influence how we consume the “Other”.

We welcome contributions that employ – but are not necessarily limited to – critical discourse analysis, multimodality, (intercultural) pragmatics to examine the intersection of enogastronomy, media, and even sustainable tourism.

Key themes and approaches include but – again – are not limited to:

Stance-taking and Evaluation:

How media discourse constructs “authentic” vs. “hybrid” culinary identities and “slow food” vs. “fast tourism” hierarchies.

The Pragmatics of Translation: How culinary terms are adapted, borrowed, or “othered” when crossing linguistic borders.

Multimodal Pragmatics:

The role of visual imagery in triggering cultural presuppositions stereotypes, and the “tourist gaze”.

Intercultural (Mis)communication: Conflicts between the media-driven “myth” of a dish and its traditional pragmatic use.

Regenerative and Sustainable Tourism: Using enogastronomic heritage as a politeness strategy or tool to mitigate friction between locals and visitors.

By examining these dynamics across diverse languages and cultures (comparative perspectives are also welcomed), this panel aims to highlight how the linguistic and semiotic framing of food can recalibrate human movement and cultural understanding in an increasingly globalized world.

Multimodal List Constructions across languages and theoretical traditions (organized by Anna Inbar, Nadav Matalon)

List constructions are widely recognized as a recurrent communicative practice across languages and interactional settings. Research has shown that lists are multifunctional resources for categorization, stance-taking, common ground construction, discourse organization, and interactional coordination (Barsalou, 2021; Dankel et al., 2024; Inbar, 2020; Jefferson 1990; Masini et al., 2018; Schiffrin, 1994). Recent work has highlighted the inherently multimodal character of lists, demonstrating systematic associations between their construction, prosodic design, and gestural practices (Inbar, 2018, forthcoming; Masini et al., 2025; Tao, 2019). Studies further suggest that recurrent gestural patterns and prosodic

configurations may be associated with different types and discourse-pragmatic functions (Matalon2021; Sánchez-Ayala, 2003; Selting, 2007; Xavier & Wilcox, 2026). Research on sign languages has likewise shown that list constructions may rely on visual-spatial resources, including digital lists, pointing constructions, and embodied methods of referent tracking (e.g., Wilcox et al., 2024).

This panel aims to bring together researchers working on list constructions across languages, communicative contexts, and theoretical traditions. Our goal is to explore how list constructions are shaped by different communicative modalities and how multimodal resources contribute to their interpretation and interactional functions.

We particularly welcome contributions addressing questions such as:

- How are list constructions coordinated with gestures and gaze?
- What similarities and differences emerge between list constructions in spoken and signed languages?
- How do multimodal resources associated with lists contribute to categorization, stance-taking, and discourse organization?
- What can cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparisons reveal about the multimodal realization of lists?
- How do list constructions vary across interactional settings and communicative genres, including everyday face-to-face interaction, institutional discourse, public speeches, and social media?
- How are multimodal list constructions acquired, designed, and used in the course of language development and language socialization?

Examining listing practices from a comparative and cross-cultural perspectives may offer an opportunity to investigate the interplay between language, embodiment, cognition, and social interaction. By bringing together scholars working on gesture, sign languages, cognition, and spoken interaction, the panel aims to foster cross-disciplinary dialogue and advance our understanding of multimodal phenomena in human communication.

Multimodal Practices and Actions Across Settings and Languages (organized by *Xiaoyun Wang, Xiaoting Li*)

Adopting conversation analytic (CA), interactional linguistics (IL), and multimodal analysis, this panel examines how social actions are accomplished through multimodal practices including grammatical, prosodic, bodily-visual practices and material resources in interactions across a variety of settings and languages. It engages with the notion of practices (Schegloff, 1996, 1997), action formation (Levinson, 2013; Enfield & Sidnell, 2017) and social action formats (Fox, 2000, 2007), and extends it to multimodal formation of social actions (Rauniomaa & Keisanen, 2012; Enfield, 2009; Goodwin, 2018; Mondada, 2018).

In addition, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural data offer a particularly productive site for the exploration of multimodal action formation. Typological difference across languages shapes how actions are designed, recognized, and responded to in situated interaction, making visible the limits of accounts that treat linguistic form as a sufficient or universal cue to action. The referential indeterminacy associated with zero pronouns in Mandarin, for instance, renders action recognition heavily dependent on sequential position, interactional context, and embodied conduct (Li, forthcoming): a finding that invites comparison with how speakers of other languages mobilize multimodal resources to accomplish similar interactional work. By comparing data from multiple languages and settings, the panel

investigates the contextual and positional sensitivity of multimodal action formation across languages and interactional contexts.

The papers in this panel address a range of action types including (but not limited to) directive, assessment, repair, and instruction across diverse interactional settings. The data include naturalistic conversation, adult second language classroom interaction, child heritage language classroom interaction, doctor-patient consultations, and joint activities. The contributions draw on video-recorded interaction in (dialects of) Chinese, English, Japanese, and Swedish, and bring a cross-linguistic perspective to questions of action formation and action ascription across different linguistic, cultural, and institutional contexts. Together, they demonstrate how participants themselves orient to the relevance of specific multimodal practices in accomplishing and recognizing actions (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018), and collectively advance the understanding of a multimodal account of action formation.

Multimodal Pragmatics of Digital Polarization and De-escalation (organized by *Ruth Karachi Benson Oji, Marco Venuti*)

Social media platforms have been increasingly marked by rising antagonism and divisive language practices; nevertheless, pragmatics offers unique insights into both the mechanisms driving polarization and potential pathways toward more constructive dialogue. This panel directly addresses the conference theme "Building Bridges" by examining how pragmatic principles operate in multimodal digital contexts—where text, images, emojis, formatting, and platform affordances converge to shape meaning-making in polarized discourse.

While traditional pragmatic frameworks of politeness and face-work (Brown & Levinson, 1987) illuminate conflict management in face-to-face interaction, digital communication introduces distinctive challenges. As Park (2008) demonstrates, face-threatening acts operate differently in computer-mediated communication, where context collapse disrupts shared understanding and algorithmic curation amplifies division. Recent research reveals how social media platforms intensify moral outrage and polarization through design features that reward divisive content (Brady et al., 2021; Culpepper, 2021; Culpepper et al., 2025). Simultaneously, multimodal elements fundamentally reshape how pragmatic signals are produced and interpreted (Herring, 2015). A user's choice of emoji—which carries complex pragmatic functions beyond mere emotional expression (Weissman, 2022)—the visual framing of an argument, or the strategic deployment of GIFs can intensify antagonism or create unexpected opportunities for de-escalation. Understanding these dynamics requires moving beyond text-only analysis to examine how pragmatic principles function across modalities and platforms.

This panel brings together empirical research employing diverse methodologies—including corpus analysis, multimodal discourse analysis, computational approaches, and experimental work—to investigate questions such as: How do multimodal elements function as pragmatic markers signaling openness versus closure in divisive exchanges? What strategies enable users to maintain or cross group boundaries in politically charged discussions? How do platform-specific affordances shape the pragmatic landscape of polarized discourse? What role does pragmatic competence play in digital citizenship and online civility?

The panel promotes the interdisciplinary dialogue called for by the conference organizers by bridging pragmatics with applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, corpus linguistics, media

studies, and social psychology. Importantly, presentations will extend beyond descriptive analysis to explore practical implications for platform design, content moderation policies, and digital literacy education. We welcome co-panelists from multiple disciplines who share our commitment to understanding how pragmatic insights can contribute to reducing societal divides and promoting more harmonious digital interactions.

Multimodal Speech Acts across Interactional and Digital Contexts (organized by *Xianming Fang, Fang Xie*)

Speech acts are not accomplished through words alone. In both face-to-face and digital interaction, individuals rely not only on verbal forms, but also on a range of embodied, vocal, and semiotic resources, including gestures, gazes, facial expressions, postures, prosody, emojis, stickers, and other platform-specific affordances. These resources may reinforce, mitigate, or even partly constitute the action being performed. Hence, a request, refusal, apology, complaint, compliment, or disagreement is not simply a matter of lexical or grammatical choice, but is often produced and interpreted through the coordination of multiple modes. Despite the importance of multimodal resources in speech acts, research in this area has tended to privilege verbal realizations, paying comparatively limited attention to the multimodal organization of action (Jucker, 2024).

This panel seeks to foreground the multimodal nature of speech acts and to bring together scholars interested in how social actions are produced, perceived, and negotiated across different communicative settings. We invite contributions that examine how embodied, vocal, and other semiotic resources shape the performance and interpretation of speech acts, and how these resources interact with verbal meaning in context. Particularly welcome are studies that investigate how multimodal cues influence the force, meaning, politeness, appropriateness, and relational implications of speech acts in naturally occurring or elicited interaction. We also welcome work on digitally mediated communication, where speech acts are frequently accomplished through combinations of written language and visual or graphic resources.

The panel is intended as a forum for theoretical, methodological, and empirical work. Relevant topics may include, but are not limited to, the role of gestures, gazes, facial expressions, postures, prosody, and voice quality in speech act production and perception; multimodal (im)politeness in speech acts; comparisons between face-to-face and digitally mediated interaction; and methodological issues involved in identifying and analyzing speech acts across modalities. We welcome a range of methodological approaches, including conversation analysis, multimodal interaction analysis, experimental pragmatics, corpus-based methods, and mixed-methods designs that combine quantitative perception measures with qualitative analysis of multimodal resources.

By bringing together research on both face-to-face and digitally mediated interaction, this panel aims to contribute to a broader rethinking of speech acts as multimodal phenomena. More broadly, it seeks to encourage dialogue among speech act theory, multimodal interaction research, pragmatics, and digital discourse studies, and to advance a more comprehensive understanding of how social actions are accomplished across multiple semiotic resources.

Reference

Jucker, A. H. (2024). *Speech acts: Discursive, multimodal, diachronic*. Cambridge University Press.

Multi-Unit Turns in Interaction: Recipient Design and Participation (organized by *Karita Suomalainen, Haruka Amatani, Ritva Laury, Mari Wiklund*)

This panel explores the organization of multi-unit turns (MUTs) in interaction, with focus on the role of the recipient. By MUTs, we mean complex, lengthy utterances, stretches of talk by one speaker linking together units such as clauses, phrases, and particles, which often emerge in ways not commonly recognized in grammars (see Houtkoop & Mazeland 1985; Marian et al. 2021; Gardner et al. 2025; see also “never-ending sentences”, Auer 1992; “clause chaining”, Iwasaki 2013; “big packages”, Jefferson 1988).

MUTs are defined as lengthy contributions by one speaker, but they do not exist in a vacuum. Recipients do not remain passive during MUTs. Like all conversational activities, MUTs are designed for their recipients and emerge interactively. As shown by Gardner et al. (2025), recipient contributions may be vocal, consisting of response particles, questions, and even clausal or phrasal contributions, or vocal noises such as laughter. Prosodic features of vocal contributions play a crucial role in how they are interpreted and how they contribute to the MUT. In addition, recipients’ gestures such as head nods, posture, and gaze contribute to the MUT by showing stance and affiliation. While Gardner et al. is based on data from a variety of Australian English, it is one purpose of this panel to explore the crosslinguistic variation in the use of these resources by recipients. For example, head nods are used by speakers of Japanese with much greater frequency than in many other languages, for example in English, and their form and use by speakers is finely attuned to the use of head nods by their recipients (Amatani, Usuda & Suzuki in preparation).

The contributions to the panel examine how speakers design multi-unit turns in relation to recipients and how recipients respond to, anticipate, and otherwise shape these extended turns through verbal, prosodic, embodied, and interactional practices in a range of languages including Danish, Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Japanese, Japanese sign language, Mandarin, and Russian, in settings ranging from everyday conversation, group therapeutic sessions, and interaction facilitated by an interpreter. By bringing together perspectives from Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics, the panel aims to advance our understanding of the collaborative nature of turn construction and participation in social interaction. We invite both junior and senior scholars to join our panel.

References

Auer, P. 1992. The Neverending Sentence: Rightward Expansion in Spoken Language. In Kontra, M. & Várdi, T. (eds), *Studies in Spoken Languages: English, German and Finno-Ugric*. Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 42–59.

Gardner, R., Blythe, J., Mushin, I., Stirling, L., Dahmen, J., de Dear, C., & Possemato, F. 2025. *The Making of Multi-Unit Turns: A Spring-Loaded Door*. John Benjamins.

Houtkoop, H., & Mazeland, H. 1985. Turns and Discourse Units in Everyday Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9(5):593–620.

Iwasaki, S. 2013. *Japanese*. Revised edition. John Benjamins.

Jefferson, G. 1988. On the Sequential Organization of Troubles Talk in Ordinary Conversation. *Social Problems* 35(4): 418–441.

Marian, K., Malabarba, T., & Weatherall, A. 2021. Multi-Unit Turns That Begin with a Resaying of a Prior Speaker's Turn. *Language & Communication* 78:77–87.

Narrating Inherited Trauma: Stance, Epistemics, and Accountability Across Languages and Cultures (organized by *Bracha Nir, Tomoko I. Sakita*)

Narrative studies have shown that stories are socially situated practices through which speakers construct identities, relationships, moral positions, and forms of knowledge (Schiffrin 1996; Ochs & Capps 2001). This panel invites contributions on the linguistic and pragmatic aspects of narrating inherited trauma across languages and cultures. It focuses on narratives in which speakers recount experiences of war, persecution, displacement, captivity, disappearance, or return that they did not witness directly, but know through family transmission, prior tellings, partial knowledge, and later reconstruction (Hirsch 2012; Leksana & Subekti 2023). The panel is anchored in ongoing comparative work on second-generation Hebrew and Japanese narratives of World War II (Nir & Sakita 2022), and asks a broader research question: how do speakers make inherited traumatic pasts tellable when the narrated events are personally consequential but not experientially their own? This question links narrative analysis with pragmatics, since such tellings require speakers to manage entitlement, source of knowledge, uncertainty, affect, moral positioning, and accountability toward absent others and present audiences.

We are especially interested in the linguistic resources through which narrators claim or limit the right to tell another person's story; calibrate certainty, hearsay, and reconstruction; display responsibility toward those whose memory they preserve; and build evaluation and intersubjective alignment into the unfolding structure of the account. The proposed approach is discourse-pragmatic and comparative, focusing on how these meanings are built through narrative structure, stance-taking, reported or constructed speech, evidential practices, and evaluative resources. These issues complicate stance analysis (Du Bois 2007), extend work on evidentiality in interaction (Nuckolls & Michael 2014), and invite renewed attention to reported or constructed speech as a resource for animating voices known through prior tellings (Tannen 1986).

Contributions may examine spoken, written, or digital data, including interviews, oral histories, family narratives, public testimony, educational or commemorative discourse, digital storytelling, and other sites in which inherited trauma is narrated. We welcome work from pragmatics, discourse analysis, interactional linguistics, linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics. Relevant topics include stance and narrative authority, epistemic positioning, evidential practices, accountability, evaluative and moral stance, intergenerational narration, reported speech, and cross-linguistic or cross-cultural comparison. Contributions may focus on World War II as well as other contexts of collective violence, persecution, forced displacement, disappearance, captivity, or return.

References:

Du Bois, J. W. 2007. The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse*. John Benjamins.

Hirsch, M. 2012. The generation of postmemory. Columbia University Press.

Leksana, G., & Subekti, A. 2023. Remembering through fragmented narratives: Third generations and the intergenerational memory of the 1965 anti-leftist violence in Indonesia. *Memory Studies*, 16(2), 465-480.

Nir, B., & Sakita, T. I. 2022. A crosslinguistic study of intersubjectivity. *JSLS conference handbook*.

Nuckolls, J. B., & Michael, L. 2014. Evidentiality in interaction. John Benjamins.

Ochs, E., & Capps, L. 2001. *Living narrative*. Harvard University Press.

Schiffrin, D. 1996. Narrative as self-portrait. *Language in Society*, 25(2), 167-203.

Tannen, D. 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*. De Gruyter.

Narratives-in-interaction: participation, mediation, inclusion (organized by *Biagio Ursi, Inés Olza*)

Storytelling is a common activity in everyday conversation, across a wide range of contexts in daily life and in all conversational cultures. The aim of this panel is to explore the applied dimensions of interactional and discourse studies on narration, with a focus on multimodal approaches.

Narration unfolds temporally as a conversational activity in talk-in-interaction (Sacks 1974, Goodwin 2015), and every participant can take part in it, either as a narrator or as an audience member receiving the story. Several configurations are thus possible, and interactants draw on various multimodal resources to define their positioning (Deppermann 2015) in relation to the events being narrated (such as whether they are familiar with the facts or not, or have experienced similar events, etc.).

Narratives play a pivotal role on the construction and negotiation of identity and interpersonal relationships (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). This panel aims to explore the narrative mode of talk-in-interaction from complementary applied perspectives. We consider narration as a situated activity that takes place for practical purposes, collaboratively, and through the mobilization of a variety of multimodal resources (prosodic, lexical, morphosyntactic, as well as material and embodied resources).

We will welcome studies on the strategies of (collaborative) construction of narratives that operate in interaction and, more specifically, in mediation across various domains (family and penal mediation, couple therapy, intercultural mediation, etc.). We encourage submissions on the use of narratives as resources for accessibility and inclusion, especially in atypical interactions (Wilkinson et al. 2020) and vulnerable contexts. Finally, contributors could examine how narratives are mobilized in foreign language classroom interactions and educational settings, where they emerge as key strategies of linguistic and cultural mediation.

All three applied perspectives highlight the fundamental role of narratives-in-interaction as instruments of mediation in a broad sense. The aim of this panel is to show how storytelling

can contribute to effective, socially grounded communication through interactional practices. Narratives can build bridges in interaction between narrators and co-participants contributing to ensure mutual understanding, and eventually mitigating conflict, and polarization. In this way, they make it possible to remedy inequalities and vulnerabilities in increasingly diverse and complex societies.

References

- Bamberg, M. & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text and Talk*, 28(3), 377-396
- Deppermann, A. (2015). Positioning. In A. De Fina & A. Georgakopoulou (Eds.), *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118458204.ch19>
- Goodwin, C. (2015). Narrative as Talk-in-Interaction. In *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118458204.ch10>
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In J. Sherzer & R. Bauman (Eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (p. 337-353). Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkinson, R., Rae, J. & Rasmussen, G. (Eds.) (2020). *Atypical Interaction*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Negation in multimodal perspectives: gesture pragmatics, contextualised meaning-making, and cross-linguistic variation (organized by *Simon Harrison, Silva Ladewig, Suwei Wu*)

Negation/negating has played a vital role in establishing multimodal perspectives on meaning, language, and communication. A head shake, a laterally swept palm, a furrowed brow, a quick turn away from the interlocutor – speakers negate, reject, deny, and distance themselves through such bodily movements, often before, or instead of, any linguistic marker of negation. Both negation and gesture have also been historically central to pragmatics, observations featuring in speech act theory, implicature, and politeness. Their interrelation has more recently become a productive site in gesture studies, both for empirical exemplification of meaning-making and multimodal language comprehension, and for theorising how bodies participate in contextualised language use (receiving in-depth treatment by Calbris, Kendon, Streeck, and Müller). A now-substantial body of work is exploring the integrated, multimodal expression of negation, i.e. the coordination of prosody, gesture, and grammar in the act of negating (e.g., Prieto & Espinal, 2020; Harrison, 2024; Harrison, Ladewig, & Wu, in preparation).

Current work on multimodal negation draws on 4 converging lines of inquiry: (a) “the two main theoretical positions” in gesture studies for pragmatics, which are “understanding of pragmatics as communicative action” and “gesture pragmatics...(as) *conditio sine qua non* of gestural meaning” (Müller, 2017, pp. 276-277); (b) Kendon’s account of speech and gesture as “partners” in utterance production and his identification of gesture’s pragmatic functions (Kendon 2004; cf. López-Ozieblo, 2020); (c) recurrent gesture theory explaining how form-meaning pairings stabilise across contexts of use and individuals (Ladewig, 2024; Harrison &

Ladewig, 2021), and (d) observations of typological variation across spoken and signed language negation (e.g., Zeshan 2004; Pfau, 2015).

In this panel, we convene scholars approaching negation multimodally as a coordinated expression, pragmatic accomplishment, and integrated understanding. Our goal is to revisit foundational theories with current empirical and methodological work (including corpus-based, experimental, discourse-pragmatic, or conversation-analytic studies). We invite contributions that examine people negating bodily across languages, cultures, and interactional settings. Conceptual and theoretical papers assessing how negation shapes our understanding of the language-gesture relationship are similarly invited. Contributions might tackle, but are not limited to, the following questions:

- How do gesture, prosody, and grammar jointly construct negation in interaction, and how are they temporally coordinated and processed?
- Through what processes do gestures associated with negation and manual/nonmanual signs conventionalise over time?
- What functions and operations does multimodal negation perform or accomplish? How can their study inform core pragmatic theories?
- Which dimensions of negating bodily are shared or vary typologically and culturally?
- How is multimodal negation shaped by discourse domains and genres?
- How well do canonical theories (Kendon's partnership model, recurrent gesture theory, gesture pragmatics) account for negation?
- What does negation reveal about the 'common ground' of gesture and sign?

Negative emotions in helping interactions (organized by *Carolina Fenner, Eva-Maria Graf, Andrea Jesser*)

Emotions are endemic in helping settings, such as psychotherapy, counseling, and helplines. They serve both as a thematic focus and as part of the interaction between the person seeking help and the person providing it. Negative emotions – such as sadness, fear, and shame – are particularly crucial in contexts that are initiated due to the existence of some problematic and emotionally charged issue. Emotions thereby often serve as catalysts for initiating conversations and shaping the helping process.

While conversation analysts have contributed valuable insight into how (negative) emotions are displayed (vocally and bodily), attributed, acknowledged, and managed in talk-in-interaction (e.g., Potter & Hepburn, 2026; Robles & Weatherall, 2021), research remains unevenly distributed. Studies have primarily focused on psychotherapeutic settings, examining negative emotions like disappointment (Couper-Kuhlen, 2009), distress (Muntigl, 2020), anger (Potter & Hepburn, 2026), and upset (Muntigl et al., 2014, 2023). Yet, emotions such as shame, as well as helping contexts like medical encounters, coaching, and digital support, remain understudied. Moreover, systematic cross-setting comparisons are lacking, particularly regarding how similar emotions are interactionally managed and normatively framed—what is expectable, acceptable, or even desired in different helping formats.

This panel addresses these gaps by exploring the multifaceted role of negative emotions in both face-to-face and digital helping settings. It brings together empirical studies to examine:

- Expression of emotion: How are negative emotions multimodally displayed across contexts, and what forms do they take?

- Interactive functions: What social actions (e.g. empathy, alignment, or resistance) do these displays elicit or accomplish in expert-helper interactions?

- Cross-setting comparisons: Are there context-specific patterns in the occurrence, management, and normative treatment of negative emotions?

By adopting a multimodal approach, the panel aims to deepen our understanding of the complexity of emotional expressions and their interactional consequences. It also seeks to foster dialogue on methodological and theoretical advancements for analyzing negative emotions in practice, across diverse helping contexts.

References

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2009). A sequential approach to affect: The case of ‘disappointment’. In M. Haakana, M. Laakso, & J. Lindström (Eds.), *Talk in interaction: Comparative dimensions* (pp. 94–123). Finnish Literature Society.

Muntigl, P. (2020). Managing distress over time in psychotherapy: Guiding the client in and through intense emotional work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 3052.

Muntigl, P. (2023). *Interaction in psychotherapy: Managing relationships in emotion-focused treatments of depression*. Cambridge University Press.

Muntigl, P., Knight, N. K., & Angus, L. (2014). Targeting emotional impact in storytelling: Working with client affect in emotion-focused psychotherapy. *Discourse Studies*, 16(6), 753–775.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2026). *Emotionography: Theory, research, practice*. American Psychological Association.

Robles, J. S., & Weatherall, A. (Eds.). (2021). *How emotions are made in talk*. John Benjamins.

Negotiated Politeness in Korean Interactions (organized by *Mee-Jeong Park*)

This panel examines how Korean speakers negotiate politeness through shifts between polite and non-polite speech styles, with particular attention to movements both into and out of panmal ‘half-talk.’ Although Korean is well known for its elaborate honorific and speech-level system (Sohn 1981, 1999), speech-style choice in actual interactions is not determined solely by age, status, or social hierarchy. Speakers instead draw on polite and non-polite forms as pragmatic resources for managing intimacy, distance, stance, footing, and relational alignment as the interaction unfolds (Eun and Strauss 2004; Strauss and Eun 2005; Brown 2011, 2015).

The panel focuses on the interactional work involved in moving between polite speech and panmal.

These transitions are rarely automatic or socially neutral. They may be proposed, delayed, accepted, resisted, repaired, or reversed as speakers negotiate relational meanings moment-by-moment. When appropriately timed and mutually ratified, panmal may index closeness, solidarity, informality, and affective involvement in the relationship. However, when introduced without sufficient relational grounding, it may be perceived as rude, presumptuous, or face-threatening (Brown and Levinson 1987; Brown 2011; Kiaer et al. 2019). This risk is especially salient among speakers who have only recently met, since a shift from polite speech to panmal often requires careful negotiation of age relations, social identities, institutional roles, and interpersonal boundaries.

However, negotiated politeness is not limited to a one-way movement from polite speech to panmal. Speakers may also shift from panmal back to polite speech to mark distance, display formality, soften or repair a delicate moment, signal a change in participation framework, create humor or irony, manage public accountability, or recalibrate a relationship that has become momentarily too intimate or interactionally risky. By examining speech-style shifts in both directions, the panel highlights the flexible and reversible character of politeness negotiation in Korean interactions. Korean speech styles are therefore approached not as fixed labels of social position but as resources through which participants build, test, affirm, and revise their relationships with one another.

The panel brings together studies of naturally occurring and mediated Korean discourse, including talk shows, reality programs, dramas, classroom interactions, interviews, and other public or semi-public encounters. Across these settings, it examines how transitions between polite and non-polite speech styles become visible, accountable, and negotiable in the data. It also considers how such transitions are shaped by the sequential organization of talk, the identities speakers make relevant, and the interactional goals pursued at the moment.

Particular attention is given to practices such as identity negotiation (Swann 1987, 2008; Park 2024), age disclosure, address-term adjustment, clause omission, avoidance of sentence endings, laughter, joking, repair, self-correction, metapragmatic commentary on the speech style itself, among others. Taken together, these studies show that Korean speakers use speech styles not merely to reflect pre-existing relationships, but to shape, test, and recalibrate those relationships in interaction. The panel contributes to Korean pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, and the teaching of Korean pragmatics in first-, second-, and heritage-language contexts.

Negotiating expertise: AI-augmented literacy in textually mediated knowledge work in the age of generative AI (organized by *Hanna-Mari Pienimäki, Anna Solin*)

Expertise often comes wrapped in linguistic packaging. Linguistically mediated expertise is not just a display of substance knowledge, it is also a demonstration of a skillful performance, and a deployment of linguistic, textual, rhetorical, indexical and genre-specific understandings. Up until now, all of this had to be mastered by a single individual or a small team. How might this be changing as more and more knowledge work is being carried out with generative AI (GAI)? Are there aspects of expertise that are more easily outsourceable to GAI? What forms of epistemic authority, if any, remain the human expert's responsibility? Are there forms of expertise that cannot, by design, be outsourced to GAI?

Reflecting the conference theme of building bridges, this panel invites contributions from pragmatics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics, as well as from other disciplines that are interested in how GAI shapes the expert voice. The purpose is to bring together different kinds of knowledge traditions to 1) map what kind of work is being done in different fields and contexts to make sense of the transformation, and 2) theorize the division of labor between the human and GAI in AI-augmented writing on the textual level.

Papers in this panel will focus on how expertise is negotiated in GAI-mediated professional practices. We welcome contributions that take a data-driven approach to the study of GAI in professional contexts. The contexts can range from business, universities and public sector organizations to journalism and medicine. The papers in this panel investigate for example how professionals talk about GAI-augmented knowledge work, the potential technology-induced transformations in work identities and how professionals use GAI in their daily work.

Negotiating Support and Autonomy: Linguistic and Communicative Practices Surrounding Aging and Assistance (organized by *Haruka Sakai, Mao Chida*)

This panel discusses the linguistic and communicative practices surrounding aging and assistance, or care, as processes of social interaction. Social support and physical assistance are provided in ways that orient to the autonomy and cognitive and physical capacities of older adults. However, such assistance may create tension, as it establishes an asymmetric caregiver–recipient relationship through interactional processes (Coupland et al., 1988). In particular, because older adults’ experiences of aging vary across multiple dimensions, the timing and manner of assistance are determined and negotiated by participants moment by moment. This raises the question of how assistance is organized within such relationships—specifically, when and how assistance is offered, accepted, or rejected, and what types of care systems operate in practice.

This panel brings together research on the interactional processes of communication involving older adults, drawing on video-recorded data of naturally occurring interaction analyzed through multimodal conversation analysis, social interaction analysis, pragmatics, and the ethnography of communication. These approaches share the underlying premise that assistance is a collaborative activity rather than a one-way action (cf. recruitment of assistance; Kendrick & Drew, 2016). Previous studies have demonstrated such collaborative activities, primarily in care settings, including interactions involving individuals with dementia. For example, studies have examined decision-making processes in care settings (Backhaus, 2010) and the implementation of “autonomous action” as an interpersonal practice, rather than an impersonal capability (Hosoma, 2025). Thus, describing interactional processes through linguistic, bodily, and material resources provides an essential foundation for illuminating the practices of aging and assistance.

Based on previous research, this panel advances the inquiry in two directions. First, it broadens the scope from care-oriented facilities to various everyday settings within local communities. In everyday settings, participants negotiate whether, when, and how to assist older adults; this occurs at home, on the street, in community centers, or during service encounters (Sakai & Sakaida, 2026). This contrasts with care settings, where roles tend to emerge as part of institutional work. This perspective enables us to shed light on the practices of those surrounding older adults (Hydén, 2014; Chatwin et al., 2022). Second, it expands the

dimensions through which assistance is practiced. Taking into account intercorporeality, multisensoriality, and technology-mediated care (Hydén et al., 2024; Mondada, 2019; Nakagawa, 2022), we elucidate support and autonomy by analyzing which resources are mobilized and how they are deployed in the negotiation of assistance. The panel thus examines how participants interactionally manage the balance and tension between support and autonomy and contributes to interactional research on the nature of aging and assistance.

We welcome papers that examine these practices through the approaches outlined above.

Negotiating uncertainty about identity and experience in institutional encounters

(organized by *Jana Declercq, Mieke Vandenbroucke*)

This panel examines how uncertainty around people's identities and experiences (regarding their bodies, relationships and life histories) is constructed in institutional settings. Pragmatics has a long history of studying (un)certainty in language through concepts as hedging, modality, mitigation. Language-in-use scholars doing applied research have also looked at how uncertainty in institutional encounters plays a role discursively. This is crucial as social scientific research shows that when institutions develop knowledge and formalise procedures and expertise, this generates, and sometimes obscures (new) uncertainties (Beck, 1992). As Giddens (1991) argued, modern institutions increasingly organise social life through abstract 'expert systems' promising Weberian control and predictability. Yet, rather than eliminating uncertainty, these systems often relocate it: individuals must trust specialised knowledge and procedures they cannot fully access or contest. In institutional encounters this is consequential, as people's identities and experiences (bodies, relationships and life histories) are assessed through expert categories, making uncertainty not only an epistemic condition, but also a deeply personal and interactional one.

This panel focuses two types of institutional procedures where the status of experience and identity is inherently uncertain: healthcare and migration governance. In healthcare, medicalisation and technologization provide more treatment options than ever (Clarke et al., 2003), creating complex dynamics of communicating uncertainty and informed, shared decision making. Healthcare has also become more specialised and dispersed across different specialised providers (Bourgeault, 2022), making knowledge and understandings of a patients' bodies and identities differentiated (Mol, 2002), and often uncertain. Research also shows that health outcomes are stratified and minority groups fare worse because their health problems remain underestimated, underdiagnosed, and undertreated (Leonard et al., 2022), exacerbating uncertainty.

In migration governance, uncertainty often concerns not only the outcome of trajectories such as asylum or family reunification procedures, but also the recognisability of migrants' experiences within institutional frames of interpretation (Maryns, 2006; Vandenbroucke, 2020; Belloni et al., 2026). In multilingual gatekeeping encounters, participants may be uncertain whether accounts of displacement, partnership, or belonging are mutually understood, or whether their narratives conform to implicit norms of coherence and credibility. Uncertainty itself can also acquire indexical value: hedging, mitigation, silence, incomplete knowledge may be read by institutional agents not as ordinary limits of memory, but as signs of untrustworthiness with far-reaching consequences for procedural outcomes and migrants' personal lives.

This panel brings together empirical presentations which examine both micro-level linguistic and more macro-level discursive constructions of uncertainty in relation to identity and experience (regarding bodies, relationships and life histories) in institutional health and migration encounters, given that self-representation and the appropriate framing of personal experiences and narratives are often key in such settings. These narratives can be inherently laced with uncertainty or generate uncertainty in light of institutional norms. We invite language-in-use scholars working on either healthcare and/or migration, using a range of methods (pragmatics, interactional sociolinguistics, linguistic ethnography, discourse analysis, conversation analysis, social actor theory), to share their insights on how uncertainty shapes and gets shaped in institutional encounters in healthcare and migration governance.

New Technologies in the Study of Communication: Rethinking Data, Analysis, and Communication Practices (organized by *Ryosaku Makino, Kanato Ochiai, Taiga Mori*)

The study of communication has always been shaped by the tools available to researchers. Audio recording enabled conversation analysis; video recording opened up multimodal research; and the development of transcription conventions — from Jefferson's (2004) foundational system to Mondada's (2018) multimodal notation — gave analysts a shared language for representing the fine-grained details of talk and embodied action. Software such as ELAN (Sloetjes & Wittenburg, 2008) further transformed how analysts segment, annotate, and navigate complex multimodal data. Today, a new wave of technologies — automatic annotation systems, AI-assisted transcription tools, programmatic data collection via APIs, and digital communication platforms — is again transforming how communication is recorded, analyzed, and even constituted. This panel brings together researchers working at these intersections, asking: what does the advent of new technologies mean for the theory and practice of communication research?

We identify three distinct but related sites of transformation. First, advances in computer vision and machine learning now enable automatic detection and annotation of multimodal behaviors — gaze, head nods, gesture — previously coded by hand, raising questions about reliability and the analytic categories presupposed in such systems. Alongside this, API-based collection from social media platforms enables large corpora of naturally occurring digital communication, opening new empirical windows onto language use and emergent communicative practices (cf. Page et al., 2022). Both developments challenge researchers to reconsider what counts as data and how it is obtained. Second, transcription and annotation tools are changing the practical ecology of conversation analysis. Tools that integrate audio/video playback, transcript editing, and annotation within a single interface alter the analyst's workflow, with consequences for what gets noticed, how sequential structure is represented, and how findings are communicated — and raise the question of how established transcription conventions can be reimaged for dynamic digital environments. Third, digital platforms — from live-streaming services to social media such as LINE and X (Twitter) — have not merely provided new data but have created genuinely new communicative environments. Novel resources (real-time chat, algorithmic curation, virtual avatars, emoji, and platform-specific conventions) configure participation in ways that challenge existing frameworks of recipient design, audience, co-presence, and sequential organization.

The panel addresses technology as methodological resource, analytic challenge, and object of study. Contributors are invited to engage any of these dimensions, empirically or

theoretically, drawing on face-to-face, computer-mediated, or digitally augmented communication.

References

- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins.
- Mondada, L. (2018). Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: Challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(1), 85–106.
- Page, R., Barton, D., Lee, C., Unger, J. W., & Zappavigna, M. (2022). *Researching Language and Social Media: A Student Guide* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Sloetjes, H., & Wittenburg, P. (2008). Annotation by category: ELAN and ISO DCR. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2008)*.

Official parliamentary transcripts and video recordings as research data in pragmatics (organized by *Jenni Räikkönen, Kirsi Sandberg, Eero Voutilainen*)

During the past few decades, there has been increasing interest in the research on parliamentary debates from pragmatic and discourse perspectives. Most past studies on the pragmatics of parliamentary debates have been based on official parliamentary transcripts prepared in parliaments. However, using official parliamentary transcripts as data can pose certain challenges in pragmatics and other linguistic analyses. For instance, transcription and editorial practices vary from one parliament to the next, making cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparisons difficult. Moreover, post-editing of contributions in the reports raises questions about whether such analyses provide insight into the language used in the parliamentary sittings themselves or rather the language of the reports (see e.g., Slembrouck 1992; Mollin 2007; Hiltunen, Räikkönen, & Tyrkkö 2020; Tyrkkö & Kotze 2023; Voutilainen 2023). The official video recordings, on the other hand, also follow a certain tradition of portraying parliamentary sessions, which might prove limiting in some research traditions.

The goal of this panel is to bring together linguists who utilise official video recordings or transcripts of parliamentary sittings in their research. We welcome individual researchers and research teams interested in parliamentary discourse and rhetoric, representing diverse research traditions and methodological approaches to present their work, share experiences and discuss different ways of using these data in linguistic studies. Presentations may focus on video recordings or reports of sittings in any parliament. They can also be multi- or interdisciplinary. Here are some examples of possible topics:

- What kinds of pragmatic phenomena can be studied using parliamentary transcripts or video recordings from parliamentary sittings as data? What types of methodological approaches are suitable for studying pragmatic phenomena in different types of parliamentary corpora?What types of challenges do transcription traditions pose for studies in pragmatics? What differences exist between official parliamentary transcripts of different countries and between transcripts produced in different time periods?

References

Hiltunen, T., J. Räikkönen & J. Tyrkkö. 2020. Investigating colloquialization in the British parliamentary record in the late 19th and early 20th century. *Language Sciences* 79: 101270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2020.101270>

Mollin, S. 2007. The Hansard hazard: Gauging the accuracy of British parliamentary transcripts. *Corpora* 2(2): 187–210. <https://doi.org/10.3366/cor.2007.2.2.187>

Slembrouck, S. 1992. The parliamentary Hansard “verbatim” report: The written construction of spoken discourse. *Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics* 1(2): 101–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096394709200100202>.

Tyrkkö, J. & H. Kotze. 2023. Perspectives on parliamentary discourse: From corpus linguistics to cultural analytics. In J. Tyrkkö, M. Korhonen, & H. Kotze (eds.), *Exploring Language and Society with Big Data: Parliamentary Discourse Across Time and Space*, pp. 1–16. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.111.intro>

Voutilainen, E. 2023. Written representation of spoken interaction in the official parliamentary transcripts of the Finnish Parliament. *Frontiers in Communication* 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2023.1047799>

Perlocution in Professional Communication: Integrating Corpus and Experimental Approaches (organized by *Sylvia Jaworska, Mian Jia*)

Speech act theory has generated a substantial and methodologically diverse body of research. Locution and illocution, in particular, have received extensive scholarly attention: a wide range of speech acts has been examined across languages, cultures, and professional settings using qualitative, quantitative, and corpus-based approaches. This work has revealed distinctive lexico-grammatical and contextual features and provided important insights into how language users get things done with words across communities of practice. By contrast, perlocution - defined as the consequential effects of an utterance on the feelings, thoughts, evaluations, or actions of an addressee, speaker, or third parties - has remained comparatively underexplored (Jucker, 2024). This is particularly striking given that studies in pragmatics and discourse analysis, including corpus-based research, frequently invoke such effects and often suggest that linguistic patterns influence perceptions, judgements, or beliefs without systematically investigating these effects. Research in communication studies, by contrast, has placed these effects at the centre of inquiry (Reimer et al., 2026). Using robust experimental methods, it has produced valuable insights into how language can influence attitudes and behaviour. However, this work is often constrained by the relative inauthenticity of the linguistic stimuli employed and by a limited connection to the features that characterise naturally occurring discourse. As a result, the validity of such findings may be restricted to experimental settings.

This panel addresses these gaps by bringing together researchers from pragmatics, communication studies, and corpus linguistics to develop integrated approaches to the study of perlocution. We argue that corpus-based methods can identify recurrent and context-sensitive linguistic patterns in authentic professional discourse, while experimental designs developed in communication studies can test their effects on audiences. In combination, these approaches could offer a more robust account of how language both functions and acts upon its recipients, thereby helping to close the theoretical–empirical gap within research on speech acts.

We focus specifically on professional communication, understood as text and talk produced in organisational contexts, including business, healthcare, media, and education, and encompassing both internal and external, client-, customer-, patient- or public-facing discourse. We invite papers that investigate how particular speech acts, linguistic features, or discursive strategies can influence perceptions, emotions, attitudes, or decision-making. We welcome in particular studies that address methodological challenges or dilemmas. In doing so, the panel seeks to advance a methodological agenda for examining the perlocutionary force of professional communication by building bridges between corpus-based and experimental approaches to develop a more integrated understanding of how language functions in context and how it produces social and cognitive effects.

References

Jucker, A. H. (2024). *Speech acts: Discursive, multimodal, diachronic*. Cambridge University Press.

Reimer, T., Van Swol, L. M., & Florack, A. (Eds.). (2026). *The Routledge handbook of communication and social cognition*. Routledge.

Plausible Deniability and Speaker Commitment: Theoretical and Experimental Perspectives (organized by *Misha Müller Müller, Napoleon Katsos*)

The ability to cancel a conversational implicature (Grice, 1975) without generating logical contradictions gave rise to Pinker and colleagues' seminal paper *The Logic of Indirect Speech* (2008). According to this account, implicit meanings provide a strategic benefit by allowing speakers to convey information to an addressee (e.g., a bribe, a sexual come-on, an indirect request, etc.) while preserving the possibility of plausibly denying the communicated content.

Since then, numerous studies have examined this theory from both theoretical and experimental perspectives. On the one hand, several authors have argued that Pinker's framework would benefit from incorporating insights from cognitive pragmatics in order to better explain the mechanisms underlying plausible deniability (Oswald, 2016; de Saussure, 2018; Müller, 2020; Mazzarella, 2023; Müller, 2024). In particular, these approaches have highlighted the addressee's perception of bad faith when a communicated content is denied despite being highly relevant in the context (Morency et al., 2008; de Saussure & Oswald, 2009; Liberatore, 2025). On the other hand, Pinker and colleagues' theory has inspired a substantial body of experimental pragmatic research, providing evidence that false information conveyed through implicature incurs greater "social costs" (Vuillioud et al., 2017) than the same information conveyed explicitly (Mazzarella et al., 2018; Bonalumi et al., 2020, 2024 inter alia).

The aim of this panel is to examine the current state of research on plausible deniability and its implications for speaker commitment. Both theoretical and experimental contributions are welcome. Particular attention will be given to insights emerging from recent developments within cognitive pragmatics, especially the distinction between denying truth-conditional and non-truth-conditional content (as per Sperber & Wilson, 2015) as well as the argumentative structures of plausible deniability attempts (as per Schumann & Oswald, 2024). We also encourage theoretical and empirical contributions examining different forms of deceptive communication, including lies by omission, perjury, indirect threats, political communication, legal discourse, and related phenomena.

The panel will combine short presentations (20 minutes talk + 10 minutes for discussion) aimed at fostering dialogue between theoretical and experimental approaches to plausible deniability and speaker commitment.

Playing Against and Playing With - Pragmatic Approaches to Video Game Communication (organized by *Christina Fallone, Hiloko Kato, Miriam Locher*)

This panel explores linguistic and multimodal pragmatic practices in video games and competitive electronic sports (E-sports). Digital games are a highly dynamic field of experimentation where new forms of socio-pragmatic practices are devised and intensively explored. Academic inquiries to date include broader linguistic studies (Ensslin 2012), discourse analysis (e.g. Ensslin & Balteiro, 2019), early ethnological studies (Sudnow, 1983), multimodal interaction analyses (Keating & Sunakawa, 2011; Reeves & Laurier, 2009) in a variety of interactional situations (such as in online multiplayer games, Bennerstedt & Ivarsson 2010; in a co-sit contexts, Aarsand & Aronsson, 2009; with spectators and fan communities, Debray, 2025, Tekin & Reeves, 2017; Baldauf-Quilliatre & de Colon, 2021) and with various technologies like VR (Baldauf-Quilliatre/de Colon 2021; Haddington, Kohonen-Aho, & Spets, 2023; Kato 2023) or computer-mediated and multimodal communication (Beyea et al., 2021 Kwak & Blackburn, 2014, Newon, 2011, Newon, 2015). As the field of game studies is quickly evolving, qualitative research on digital play as socio-pragmatic practice is of increasing interest.

This panel will also aim to address how people use games to build ideological bridges between each other both in shared game worlds with synchronous, online interaction and game worlds explored in a single-player environment. Competition and antagonism are often core elements of the video game world, yet the communicative, interpersonal practices that emerge around and within games connect players through shared meaning making beyond conflictual interaction as team coordination and efforts are often key. In sum, while much attention is given to show people play against each other, equal attention should be given to how people play with others and explore how players engage with video game characters and navigate the video game world. The inherently interdisciplinary nature of research on video games similarly invites co-operation and synthesis with other academic fields, helping evolve our pragmatic research methods and theories. Through this panel, we invite scholars from a diverse range of theoretical backgrounds to join us in having a broader conversation on how the pragmatic study of game and gamer interaction can expand our understandings of (multimodal) digital interactions and influence the field of interpersonal communication in virtual spaces.

Positioning in mediated political talk (organized by *Georg Albert, Mark Dang-Anh, Myriam Goll, Alessandro Stephan*)

In mediated political talk, participants continuously position themselves and others in relation to each other as well as to broader political discourses that shape and constrain their interaction. Through such positioning practices, situated interaction becomes interwoven with and related to wider (trans-situational) discursive formations. This panel invites contributions that explore this intersection between interaction and discourse by focusing on positioning and stancetaking (cf. Du Bois 2007) in mediated political talk. Drawing on conversation analytic and discourse analytic approaches, the panel examines how participants use

linguistic and multimodal resources to negotiate social relations, identities, common ground, and stances across political media formats such as televised debates, interviews, podcasts, or live streaming.

Special attention will be paid to the role of indexicality in political positioning. Linguistic forms are not merely used to convey propositional content but simultaneously index social identities, evaluative orientations, historical references, and future projections (cf. Silverstein 2003). Such indexical practices are not static; rather, they are shaped by the mediality of the communicative setting (cf. Dang-Anh 2024; Luginbühl/Schneider 2020). Participants negotiate their positions within complex media settings conditioned by multiple audiences, layered addressivity, and political interests that may extend beyond the situated interaction. The fundamental mechanisms of face-to-face interaction (sequence organization, turn-taking, repair) are accordingly reconfigured by the affordances of the respective media formats (cf. Albert 2024; Clayman/Heritage 2002).

By integrating positioning theory and stancetaking research with the concepts of indexicality and mediality, this panel aims to develop a nuanced understanding of how political positioning operates across and beyond the boundaries of situated interaction.

We invite empirically based contributions that address, among others, the following questions:

How are positioning and stance-taking accomplished by linguistic means and multimodal resources in different mediated political formats and, further, shaped by their mediality?

In what ways are knowledge and common ground discursively constructed, negotiated, or contested in mediated political interaction?

What kind of characteristic interactional phenomena do we find in mediated political talk with regard to general conversational mechanisms or different political styles (e.g., conversational behavior of populists)?

What are particular methodological challenges in analysing audio-visual data of mediated political talks and how can we solve them?

Albert, Georg. 2024. Playing one's part within a medial procedure: A talk show host's role-specific interaction. In Luginbühl, Martin/Schneider, Jan Georg (eds.), *Media as Procedures of Communication*, 98–123. Amsterdam: Benjamins .

Clayman, Steven E./Heritage, John. 2002. *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dang-Anh, Mark. 2024. Handling signs medially: On mediality and indexicality in semiotic media practices. In Luginbühl, Martin/Schneider, Jan Georg (eds.), *Media as Procedures of Communication*, 220–245. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse*, 139–182. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Luginbühl, Martin/Jan Georg Schneider. 2020. Medial Shaping from the Outset. On the Mediality of the Second Presidential Debate, 2016. *Journal für Medienlinguistik* 3(1). 57–93.

Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication* 23(3–4). 193–229.

Pragmatic Acts of Neo-Imperialism. Reference, Presupposition, Indexicality (organized by *Rita Vallentin, Miriam Lind, Britta Schneider*)

The nexus of language and imperialism has been explored previously from a variety of angles, starting with the rich research on linguistic imperialism (e.g. Phillipson 1992), and further reaching from investigations into discursive constructions of empire (e.g. Thompson 1997) to the critical study of colonial naming practices (e.g. Levkovych 2020) and the impact of colonialism on language research (Deumert/Storch 2020).

While the prime epoch of imperialism is often located in the past, we currently witness a rise in neo-imperialist claims and practices. In terms of geopolitical conflict, Russia's war against Ukraine, Trump's threats to invade Greenland and the US' current attacks on Iran, the increasing Chinese influence and economic expansion in Africa (e.g. Lumumba-Kasongo 2011), and tech giants' fantasies of so-called "freedom cities" come to mind. Yet, neo-imperialism goes much further than that: it concerns AI, technology, platformization, and datafication (Mannion 2020), and stretches beyond the spatial constraints of Earth in fantasies of colonising Mars ('exoimperialism', see Dy/Roberts 2025) and the new-found eagerness for moon missions.

While neo-imperial projects have become a central concern across the social sciences (Mbembe 2021, Mejias/Couldry 2024), pragmatic research has so far put little attention on their linguistic dimensions. Thus, this panel aims to bring together pragmatically oriented research on neo-imperial language use, with a particular focus on referential practices, indexicality and presupposition, and how they might contribute to the discursive naturalization or contestation of neo-imperial claims.

The overarching question guiding the panel is what shared characteristics and differences can be identified across these (and other) pragmatic acts of neo-imperialism. Possible topics include:

- Geopolitical neo-imperialism, e.g. in the Arctic, Eastern Europe, and Africa
- Expedition projects and 'new frontiers' (e.g. in 'exoimperialism')
- AI/techno-neocolonialism
- (Post-)Colonial toponymy
- Linguistic neo-imperialism
- Freedom Cities
- ...

References

Deumert, Ana, and Anne Storch. 2020. *Colonial and Decolonial Linguistics – Knowledges and Epistemes*. Oxford University Press.

Dy, Angela Martinez, and David Roberts. 2024. Geek saviours to the rescue? Primitive accumulation, astroappropriation, and exoimperialism in NewSpace entrepreneurship. *Politics and Space* 43(3): 558–575. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544241271475>

Levkovych, Nataliya. 2020. *Advances in Comparative Colonial Toponomastics*. Walter de Gruyter.

Lumumba-Kasongo, Tukumbi. 2011. "China-Africa Relations: A Neo-Imperialism or a Neo-Colonialism? A Reflection". *African and Asian Studies* 10 (2-3): 234–66. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156921011X587040>

Mannion, Cara. 2020. "Data Imperialism: The GDPR's Disastrous Impact on Africa's E-Commerce Markets Notes". *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law* 53 (2): 685–712.

Mbembe, Achille. 2021. *Out of the Dark Night*. Columbia University Press.

Mejias, Ulises A., and Nick Couldry. 2024. *Data Grab. The New Colonialism of Big Tech (and How to Fight Back)*. Penguin.

Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Thompson, Andrew S. 1997. "The Language of Imperialism and the Meanings of Empire: Imperial Discourse in British Politics, 1895–1914". *Journal of British Studies* 36 (2): 147–77. <https://doi.org/10.1086/386132>

Pragmatic approaches to the study of gender-inclusive language (organized by *Johanna Isosävi, Krista Leipivaara*)

Recent debates on gender-inclusive language in many lingua cultures (Isosävi & Dupuy, under review; Leipivaara, in preparation) have highlighted the need for analytical frameworks that go beyond morphosyntactic description and normative evaluation. Besides fixed norms, gender-inclusive language can be seen as a context-based dynamic process that includes new developing alternatives, attitudes, and negotiations of identity, power and ideology (cf. Lampropoulou et al., 2026). This panel proposes pragmatic perspectives on gender-inclusive language, focusing on how inclusive forms are interpreted, negotiated, and routinised in use. Rather than treating inclusivity as a property of linguistic forms, the contributions examine it as a context-sensitive pragmatic phenomenon grounded in expectations, inference, and interaction.

In this panel, we welcome research across diverse languages and a wide range of pragmatic approaches, including metapragmatics, sociopragmatics, corpus pragmatics, cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics, as well as neuropragmatics. Particular attention is paid to pragmatic effects such as markedness, processing effort (e.g. Tibblin et al., 2026), and implicature generation, as well as to variation across discourse types and communicative settings.

Empirically, the panel brings together analyses based on authentic language data as well as experimental and elicitation-based approaches. By foregrounding pragmatic mechanisms, the panel aims to clarify how different forms may give rise to divergent interpretations (cf. Hekanaho, 2026), how pragmatic norms shift over time, and how inclusivity becomes pragmatically conventionalised. Overall, the panel seeks to contribute to a more fine-grained understanding of gender-inclusive language by situating it within general theories of pragmatic interpretation and language use.

Literature

Hekanaho, L. (2026). *Esimies or esihenkilö? Investigating the use of gender-exclusive and gender-inclusive occupational titles in Finnish*. In F. Pfalzgraf (Ed.), *Gender-Inclusive Language: Findings from 14 Languages and Open Research Questions* (pp. 69-96). De Gruyter Mouton.

Isosävi, J. & Dupuy, A. (under review). *Madame, Monsieur or Mx? Perceptions of gendered and non-binary address forms among young people in Montreal*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, special issue “Dear Sir or Madam? Gender as the Missing Link in Address Research”, ed. by M. Sampedro Mella and N. Truan.

Lampropoulou, S., Sarri-Chasan, D., Stamou, A. G. & Georgalidou, M. (2026). *Gender language practices in Greek: Reform, uptake and metapragmatic stancetaking*. In F. Pfalzgraf (Ed.), *Gender-Inclusive Language: Findings from 14 Languages and Open Research Questions* (pp. 149-178). De Gruyter Mouton.

Leipivaara, K. (in preparation). « On n’imagine évidemment pas une police du langage » : étude comparative des idéologies linguistiques dans les discussions parlementaires sur le langage inclusif.

Tibblin, J., Gyax, P., van de Weijer, J., & Granfeldt, J. (2026). *Recognized but harder to integrate: An eye-tracking study of French gender-fair forms during reading*. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 47, e4, 1–34.

Pragmatic borrowing in different language settings (organized by *Helga Hilmiðóttir, Elizabeth Peterson*)

The term pragmatic borrowing was introduced by Andersen (2014) as an umbrella term for words and phrases borrowed from a source language into a recipient language that do not add to the propositional content of an utterance, but, instead, function as discourse structuring devices or indexes of speakers’ attitudes and styles. Thus, pragmatic borrowing includes the incorporation of items that have been categorized as, for example, response particles (yes), discourse markers (anyway), address terms (dude), swearwords (what the fuck), and apologies (sorry). In addition to direct borrowing of single words and phrases, speakers may also use indirect borrowing or calques, which are word-for-word translations of pragmatic items, such as the Icelandic agreement token *hundrað prósent* ‘hundred procent’, and non-lexical features such as specific prosodic patterns and gestures. While much of the previous work on pragmatic borrowings has focused on English as the source language and the languages of Europe as receiving languages, in this panel we actively seek researchers from other language contact settings.

Previous studies show that pragmatic borrowings often adapt to the new language with respect to form and/or function (Betz et al 2021; Hilmisdóttir, Huhtamäki & Karlsson 2025), and that they can be used to index social and cultural values (Peterson 2017, 2026). In addition, the borrowed items have a different status and create different connotations in the borrowing language than in the source language (see Beers Fägersten 2014 on the use of fuck in Swedish). That is, the borrowed forms can be said to take on a new life and functions in the receiving language.

In this panel, we welcome contributions on a variety of topics that shed a light on the notion of pragmatic borrowings from English and other source languages. We welcome studies on talk-in-interaction, including computer mediated discourse. Examples include corpus analyses, investigations of prosody of pragmatic borrowings, interactional functions, stylistic meaning and stance, and orthographic and phonological adaptation (see Hilmisdóttir & Peterson 2023).

References:

- Andersen, Gisle. 2014. Pragmatic borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 67. 17–33.
- Beers Fägersten, Kristy. 2014. The use of English swear words in Swedish media. In Rathje, Marianne (ed.), *Swearing in the Nordic countries* (Sprognævnets Konferenciserie 2), 63–81. Copenhagen: Danish Language Council.
- Betz, Emma, Deppermann, Arnulf, Mondada, Lorenza & Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2021. OKAY across languages: Toward a comparative approach to its use in talk-in-interaction (*Studies in Language and Social Interaction* 34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hilmisdóttir, Helga and Elizabeth Peterson. 2024. Language contact and language change: Impact on the languages of the Nordic countries. In E. Peterson and K. Beers Fägersten (eds.) *English in the Nordic Countries: Connections, Tensions, and Everyday Realities*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge
- Hilmisdóttir, Helga, Martina Huhtamäki & Susanna Karlsson. 2025. Introduction: Pragmatic borrowing from English. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 48(2), 113–115.
- Peterson, Elizabeth. 2017. The nativization of pragmatic borrowings in remote language contact situations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 113, 116–126.
- Peterson, Elizabeth. 2026. Indirect Language Contact and Pragmatic Borrowing. In Ledgeway et al. (eds.): *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Diachronic and Historical Linguistics*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Pragmatic Functions of Borrowed Character Writing Systems in Pre-modern Korea (organized by *Hyunsoo Moon*)

Theme and Purpose This panel explores the graphopragmatic dimensions of pre-modern Korean writing systems—specifically Idu, Kugyol, and Hyangchal. Moving beyond traditional phonetic analyses, we shift the focus to their roles as dynamic instruments of social interaction, information structuring, and context-dependent communication. In the pre-modern Sinographic cosmopolis, the development of these borrowed character notation

systems was a strategic pragmatic response to the gap between elite Classical Chinese and the spoken Korean vernacular. We analyze how these scripts functioned as "contextualization cues," enabling scribes and readers to navigate bilingual identities and bureaucratic hierarchies.

Specifically, we examine:

Administrative Pragmatics (Idu): How it served as a specialized register, inserting Korean functional morphemes into Sinitic structures to establish pragmatic authority in Goryeo and Joseon legal contexts.Interpretive Interaction (Kugyol): How it operated as a system of "cognitive glossing," acting as a pragmatic bridge that re-contextualized universal canonical texts into the Korean linguistic mindset.Affective Stance (Hyangchal): How text genres like the Bohyeon sipwon-ga utilized vernacular sentence-final particles and honorifics to recover interpersonal pragmatics and subjective affect often lost in abstract Classical Chinese translations.

By offering a non-Western perspective on historical script-switching, this panel demonstrates that literacy in pre-modern Korea encompassed a highly calculated selection of media based on the social and communicative utility of the text.

To ensure a rigorous exploration of these themes, this panel has secured a foundational lineup of international scholars who have tentatively agreed to participate. While these core presentations firmly anchor our discussion on the Pragmatic Functions of Borrowed Character Writing Systems in Pre-modern Korea, we are committed to avoiding any in-group restriction. Therefore, this outline simultaneously serves as an open Call for Papers. We actively invite proposals for additional contributions that expand upon these topics. We welcome submissions exploring comparative writing systems in East Asia, qualitative textual analyses of historical materials, or newly uncovered primary sources written in borrowed scripts. To maintain a balanced and dynamic environment, at least one to two presentation slots in our 90-minute session structure will be reserved for spontaneously submitted abstracts selected by the panel organizers.

Pragmatic Markers in Learner Language (organized by *Louise Mycock, Sandra Götz-Lehmann, Kathrin Kircili*)

The key role that pragmatic markers (PMs) such as English actually, well, you know, and I mean play in social interaction, collaborative meaning-making, and successful communication is well known in a range of different languages (Fischer 2006, Degand et al. 2022, inter alia). PMs are essential to achieving communicative goals such as managing interaction or expressing attitudes. What is far less well understood is how language learners acquire and use PMs in an L2 or additional language. The appropriate use of PMs has been identified as a hallmark of higher proficiency in L2 learners (Sankoff et al. 1997), and yet speakers often struggle to acquire PMs even after extended exposure (Romero-Trillo 2002). Raising learners' awareness of PMs and providing explicit instruction have been shown to have a positive effect on their use (for example, Sánchez-Hernández & Barón 2022), but PMs are rarely taught explicitly, and they have not been systematically integrated into mainstream teaching materials. The result of an incomplete command or total absence of PMs is partial acquisition of an L2/additional language, which risks negative consequences relating to perceptions of naturalness and native-like competence of the target language.

In this panel, we seek to bring together researchers working on PM use in the language of non-native speakers in order to address fundamental questions including, but not limited to:

How do PMs in learner language compare with those employed by L1 speakers?

What influence does a speaker's L1 have (for example, positive/negative transfer, borrowing) on the PMs that they use and how they employ them in the target language?

What innovations are observed in the way learners employ PMs in the target language?

What if any, patterns are detectable in the order of PM acquisition by language learners?

How does PM use correlate with objective proficiency and/or the subjective perception of competence?

Which features of PM use may be language specific and which may be universal?

Which pedagogical interventions have a positive impact on the acquisition of PMs by language learners and why?

What role does prosody play in PM use by language learners?

References

Degand, L., Z. Broisson, L. Crible & K. Grzech (2022). Cross-linguistic variation in spoken discourse markers. In E. Peterson, T. Hiltunen & J. Kern (eds.), *Discourse-Pragmatic Variation and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 83–103.

Fischer, K. (ed.) (2006). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Leiden: Brill.

Romero-Trillo, J. (2002). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 769–784.

Sánchez-Hernández, A., & J. Barón (2022). Teaching second language pragmatics in the current era of globalization: an introduction. *Language Teaching Research* 26: 163–170.

Sankoff, G., P. Thibault, N. Nagy, H. Blondeau, M.-O. Fonollosa & L. Gagnon (1997). Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation. *Language Variation and Change* 9: 191–217.

Pragmatics Beyond Borders: Mobility and Recontextualisation Beyond the Nation State (organized by *Lucien Brown, Jess Kruk, Eldin Milak, Daniel Pieper*)

In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to how linguistic and multimodal resources circulate across borders, driven by globalisation, migration and digital communication. These processes have intensified the mobility of pragmatic forms, interactional styles and communicative norms, enabling them to travel across spatial and cultural contexts. At the

same time, the multi-/translingual turn in sociolinguistics has problematised foundational assumptions about language, particularly the treatment of “named languages” as bounded entities tied to nations or ethnicities (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013; Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010). Together, these developments raise important questions for pragmatics regarding how pragmatic meanings are negotiated when communicative resources move across contexts, and how pragmatic norms are both disrupted and reconstituted beyond the nation state.

In this panel, we examine these dynamics through the lens of mobility, recontextualisation and bordering. We focus on how various linguistic resources are relocated and reinterpreted across diverse settings. These resources may include prototypical pragmatic features such as politeness strategies, stance markers, speech acts, interactional routines and metapragmatic evaluations. But we also welcome submissions that deal with any linguistic, multimodal or semiotic resource that acquires new contextual meanings as it traverses global borders, emphasising that it is this situated, interactional emergence of meaning that constitutes such phenomena as pragmatic. As resources move, they may take on new indexical values and become subject to reinterpretation (see Agha, 2007; Greer, 2022). At the same time, we are interested in bordering as a form of social action, whereby participants mobilise pragmatic meanings to construct, police or resist boundaries within and around discursive spaces, thereby exercising discursive agency in both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic ways (see Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).

Crucially, the panel highlights the dialectic between the global and the local in the circulation of pragmatic resources. Forms that are perceived as global or widely recognisable do not simply retain stable meanings as they travel. Rather, they are frequently localised and re-embedded within specific communities of practice. In this process, pragmatic forms may come to index highly local identities or stances, enabling participants to forge social connections while simultaneously drawing on transnational repertoires (Clift & Helani 2010). In addition, as pragmatic resources move across contexts, they disrupt local interactional norms and moral orders, giving rise to negative interpretations and conflict (see Brown and Kim, 2025).

Overall, this panel aims to advance a more integrative vision of pragmatics, attuned to mobility, multimodality and meaning-making, and equipped to account for communication beyond the bounded categories of language, culture and nation. While intercultural pragmatics has long examined communication across cultural boundaries (Kecskes, 2014; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009), it has often remained anchored in relatively stable notions of language, culture and speakerhood. This panel argues for a broader reorientation of pragmatics beyond borders, engaging more directly with insights from sociolinguistics, social semiotics and multimodal discourse analysis. We particularly welcome contributions that examine pragmatic mobility and bordering practices in the Asia-Pacific region, the Global South, and diasporic or transnational communities, as well as submissions that engage with digital and multimodal environments.

Pragmatics for the public sphere (organized by *Jef Verschueren, Michael Meeuwis, Jan-Ola Östman, Rui Zhang*)

As a realm of publicly accessible discourse and as an arena for struggles over meaning, the public sphere (cf. Habermas 1989) has been undergoing drastic technologically driven changes during the past couple of decades. These changes include:

- a significant weakening of the boundaries between public and private
- more problematic assignment of responsibilities for message content
- historically unrivalled world-wide connectivity and (in theory) universal access to channels of communication
- automated and algorithm-guided fragmentation and polarization

The resulting communicative architecture raises new problems for a pragmatic approach to (semi)public discourse. In general, the question is: How can we cope with cohesion, coherence, and incremental understanding in a communicative realm characterized by the fragmented connectivity of the personalized use of internet-based communication tools? The complexity of this question increases in a multilingual context when messages may still be interpreter-mediated (cf. Zhang 2025) but increasingly pass through the filter of AI-assisted computational translation.

We invite contributions that yield insights into meaning-making communicative processes that constitute newly emerging public spheres in a global context that does not confine public communication to an easily identifiable locale or a single speech community. We are motivated by the conviction that, as students of language, we cannot avoid taking responsibility (cf. Ädel & Östman 2023, Haugh & Márquez Reiter 2025) for the risks involved in changing meaning-making processes that may be detrimental to the healthy functioning of societies. But in order to take responsibility, we must first understand.

This is an open call. Contributions to this panel, sharing this overall perspective, may deal with any type of public discourse reflecting (some of) the characteristics hinted at above. We hope to attract papers on a wide variety of data representing a diversity of analytical approaches. They may be situated in political, judicial, media, or education contexts. The focus may be on any aspect relevant from a pragmatic point of view, in the widest sense of linguistic ‘pragmatics.’ More theoretical papers relevant to the theme of the panel will also be considered.

References

Ädel, Annelie & Jan-Ola Östman (eds.). 2023. *Risk Discourse and Responsibility*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Haugh, Michael & Rosina Márquez Reiter (eds.). 2025. *Morality in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhang, Rui. 2025. “A public sphere of meaning negotiation: The interpreter-mediated Chinese Premier’s Press Conference.” In *Meaning Generation in Chinese Official Media Discourse*, ed. by Lut Lams, Rui Zhang & Emma Lupano, 8-27. London: Routledge.

Pragmatics in Autistic Children: Bridging Disciplines, Methods and Contexts (organized by *Maria Busch, Jaime Crisosto-Alarcón*)

Pragmatics plays a central role in autism research, both in studies of individual pragmatic performance - such as the interpretation of literal and non-literal language or discourse organization - and in analyses of interactional processes emerging in social communication (e.g. Petit et al., 2025; Ábalos et al., 2026). Research in this area spans multiple disciplines, methodologies, and applied domains. Jameson and Bean (2026) trace a historical shift in autism communication research, from pathologizing deficit models towards neurodiversity-affirming and context-sensitive frameworks, reflecting broader changes in both diagnostic paradigms and research epistemologies.

This panel takes the conference's overarching theme of Building Bridges as its guiding principle. It aims to bring together researchers working on autistic children's pragmatics, across disciplinary and methodological boundaries — connecting conversation analysis and experimental pragmatics, developmental linguistics and speech-language pathology, basic research and intervention science. By placing these perspectives in dialogue, the panel seeks to advance a more integrated understanding of how autistic children communicate and what factors shape communicative participation.

We invite contributions that examine pragmatics in autistic children in naturalistic contexts — such as conversation-analytic studies of interaction — as well as in experimental or quasi-experimental paradigms. Studies addressing the following areas are particularly welcome: pragmatic development and its variability across the autism spectrum; the design, implementation, and evaluation of pragmatics-focused interventions; and the use of technology — including digital tools, augmentative and alternative communication (AAC), and AI-assisted methods — in both research and intervention contexts.

References:

Ábalos, Z., Kissine, M., Vicente, A. & Castroviejo, E. (2026). Conversational Topic Shifts and Topic Maintenance in Autistic and Neurotypical Children. *Autism research : official journal of the International Society for Autism Research*, 19(4), e70204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.70204>

Jameson, M. & Bean, A. (2026). Profiling Autistic Language and Communication: A Critical Review of the Scientific Narrative Over Time. *Current Developmental Disorders Reports*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40474-026-00349-2>

Petit, N., Geoffray Cassar, M.-M. & Baltazar, M. (2025). Some (but not all) Pragmatic Inferences are Difficult for Autistic Children. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*. Vorab-Onlinepublikation. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-025-06838-4>

Pragmatics of Debates on Conspiracy and Pseudoscience: Evidence, Authority, and Distrust (organized by *Dorota Kotwica*)

From climate change denialism and anti-vaccine rhetoric to Flat Earth beliefs, conspiracy theories and pseudoscientific discourses thrive in digital communication sphere, characterized by “epistemic instability” (Harambam & Aupers, 2020). The boundary between facts and opinions has become increasingly blurred (Demata, Zorzi & Zottola 2022: 6) and the horizontal circulation of information online seems to enable virtually anyone to claim expertise or authority over topics traditionally reserved for specialists.

Previous research has explored conspiracy and pseudoscientific discourse from critical discourse analysis perspectives and through case studies (Oswald & Herman 2016; Deschrijver 2021; Dynel & Zappavigna 2023), yet, to date, no attention has been paid to how such discourses are managed dialogically in interaction from a pragmalinguistic perspective (Demata, Zorzi & Zottola 2022: 11).

To do so has become especially relevant as alternative narratives migrate from echo chambers to mainstream platforms, sparking debates among heterogeneous audiences. Such debates offer a crucial setting for examining how competing perspectives are negotiated, specifically regarding epistemic authority and the conflict between scientific consensus and alternative narratives, a phenomenon that remains understudied from an interactional perspective.

To address this gap, this panel seeks to explore how these interactional dynamics unfold in light of various pragmatic phenomena such as (but not limited to) evidentiality, epistemicity, impoliteness, and (dis)agreement. We hope to advance understanding of how truth, legitimacy and authority are negotiated in polarized digital environments when conspiracy theories and pseudoscientific claims are discussed, and to shed light on what differences emerge across languages, platforms, and types or topics of alternative narratives (e.g., climate, politics, health, and science).

We invite contributions from diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives. Empirical studies across languages, platforms, and topics are particularly welcome.

References

- Demata, M., V. Zorzi & A. Zottola (2022). "Conspiracy theory discourses. Critical inquiries into the language of anti-science, post-truthism, mis/disinformation and alternative media". In Demata, M., V. Zorzi & A. Zottola, (eds.) *Conspiracy Theory discourses* (1-23). John Benjamins.
- Deschrijver, C. (2012). "On the metapragmatics of 'conspiracy theory': Scepticism and epistemological debates in online conspiracy comments". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 182, 310-321.
- Dynel, M. & M. Zappavigna (2023). "Enacting polyvocal scorn in #CovidConspiracy tweets: The orchestration of voices in humorous responses to COVID-19 conspiracy theories". *Discourse, Context and Media*, 52, 1-10.
- Harambam, J. & S. Aupers (2015). "Contesting Epistemic Authority: Conspiracy Theories on the Boundaries of Science". *Public Understanding of Science*.
- Kotwica, D. (in preparation): "Distrust on YouTube: An Analysis of Epistemic Vigilance Practices in Conspiracy Theory Debates".
- Oswald, S. & T. Herman (2016). *Argumentation, Conspiracy and the Moon: a Rhetorical-pragmatic Analysis*. In Danesi, M. & S. Greco (eds). *Case Studies in Discourse Analysis* (295–330). Lincom Europa.

Pragmatics of Literature (organized by *Claus Ehrhardt, Paola Del Zoppo*)

This panel proposes an interdisciplinary exploration of the pragmatics of literature as a framework for investigating the pragmatic dimensions of literary communication. Bringing

together approaches from linguistic pragmatics, conversation analysis, literary stylistics, hermeneutics, translation studies and reception studies, the panel aims to examine how literary texts construct, negotiate, and problematize interaction, voice, authority, and interpretive legitimacy.

Despite a long tradition of interaction between pragmatics and literary studies, research remains fragmented. By bringing together scholars working on literature as communication and on communication represented in literature, the panel seeks to create a common forum for discussing the contribution of literary texts to contemporary pragmatic theory and analysis.

The panel addresses two main approaches to the pragmatics of literature: on the one hand, it explores literature as a form of communication; on the other, it considers literary texts as a privileged site for observing and analysing pragmatic phenomena.

The first approach considers “literature as communication” (Sell 2000) treating literary texts as complex utterances produced and received in specific circumstances. Following the pivotal work of Pratt (1977) the literary speech situation and the literary cooperation need further exploration and discussion. Differences between literary discourse and written non-fictional-communication can be identified for example in the function of the utterances, in reader’s expectations, in the production of relevance or the general outline of the situation. Accordingly, the presumption of collaboration is manifested in a specific way and creates a frame in which specific pragmatic mechanisms emerge. In the process of reader’s reconstruction sense out of author’s presumptive intentions plays a special role. Furthermore, the relationship between writer and reader, mutual expectations, the context, sincerity conditions and other pragmatic features may be analysed.

The second approach focuses on communication within texts. Literary works are approached as products of authors particularly skilled in observing, analysing and representing communicative situations and constellations. They can therefore be regarded as rich examples of communication and, thus as objects of pragmatic analysis such as turn-taking-mechanisms, politeness strategies, forms of address, implicatures, ambiguity, irony, humor, stance-taking, and interactional positioning. Literary dialogue and narration are thus treated not only as aesthetic devices, but as complex communicative practices that activate culturally and historically situated expectations concerning cooperation, authority, credibility, and subjectivity. The analysis of literary texts can be used to verify and improve the methodological and conceptual instruments of pragmatic analysis.

The panel focuses primarily on written literary texts. it aims to contribute to the development of a pragmatics of literature capable of integrating linguistic analysis with questions of interpretation, cultural legitimacy, and communicative practice.

Black, Elizabeth (2014): *Pragmatics Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Fludernik, Monika (1996): *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology*. London/ New York: Routledge.

Mey, Jacob L. (1999): *When voices Clash. A study in Literary Pragmatics*. New York-Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

Pilkington, Adrian (2008): *Poetic effects. A relevance theory perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Pratt, Mary Louise (1977): *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Sell, Roger (2000): *Literature as Communication. The foundation of mediating criticism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Pragmatics of Short Videos: Embodied Communication in Algorithmic Environments
(organized by *Simon Meier-Vieracker, Silva Ladewig, Martin Luginbühl*)

People who create short videos for social media platforms like TikTok or Instagram communicate with their bodies. TikTok's predecessor musical.ly started as an app for lip-sync and dance videos that confine creators' expressive means to their bodily behaviour, and these genres are still popular on the platform today (Meier-Vieracker 2025). But even in original sound videos – often recorded as selfie videos – creators use their bodies in a variety of ways for their multimodal meaning-making. The semiotic resources range from prosodic means to proxemics, gestures, and facial expressions to playful alterations by digital means like film editing or filters as a way of “synthetic embodiment” (Jones 2023: 27). Indeed, the platform's technical affordances shape creators' bodily communication in a variety of ways: The 9:16 vertical frame compresses the periphery of the gesture space and privileges center-front upper-body articulations, so that creators noticeably reorganise where and how their hands move (Meier-Vieracker to appear). Highly expressive intonation and rhythmic patterns are used to attract the viewers' attention (Han & Zappavigna 2024) scrolling through their feeds, and the camera shake caused by taking the selfie is deliberately employed as a stylistic device to convey immediacy. In turn, the adaptations of established genres or activity types to the short-video format like, e.g., news (Luginbühl 2025), teaching (Hartung et al. 2023), or political activism (Sigurdardottir & Rautajoki 2024) are notably characterised by alterations in bodily behaviour.

In our panel, we want to bring together scholars doing empirical research on short videos and short-video platforms to discuss the complex interrelationships between the platforms' digital affordances – the video recording and editing techniques, the algorithmic feeds, etc. – on the one hand and the multiplicity of embodied communication patterns as social affordances on the other. We invite contributions dealing with specific genres of short-video content, as well as those that examine particular semiotic resources in a variety of contexts. Contributions might deal with, but are not limited to the following questions:

- How do the attention economies of the algorithmic feeds of short-video platforms affect the ways people communicate with their bodies?What multimodal profiles do different genres of short-video content exhibit?How do creators orchestrate their bodily behaviour with other semiotic resources like text inserts, stickers, greenscreen filters, or music?How does brevity affect embodied communication in short videos when compared to long-format videos on YouTube or TV?How are gestural repertoires of established activity types (e.g. Ladewig 2025 on political talk shows) repurposed or replaced when these are adapted to the short-video format?How can bodily communication as part of the complex multimodal wholes of short videos be annotated in a systematic way (Grzenkiewicz & Wildfeuer 2025)?How are short-video-typical ways of embodied communication metapragmatically reflected upon and enregistered?

Pragmatics of TikTok: Exploring interaction on short-form video platforms (organized by *Ylva Biri, Routa Hallapaju, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen*)

Short-form video platforms have emerged as significant sites for social interaction, reshaping the ways users communicate, express their identities, and form communities. The unique features of platforms like TikTok and Douyin facilitate innovative forms of interaction that blend video, audio, and textual elements, resulting in multimodal and cross-modal communicative practices (Jiang & Vásquez 2025). For this panel, we invite papers that delve into the pragmatics of these platforms, focusing on how users navigate and construct meaning in these dynamic environments.

Analysing interaction on these platforms is particularly intriguing due to their inherent affordances, which influence user behaviour and engagement. The mechanisms of duetting and stitching, for instance, create opportunities for co-construction of meaning, the negotiation of identity, and the shaping of community norms among TikTokers and their audiences (Darvin 2022). The comment section provides yet another mode of interaction between content creators and viewers (Xie 2025, Zappavigna 2026). Yet, short-form video platforms remain underexplored in terms of how users establish rapport (but see Christiansen et al. 2026), convey humour, and perform self-presentation, often within the constraints of brevity that these platforms impose.

To deepen our understanding of pragmatics of short-form video platforms, the panel welcomes diverse methodological perspectives, including (but not limited to) corpus-assisted discourse analysis, interactional pragmatics, and digital conversation analysis, to explore how interaction unfolds within these multimodal digital spaces. Panel participants can present empirical as well as theoretical or methodological papers on these topics.

References

Christiansen, Alex, Shioma-Lei Craythorne, Paul Crawford, Michael Larkin, and Ruth Page. 2026. Mental health advice on TikTok. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 257, 26-38.

Darvin, Ron. 2022. Design, resistance and the performance of identity on TikTok. *Discourse, Context & Media* 46, 100591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2022.100591>.

Jiang, Yaqian, and Camilla Vásquez. 2025. Sharing as informal teaching: identity construction of an English learner/teacher microcelebrity on Douyin'. *Discourse, Context & Media* 65, 100888. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2025.100888>.

Xie, Fang. 2025. "This looks so good 🍷": Emoji functions in compliments on TikTok and DouYin'. *Internet Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00131.xie>.

Zappavigna, Michele. 2026. Emoji as resources for negotiating affiliation and taste in TikTok comments. *Internet Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00144.zap>.

Pragmatics through the life course: Honoring the work of Jenny Cook-Gumperz (organized by *Elena Raymond*)

This panel honors the scholarship of Jenny Cook-Gumperz and invites contributions that engage with, extend, or revisit her work across the fields of interactional sociolinguistics, pragmatics, literacy, and discourse studies. Cook-Gumperz's research has been instrumental

in shaping our understanding of the nexus between language, social interaction, and the institutional contexts in which communicative practices are learned, performed, and evaluated. Her work has been particularly influential in areas such as language socialization, gender and language, discourse in educational settings, and the sociolinguistic analysis of interaction. At the core of Cook-Gumperz's contribution is a sustained attention to the ways meaning is jointly constructed in interaction and shaped by the expectations, norms, and histories that participants bring to their encounters. Her work highlights how communicative competence is not simply an individual cognitive achievement, but a socially situated practice that develops across the life course and is continuously recalibrated in response to changing social landscapes. From early processes of language socialization to participation in complex institutional settings, individuals learn how to interpret, produce, and evaluate discourse in ways that are locally meaningful and socially consequential. As she observes, individuals "must present a social self that in any single context seems continuous with a history that either precedes or extends beyond the present. On the other hand, late modern societies provide many possibilities for individual change and for the progressive development of the self" (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz 2008:539). This insight underscores the dynamic interplay between continuity and transformation in communicative practice and reveals how the smallest linguistic choices ripple outward, shaping not only the immediate interaction and the presentation of self but also the broader evolution of communities, relationships, and the very institutional frameworks that govern them.

Framed around the theme "Pragmatics through the life course,"

this panel seeks papers that explore how pragmatic competence, interactional norms, and communicative practices emerge, shift, and are negotiated across social and institutional contexts in different stages of life -from early childhood socialization and schooling to the transitions of professional life, family dynamics, and contexts related to aging. We welcome contributions that draw or build on Cook-Gumperz's approaches to interactional analysis, including studies of language socialization, gender and interaction, institutional discourse, and the sociocultural organization of communicative practices in education, the workplace, and family life, among others. By bringing together scholars working in diverse empirical settings, the panel aims to highlight the continuing relevance of Cook-Gumperz's insights and to explore how her work continues to inform contemporary research on pragmatics and social interaction across the life course.

References

Gumperz, John J., and Jenny Cook-Gumperz. 2008. "Studying language, culture, and society: Sociolinguistics or linguistic anthropology?" *Journal of sociolinguistics* 12(4):532-545

Preparing African Languages for AI: Pragmatics Beyond Data Scarcity (organized by *Gratien Atindogbe, Rachel Ayuk Ojong Diba*)

AI is reshaping language representation and technology. However, African languages remain among the most underrepresented in computational systems, limiting their presence in modern language technologies. Explanations often cite data scarcity and limited resources, but do not fully explain their marginalisation in AI systems.

This panel argues that the challenge extends beyond the availability of linguistic data. Contemporary NLP and LLM development continue to prioritise lexical, syntactic, and

semantic information while giving comparatively limited attention to the pragmatic dimensions of language through which meaning is negotiated in context. Yet African languages are rich in pragmatic resources, including speech acts, politeness systems, conversational implicatures, oral traditions, proverbs, mediation discourse, conflict-resolution practices, and culturally grounded communicative norms. The limited representation of such knowledge risks producing language technologies that are linguistically incomplete and culturally disconnected from the communities they are intended to serve.

To address this challenge, the panel introduces the emerging concept of Digital Language Preparation (DLP). DLP refers to the systematic process by which a language is prepared for meaningful participation in digital, computational, and AI ecosystems. Unlike language documentation, which primarily focuses on recording and preserving language use, DLP focuses on developing the linguistic, pragmatic, sociocultural, technological, and institutional infrastructures necessary for computational engagement. From this perspective, preparing a language for AI involves not only creating corpora and lexical resources but also documenting, modelling, and representing the contextual knowledge through which speakers construct meaning, maintain social relationships, negotiate authority, resolve conflicts, and transmit cultural knowledge.

The panel invites contributions exploring how pragmatics can prepare African languages for participation in NLP, AI, and LLM ecosystems. Topics may include:

- pragmatic annotation and corpus development;
- computational models of speech acts, politeness, and discourse practices;
- proverbs, oral traditions, and culturally embedded knowledge in AI;
- culturally appropriate conversational agents;
- multilingual pragmatics;
- ethical issues in computational representation;
- frameworks for Language Preparation;
- and linguistic justice, digital inclusion, and responsible AI.

This panel seeks to bring together scholars from pragmatics, African linguistics, computational linguistics, NLP, AI studies, digital humanities, language documentation, and related fields to advance discussions on how languages can be prepared, not merely documented, but also for meaningful participation in emerging AI ecosystems. It proposes that reducing the underrepresentation of African languages in digital technologies requires not only more data but also greater attention to the pragmatic knowledge through which language functions within society.

We particularly encourage submissions from researchers working on African languages, pragmatics, computational linguistics, NLP, AI, language documentation, digital humanities, language technology, and related approaches to digital language development.

If you are interested in contributing to this discussion, please submit an abstract outlining your research, insights, or case studies related to the panel themes. Provide information on how your work addresses the role of pragmatics or DLP in African languages and computational systems. Submissions should follow the conference guidelines and will be evaluated for relevance and originality.

Processuality: (continuous) change in a dialogue (organized by *Angela Grimmering, Katharina J. Rohlfing*)

In a dialogue, partners are working together toward a joint goal. They adapt to each other (Pickering & Garrod, 2004) and establish a common ground (Clark, 1996). While this joint work can be described through interactional units like turn-taking, repairs, or feedback, what remains challenging is how to analyze the qualitative changes through which common ground is continuously established to successfully accomplish a communicative task. Capturing this process requires moving beyond individual contributions of interaction partners and adopting a unit of analysis in which partners are treated as a jointly organized meaning-making system. Although existing methods can measure certain aspects of constructing meaning, such as dynamic systems methods, the process of change – for example, in understanding, adaptation, or partner models – through which participants progressively shape the interaction toward a communicative goal remains difficult to grasp.

Previous research has approached some aspects of processuality in human communication by suggesting that interactions can be organized into phases or recurrent patterns (e.g., Schegloff, 2007), pointing to the possibility that change in dialogue is not only continuous but also unfolds through jointly accomplished forms of progression toward communicative goals (e.g., Bangerter & Clark, 2003). This is reflected in genre studies that describe communicative tasks such as explaining or narrating in terms of interactive jobs, as well as in accounts that distinguish between chat and chunks (Gilmartin et al., 2018) or conceptualize interaction through emergent history (Pekarek Doehler et al., 2018; Lyra, 2019).

Building on these perspectives, this panel focuses on broader units of analysis that treat dialogue as organized toward communicative tasks and asks how qualitative changes in meaning and its progression, and coordination can be assessed beyond temporal progression, participation and individual contributions. To address this focus, we invite contributions on current empirical, theoretical, and methodological approaches to studying processuality in human communicative interactions across various interactional contexts, such as explaining, narrating, teaching, clinical consultations, collaborative problem solving, or everyday conversation.

References:

- Bangerter, A., & Clark, H. H. (2003). Navigating joint projects with dialogue. *Cognitive Science*, 27(2), 195–225.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gilmartin, E., Vogel, C., & Campbell, N. (2018). Chats and Chunks: Annotation and analysis of multiparty long casual conversations. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.
- Lyra, M. C. (2010). On interaction analysis and dialogical perspective: Emergent patterns of order and relational agency. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 44, 273–280.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., Wagner, J., & González-Martínez, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Longitudinal Studies on the Organization of Social Interaction*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2004). Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27(2), 169–190.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge University Press.

Producing and Evaluating Communication (organized by *Billy Clark, Siobhan Chapman*)

This panel will bring together researchers aiming to build on existing work in pragmatics by considering the processes involved in production and evaluation, how they interact with each other, how they interact with processes of interpretation, and how they contribute to communicative interaction overall. It will provide the opportunity to present and discuss ideas emerging from a research project funded by the Leverhulme Trust (<https://www.leverhulme.ac.uk>) which aims to develop an account which combines these elements (MRF-2024-043, 'Producing and Evaluating Style', Investigator Billy Clark).

Some recent developments in pragmatics can be understood as focusing on the full complexities involved in communication, no longer concentrating mainly or only on the interpretation of utterances and no longer seeing linguistic meanings as the main or only inputs to pragmatic processes. There is increased awareness of the dynamic nature of communication and the ways in which communication extends through and beyond interactions.

While there is reference to what communicators do in producing utterances in the suggestions made by Grice (1975, 1989) and in approaches which build on this (e.g. Horn 1984, 1988; Levinson 1987, 2000; Sperber and Wilson 1986), much work in pragmatics has focused mainly on how communicative acts are understood. There has been some work making more or less specific suggestions about the pragmatics of production (e.g. Keeskes 2013; Papafragou and Grigoroglou 2019; Park 2024) and a smaller amount, often from the perspective of stylistics, on evaluation (e.g. Clark 2014; van Peer 2008).

The model being developed in the Leverhulme Trust-funded project which provides the foundation for this panel builds on these recent approaches by including accounts of production and (aesthetic and more general) evaluation and of how production, interpretation and evaluation typically happen simultaneously and in interaction with each other. It views communication as dynamic extending through time, before, during and after moments of interaction. It also makes suggestions about the nature of the processes involved and the extent to which various kinds of 'reasoning' are involved.

The panel invites contributions from researchers which explore aspects of these questions from any theoretical perspective and focus on any types of texts and interactions, including, but not restricted to, literary texts, face-to-face conversations, computer-mediated and multimodal communication. The panel will highlight similarities and differences across the various approaches, with space to discuss possible future research directions.

The panel will aim to be as inclusive as possible, and particularly to allow space for early career academics to contribute. We therefore intend to assign spaces on the panel mainly in response to abstracts submitted in response to the panel call for papers. Panels on similar themes that we have organised previously (including IPrA in 2011 and 2017) have attracted considerable interest, and we therefore envisage that there will be a number of good quality submissions to this panel. We do, however, also intend to approach directly some individuals who might be able to contribute papers which would help to define and shape the panel.

Prolonged Touch: At the intersection of interaction and tactile co-presence (organized by *Julia Katila, Iira Rautiainen, Mari Holmström, Kreeta Niemi*)

Interpersonal touch encompasses both interaction and tactile co-presence, often unfolding through the involvement of whole bodies and extended temporal durations. For example, a small child may be sitting on their mother's lap, looking at a toy or a book, while the mother is engaged in a conversation with other adults. The ongoing touch between the child and mother is a form of tactile co-presence rather than interaction between the two. Yet the encounter could, at any given moment, become interaction if the child, for instance, produces a vocalization accompanied by touch to get the mother's attention. In this example, touch can be viewed as an interactional

move. Importantly, touch as mere copresence and as an interactional resource are often intertwined, escaping the clear distinction between action and being.

Drawing on and complementing decades of interaction research that has uncovered a wide variety of interactional uses of touch (for an overview, see Mondada & Cekaite, 2020), we invite discussion of the diverse forms of temporally prolonged touch. Despite the body of work on touch, we still know little about prolonged forms of interpersonal touch – such as touch as ongoing tactile copresence (see Goodwin, 2017; Katila, 2018) – especially outside intimate relationships. To map the variety of its potential contexts and forms, this panel invites empirical investigations addressing prolonged interpersonal touch across diverse interactional contexts and social relationships.

As a working concept, by prolonged touch we mean (at least) one of the following (recognizing that sometimes these two understandings are not clearly separable):

- 1) touch that accompanies or is embedded in focused interaction but continues beyond sequences of gestures and/or talk, and
- 2) touch that happens outside focused interaction and is sustained as a form of tactile co-presence.

This definition for prolonged touch can include momentary and longer-term co-being in touch, including forms of passive touch or sustained tactile gestures. By highlighting the saliency of the body and embodiment to interaction research, the panel continues the line of interaction analytic work drawing on the phenomenological concept of intercorporeality (Merleau-Ponty, 1968; See Meyer et al., 2017).

We welcome both empirical studies and methodological reflections examining touch as an intercorporeal, multisensorial, and affective phenomenon situated in a specific spatio-material context, such as education, healthcare, home, or public sphere. We particularly invite presentations addressing the ways in which prolonged touch is initiated, accounted for, transformed, or brought to an end. Studying interpersonal touch extends beyond analyzing actions and requires methodological reflection, and potential challenges may arise when it comes to purely observation-based analyses. Rather than reducing touch to categories, we seek analyses that explore its situated, emergent, and temporally unfolding character. We envision the panel to provide a lively discussion on the empirical and methodological diversity in studying prolonged forms of interpersonal touch.

Pursuing silences and absences of language in the field: Affordances and challenges for linguistic ethnography (organized by *Jessica McDaid, Marie Jacobs*)

Linguistic ethnography, while attaching much importance to thick description of context and setting, has language, semiotics and communication as its focal points. To account for how language operates in the social space, and the impact this has on the circulation of meanings, goods, or objects, we tend to rely on that which is readily audible and observable, rather than on “language which is disavowed, concealed, or silenced” (Thurlow et al., 2022, p. 833). Methodologically speaking, our toolkit is usually comprised of fieldnotes, transcripts and verbal/written input that relay what is there in the field. Epistemologically, it is often argued that we can “pin down” the irreducibility of ethnographic findings by grounding our description with interactional sociolinguistics’ sophisticated analytical apparatus (Heller et al., 2018; Rampton et al., 2004). Nevertheless, a reliance on observation and perceptibility profoundly shapes our approach to “data”, including how we visualise, generate, and interpret it. This presents challenges when one is confronted with the absence of language in the field, as what is non-materialised (including pauses, omissions or that which is concealed or not alluded to) is somewhat analytically elusive (Jaworski, 1997).

On the one hand, silence can be considered “a relatively bounded, identifiable phenomenon” (Muñoz, 2014, p. 27) that can be measured and located within interactions. On the other, at a more macro level, that which is “hidden, silenced, invisibilised, removed, or simply not acknowledged as relevant enough to be given spatial, linguistic, or social space to occupy” (McDaid, submitted) tends to lack a “recognisable ‘form’” (Nakane 2007). Yet, at the same time, we widely acknowledge how the presence of absences indexes norms of relevance, boundaries of “tellability” (Norrick, 2021), and power relations –meaning that silences are not merely what interlocutors do not say, but what social conditions render unsayable. Despite the growing body of work on silence and absences in linguistics, anthropology, and education (see Deumert, 2022; Martín Rojo, 2010; Orthaber, 2022; Sbardella, 2014; and Sulzer, 2022), there is a pressing need to approach such questions within the linguistic ethnography paradigm, as accounts that address the complexities of making sense of linguistic absences through ethnography are missing.

Filling such gaps are the aim of this panel, which explores the unique affordances of linguistic ethnography, as a discipline and epistemological apparatus that requires prolonged linguistic, social, and affective fieldwork engagement, to capture potential salencies of silences and absences. It welcomes contributions that interrogate how the immersive and inhabited nature of our fieldwork attunes linguistic researchers towards perceiving absences that might go unexplored or unnoticed elsewhere, and reflects on how linguistic ethnographers can methodologically, theoretically, epistemologically, grasp silence as data, and what doing so can mobilise, at different stages of the research process, including:

- Project design: ethics, participant “voices”, agency, privacy and protection.
- Fieldwork and analysis: expectations of language occurrence, how we “fill in the gaps”, or spot/capture/interpret silences and absences while interaction unfolds.
- Knowledge production: turning absences into knowledge, and the effects of visibilisation (of certain voices, inequalities, practices) of silences and absences through writing.

Reacting to Digital Content: Pragmatics of Reuse, Uptake and Affective Alignment

(organized by *Carolyn Dix, Karina Frick, Daniel Pfurtscheller*)

Digital platforms are increasingly organized around practices of reacting. Across platforms, reactions are shaped by affordances and emic labels, from low-threshold uptake such as likes, comments, quotes, reposts or stitches to elaborate audiovisual formats such as live responses and reaction videos. At this end of the spectrum, reception becomes a “vernacular form of visual production” (Kim 2016:333): prior content is watched, paused, felt, discussed and repackaged before an audience. Positioned “in-between media text and media reception” (Bliss & Nansen 2023:751), reaction media offer a privileged site for analyzing how users take up, reuse, evaluate and align with existing digital content.

The panel examines reacting as a pragmatic, multimodal and affective practice of digital participation. It builds on work on recontextualization, quotation and social media uptake, which has shown how communicative material changes when it is quoted, shared, screenshotted, remediated or re-embedded in new participation frameworks (Haapanen & Perrin 2020; Zappavigna 2022). Sequentially, reaction formats are placed in second position: they comment on, respond to or rework already available digital content. By selecting, transforming and recontextualizing earlier resources, reactors position themselves affectively, epistemically and deontically toward both content and participants. Such practices connect diverse scales of multimodal action, from button clicks and comments to memes, livestreams and videos, and they coordinate talk, gaze, gesture, text, sound and platform-specific metrics in a “crisscross of modalities” (Dutt & Graham 2023:2).

We invite empirically grounded and theoretically oriented papers on reactions across languages, platforms and communities. Comparative, ethnographic, corpus-pragmatic and interactional approaches are welcome. Contributions may address how user-generated content becomes recognizable and accountable as reaction; how prior materials are framed as quotable, replayable, commentable or shareable; how platform affordances shape timing, visibility and audience design; how semiotic streams are coordinated; how affective alignments and disalignments become public, durable and circutable; and how reactions are commented on metapragmatically by reactors or audiences.

By treating reaction as a cross-format pragmatic problem, the panel connects internet pragmatics, multimodality, affect, temporality and platform affordances. In relation to the conference theme “Building Bridges”, it shows how reactions create ambivalent connections: they may intensify ridicule, antagonism and polarisation, but they also organize shared attention, support, humour and affiliation.

References

- Bliss, Lauren, and Bjørn Nansen. 2023. “Reaction Media.” *Television & New Media* 24(7):751–769.
- Dutt, Scott, and Sage Graham. 2023. “Video, talk and text.” *Discourse, Context & Media* 55:100726.
- Haapanen, Lauri, and Daniel Perrin. 2020. “Linguistic recycling.” *AILA Review* 33:1–20.
- Kim, Yeran. 2016. “Globalization of the privatized self-image.” *Routledge Handbook of New Media in Asia*, 333–342.

Zappavigna, Michele. 2022. "Social media quotation practices." *Journal of Pragmatics* 191:98–112.

Reading-in-interaction (organized by *Lorenza Mondada, Katariina Harjunpää*)

This panel proposes an interactional perspective on reading, rooted in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (EMCA). It aims at pursuing a reflection on how textual artefacts of all kinds are actually used in social activities: rather than treating texts as autonomous structures isolated from their contexts of use, or merely as material objects, the aim is to study them as they are mobilized in situated textual activities, that is, multimodal activities such as writing, annotating, correcting, commenting, interpreting and reading them.

While documents in their materiality have been studied in EMCA as objects in interaction (Bruxelles et al. 2003, Moore 2010), and digital documents have been integrated in studies of technologically supported and mediated interactions (Luff et al. 1992, 2006), the study of actual textual practices is still under-developed (but see Livingston 2005, Lynch 2009, Watson 2009). Inspired by previous studies of writing-in-interaction (see the S.I. edited by Mondada 2016), this panel proposes novel approaches of reading-in-interaction—while considering the rich literature about literacy and history of reading practices (Chartier 1995, Street 1984).

In particular it aims at discussing how a multimodal analysis within EMCA (Mondada 2018) can unpack multiple practices of reading: reading aloud, reading carefully, flipping through, taking a quick look, skimming, scanning, deciphering, etc., and the way they are embodied (Sterponi 2007), the way they connect the kind of artefact they read and the situated activity in which reading is embedded in. How is reading integrated in an ongoing activity and within which sequential environments? What makes reading publicly accountable as such? How can reading be formatted as an individual vs. collective action? How are asymmetries of access to read objects organised and distributed among co-participants? How is reading organised in a recipient-designed way? The panel will explore these and other issues contributing to an interactional and praxeological approach to reading. Talks in this panel will propose multimodal analyses of video data documenting various institutional and professional settings in which reading takes place, featuring a variety of reading practices, reading participants, artefacts and languages.

Reciprocal (Im)politeness in and/or across Languages and Cultures (organized by *Chaoqun Xie*)

Recent developments in interpersonal pragmatics have increasingly emphasized the interactional and relational nature of politeness and impoliteness (Xie 2023). Building on this interactional turn, a growing body of research has identified reciprocity as a fundamental principle underlying interpersonal communication. In particular, the Principle of (Im)politeness Reciprocity (Culpeper and Tantucci 2021) highlights how interpersonal behaviour is shaped by expectations of appropriate response, return, mitigation, resistance, or escalation. Subsequent studies have demonstrated how reciprocity operates in online impoliteness and conflict (Culpeper, Tantucci and Field 2025), while recent work has extended the discussion to human-AI interaction (Tantucci and Culpeper 2026). Together, these developments suggest that reciprocity is emerging as a productive analytical lens for understanding the dynamics of (im)politeness and interpersonal relations.

This panel aims to explore reciprocal (im)politeness within and across languages and cultures. While reciprocal (im)politeness appears to be a pervasive feature of social interaction, its manifestations, norms, and evaluations may vary across linguistic communities, cultural traditions, communicative settings, and interactional contexts. Different languages and cultures may hold different expectations concerning the appropriate reciprocation of politeness and impoliteness and the moral meanings attached to such reciprocal behaviour. Investigating such variation can contribute to broader discussions of language, culture, morality, emotion, and interpersonal relations.

Reciprocal (im)politeness encompasses a wide range of interactional phenomena. Polite actions may invite reciprocal politeness and other affiliative responses, whereas impolite actions may trigger retaliation, resistance, face-restoration, or conflict escalation. Reciprocity may be immediate or delayed, explicit or implicit, and realised through verbal, embodied, multimodal, or technologically mediated resources. Examining these processes can enhance our understanding of how interactants negotiate relational expectations, social identities, rights and obligations, and moral orders.

The panel welcomes contributions addressing, but not limited to, the following topics:

- the Principle of (Im)politeness Reciprocity;
- reciprocal politeness and affiliative responses;
- reciprocal impoliteness, retaliation, and escalation;
- reciprocal facework: face-enhancement, face-aggravation, and face-restoration;
- morality and evaluation in reciprocal (im)politeness;
- emotional dimensions of reciprocal (im)politeness;
- cross-cultural variation in reciprocal (im)politeness;
- reciprocal (im)politeness in intercultural and multilingual interaction;
- reciprocal (im)politeness in workplace, educational, family, and institutional settings;
- reciprocal (im)politeness in social media and digitally mediated communication;
- reciprocal (im)politeness in human-AI interaction;
- multimodal and conversation-analytic approaches to reciprocal (im)politeness.

The panel welcomes discourse-analytic, interactional-pragmatic, conversation-analytic, ethnographic, corpus-based, multimodal, experimental, and interdisciplinary approaches, particularly studies grounded in naturally occurring interactional data.

References

Culpeper, Jonathan, and Vittorio Tantucci. 2021. The principle of (im)politeness reciprocity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 175: 146-164.

Culpeper, Jonathan, Vittorio Tantucci, and Eleanor Field. 2025. Impoliteness reciprocity online. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 242, 216-236.

Tantucci, Vittorio, and Jonathan Culpeper. 2026. Can ChatGPT reciprocate impoliteness? The AI moral dilemma. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Xie, Chaoqun (ed.). 2023. *Advancing (Im)politeness Studies: Cultural, Digital and Emotional Aspects*. Cham: Springer.

Regional (im)politeness: Description, theory and method (organized by *Jonathan Culpeper, Anne Barron, Cesar Felix-Brasdefer, Mathew Gillings*)

An aim of this panel is to act as a centre of gravity for the various but often disparate research efforts examining how politeness and/or impoliteness vary across geographical regions. Variational pragmatics (e.g. Schneider and Barron 2008), operating at the intersection of pragmatics and dialectology, examines variation in language use according to regional and social variables. Whilst much work in variational pragmatics has focused on intra-lingual variation across nations, especially involving pluricentric languages such as English and Spanish (e.g. Britain/Ireland/USA/Australia), this panel will focus on sub-national regional variation in (im)politeness patterns, and also examine how such variation interacts with social factors, such as gender, age, socio-economic class and ethnic identity. Studies that focus on sub-national regional variational aspects of (im)politeness are not new (e.g. Barron 2009); they are sometimes conducted within a variational pragmatic framework (e.g. van Dorst et al., 2024) and other times a dialectological framework (e.g. Schlegl and Tagliamonte 2021).

The panel focuses on sub-national regional pragmatic variation in interaction with social factors. Papers will potentially involve each or any of several different levels of variation (e.g. Barron, 2021; Schneider, 2021; Félix-Brasdefer, 2021), including: (1) regional differences between regions in a single nation (e.g., Northern England vs. Southern England); (2) local differences between cities within a nation (e.g., London vs. Manchester); and (3) sub-local differences between districts within a city (e.g., Vienna's 1st district vs. the 21st district).

This panel welcomes papers that make a significant descriptive contribution. However, it is particularly interested in how such contributions are underpinned by theory and made possible by method. How, for example, is the notion of politeness theorised? Or, how is the concept of a region operationalised? What are some effective methods for comparing and contrasting data in terms of context and pragmatic features? We especially encourage contributions that address the many underexplored regions within underexplored nations (e.g. within the Americas, Guatemala, Bolivia, Paraguay, El Salvador, Panama, Caribbean regions).

Barron, Anne (2009). Apologies across the U.S.A. In Fraser, B. & Turner, K. (eds.), *Language in Life, and a Life in Language: Jacob Mey – A Festschrift* (pp. 9-17). Emerald Publishing.

Barron, Anne (2021). Contrastivity and comparability: pragmatic variation across pluricentric varieties. *Sociolinguistica*, 35(1): 189-216

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. (2021). Pragmatic variation across varieties of Spanish. In Koike, D. A. & Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Spanish Pragmatics* (pp. 269–287). Routledge.

Schlegl Lisa and Tagliamonte Sali A. (2021). 'How do you get to Tim Hortons?' Direction-giving in Ontario dialects. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*, 66(1):1-30. doi:10.1017/cnj.2020.34

Schneider, Klaus P. and Anne Barron (eds). 2008. *Variational Pragmatics*. John Benjamins.

Schneider, Klaus P. 2021. Variational pragmatics. In Haugh, M., Kádár, D. & Terkourafi, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociopragmatics* (pp. 663–686). Cambridge University Press.

van Dorst, Isolde, Mathew Gillings and Jonathan Culpeper. 2024. Sociopragmatic variation in Britain: A corpus-based study of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 227(7): 37–56.

Relating and Relational Work in Public Interaction (organized by *Miriam Locher, Yongping Ran*)

Relationship negotiation and relating are primary social phenomena that are inherent in everyday pragmatic phenomena (Arundale 2021). The study of linguistic and multimodal practices to negotiate (establish, enhance, maintain, challenge) relationships is the core research focus of in interpersonal pragmatics (Locher 2013). Yet as Arundale (2021) demonstrates, fundamental disagreements persist regarding whether relationships are exogenous to or endogenous in interaction, how the individual and the social are linked, and whether social phenomena are additive or non-additive.

This panel brings together research traditions from recent im/politeness studies (see, e.g. Culpeper et al. 2017; Jucker et al. 2023), identity construction (see, e.g. Locher & Bolander 2017), rapport management (e.g. Spencer-Oatey 2013), sociopragmatics (Haugh et al. 2021), among others, in order to explore how relationships are negotiated in practice and what we can learn from these instances with respect to relating and relational work. In particular, we wish to explore public contexts where the participation structure goes beyond a dyadic and private exchange, including not only the direct addressee and ratified participants but also overhearers and eavesdroppers. The public nature of exchanges has an impact on face-sensitivities in diverse ways which deserve further attention (see, e.g., Chang & Haugh 2025; Ran & Fan 2025). This sociopragmatic and interpersonal pragmatic perspective demands directing attention to how relating unfolds in public places such as streets, markets, transport hubs, queues, waiting rooms, public computer-mediated communication and other shared (physical and metaphorical) spaces where participants are often unacquainted, yet nonetheless engage in relational work through brief, sometimes minimal, interactions that they perform in front of witnesses. These public settings can reveal fundamental processes of civil inattention, territoriality, requests for assistance, complaints, and the negotiation of social distance but also displays of adherence to social norms and shared role understandings, which gives us access to societal ideologies evolving around the moral order and norms of appropriate conduct that deserve our academic attention.

The scope of the panel encompasses: (a) theoretical debates on exogenous vs. endogenous conceptualizations of relationships; (b) methodological strategies for capturing relational phenomena in public encounters; (c) empirical investigations of how participants manage connection-separation, involvement-detachment, and rights-obligations in public places; (d)

comparative analyses of relational work across settings; and (e) the applicability of dialectical and non-additive frameworks to study relational work in public interaction.

References (simplified)

Arundale 2021. Relationships/relating. In Haugh et al. (eds) pp.272-292. Culpeper et al. (eds) 2017. Palgrave Hbk Linguistic (Im)Politeness. Haugh et al. (eds) 2021. Camb. Hbk Sociopragmatics. CUP. Jucker et al. (eds) 2023. Multimodal Im/politeness. Benjamins. Locher 2013. Relational work. *J Pragmatics* 58:145-9. Locher & Bolander 2017. Facework/identity. In Hoffmann & Bublitz (eds) pp.407-434. Ran & Fan 2025. Understanding Chinese Relational Practice. In Alba-Juez & Haugh (eds) pp.242-271. Spencer-Oatey 2013. Relating at work. *J Pragmatics* 58:121-137.

Relating and relationship development over time (organized by *Chilmeg Elden, Michael Haugh*)

A growing body of research has examined interpersonal relationships from an interactional perspective, treating relationships as interactional achievements between two or more parties, which are accomplished over various different spans of time, rather than being static properties of individuals (Arundale, 2010, 2020, 2021a, 2021b; Enfield, 2009, 2013; Haugh, Kádár & Mills, 2013). However, while an increasing number of studies have explored the dynamic, in situ processes by which interactants get to know each other (e.g. Barron, 2025; Chang, 2025, 2026; Haugh et al., 2025; Haugh & Pillet-Shore, 2018; Korobov, 2024; Templeton et al. 2024; see also Svennevig, 2025), as well as how interpersonal relationships are maintained and negotiated interactionally in family discourse (e.g. Beach, 1996; Sinkeviciute & Rodriguez, 2025), in the workplace (e.g. Chang, 2016; Spencer-Oatey, 2013; Spencer-Oatey & Lazidou, 2022; Spencer-Oatey & Wang, 2025), medical and health-related interactions (e.g. Beach et al., 2018, 2024), and mediated interactions (Ran & Zhao, 2018), relatively little attention has been paid to how relationships develop over time and across interactions.

The aim of this panel is to expand on the existing research on interpersonal relationships through drawing attention to temporal dimensions of relating and relationship development (Depperman and Pekarek-Doehler, 2021). The panel will bring together scholars who examine how interpersonal relationships are interactionally accomplished across different timespans in different contexts. We invite contributions that draw on various kinds of interactional data which capture temporal dimensions of relating, including co-present interactions, online interactions, or interactions in mediated contexts (e.g., reality TV shows), as well as longitudinal studies that capture developmental trajectories across interactions. Through incorporating various kinds of interactional data and methodological approaches, this panel seeks to explore how interpersonal relationships can interactionally emerge, evolve, be maintained, and, in some cases, come to an end. The panel is particularly interested in work that examines: (1) the establishment of interpersonal relationships in first or subsequent encounters; (2) the maintenance and negotiation of ongoing relationships; and (3) the interactional practices of which interpersonal relationships deteriorate or dissolve.

We anticipate attracting a diverse range of scholars to the panel, as we will welcome papers that employ a range of different analytic frameworks and methodologies to examine how interpersonal relationships are interactionally accomplished, including approaches drawing

on conversation analysis, MCA, discourse analysis, corpus pragmatics, interpersonal communication and social psychology. We will especially welcome papers that attempt to bridge one or more of these approaches. Alongside inviting those who have already established lines of research in or related areas, we will also launch an open call for contributions from additional participants in order to attract a broad range of theoretical perspectives on relating and relationship development.

Rethinking Politeness Formulae: Bridging Traditional and Advanced Approaches in Pragmatics (organized by *Gudrun Held*)

Since the seminal work of Brown & Levinson (1978/1987), politeness strategies

have been central in pragmatic theory. In line with the three epistemological ‘waves’ politeness was first conceptualized as the mitigation of face-threatening acts, then as participants’ context-dependent interpretations, and, more recently, as a jointly negotiated interactional achievement. From this perspective, politeness is no longer treated as an inherent property of linguistic forms, but as an emergent quality of situated discourse.

This shift has had important consequences for the status of politeness formulae, a heterogeneous set of highly frequent, conventionalized expressions found across languages and deeply embedded in everyday communicative practice. Once treated as standard markers of polite meaning and as part of culture-specific behavioral norms, such expressions are now more often approached as ‘default’ discourse routines (Coulmas 1981, Beeching & Murphy 2019).

As a result, both the label politeness formula and the analytical status of the category have become unstable (Schlund 2014) —an issue further complicated by the distinction between two notions of politeness: politeness₁, the culturally learned lay concept, and politeness₂, the theoretical construct. (Im)politeness emerges as a complex system of numerous dynamic components, among which canonical expressions may play a minor role.

However, with the increasing use of large digital corpora and bottom-up approaches, formulaic language has regained the attention of politeness research: Watts’ definition of ‘politic’ behaviour, Terkourafi’s frame-based theory, and the recent interest in meta-discursive resources revalue its character as context-appropriated and rule-embedded language use. Providing quantifiable datasets, formulae reveal themselves as key sites for examining conventionalization, evaluation, and linguistic change (Terkourafi & Kádár 2017). This renews inter- and cross-cultural analysis (House & Kádár 2021) and supports historical pragmatics: Often considered fossilized residues of earlier behavioral forms, politeness formulae both undergo social transformation and reflect processes of pragmaticalization (Brinton 2017). As such, they offer a valuable lens for tracing the historicity of politeness.

The panel therefore seeks to reassess the role of formulae and formulaic expressions in both politeness theory and social practice, from synchronic and diachronic perspectives. It invites contributions addressing questions such as: What justifies retaining or abandoning the label politeness formula? How does this category relate to different understandings of politeness? Under what contextual conditions do standardized expressions evoke, negotiate, neutralize, or transform (im)politeness? Which theoretical and methodological approaches are best suited to their investigation?

We welcome theoretical and data-driven contributions on individual formulae, formulaic repertoires, and broader systems of conventionalized expression. Comparative, cross-linguistic, and diachronic perspectives are especially encouraged.

Minimal references:

Brinton, L. J. (2017), *The Evolution of Pragmatic Markers in English*. Cambridge.

Beeching, K./ Murphy, J. (2019) Introduction: Strategic uses of Politeness Formulae. In: *JoP* 142, 200 – 206.

Coulmas, F. (ed.) (1981), *Conversational Routine. Explorations in Standardized Situations and Prepatterned Speech*. Berlin.

House, J./ Kádár, D. (2021), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics*. Cambridge.

Schlund, K. (2014), On form and function of politeness formulae. In: *JoPR* 10/2, 271 – 296.

Terkourafi, M. / Kádár, D. (2017), Convention and Ritual (Im)politeness. In: Culpeper/Haugh/Kádár (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*. London, 171 – 197.

Rethinking Pragmatics through African Multilingualism (organized by *Rachel Ayuk Ojong Diba*)

Many influential pragmatic theories have been developed from contexts in which languages are treated as relatively bounded, stable, and identifiable systems. Core concepts such as speech acts, implicature, politeness, communicative competence, inference, and conversational cooperation have often been examined in interactional settings where participants are assumed to share a common linguistic code. Yet for many speakers across Africa, communication frequently involves the flexible mobilization of multiple linguistic resources, movement across repertoires, and interactional practices that challenge conventional assumptions about language boundaries and shared codes. Such realities invite renewed reflection on some of the foundational assumptions that have shaped pragmatic inquiry.

This panel explores how African multilingualism can contribute to the advancement of pragmatic theory. Rather than treating African multilingual settings merely as sites for testing existing theories, the panel approaches them as sources of conceptual and theoretical innovation. Across the continent, speakers routinely draw on local languages, lingua francas, colonial languages, pidgins, creoles, youth varieties, and hybrid communicative forms to accomplish social action. These practices raise important questions about how meaning is produced, interpreted, negotiated, and contested in contexts where communicative competence extends beyond mastery of a single language and where linguistic boundaries are often fluid, overlapping, and socially negotiated.

The panel is particularly interested in how African multilingual realities can help rethink fundamental questions in pragmatics. To what extent does pragmatic meaning depend on shared linguistic codes? How are speech acts, inference, and interactional coherence achieved when speakers draw on multiple linguistic resources simultaneously? How do multilingual repertoires shape stance-taking, identity construction, authority, solidarity, humour, indirectness, and conflict management? What role do language ideologies, metapragmatic

awareness, and linguistic creativity play in the interpretation of meaning? And how might African multilingual practices contribute to broader debates about communicative competence, language boundaries, and the social organization of interaction?

By highlighting multilingual repertoires as the normal condition of communication, the panel seeks to place African multilingualism at the centre of contemporary pragmatic theorizing. It welcomes contributions that examine how speakers use multilingual resources to construct social relationships, negotiate belonging, perform identities, and create meaning across diverse sociolinguistic environments, including face-to-face interaction, mobility contexts, and digital communication.

The panel welcomes contributions from pragmatics, sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, discourse analysis, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, contact linguistics, digital communication studies, and related fields. Topics may include, but are not limited to:

- Pragmatics in multilingual interaction;
- Speech acts across multilingual repertoires;
- Inference, interpretation, and meaning-making in multilingual settings;
- Language choice and social meaning;
- Identity, stance, language ideologies, and metapragmatic practices;
- Humour, metaphor, and indirectness;
- Pidgins, creoles, and hybrid communicative practices;
- Digital multilingualism and online interaction;
- Pragmatics of mobility, migration, and displacement;
- Linguistic creativity and communicative innovation;
- Multilingualism and communicative competence;

The panel brings together scholars to advance ongoing conversations about the relationship between multilingualism and pragmatics. It argues that African multilingualism constitutes a valuable source of theoretical insight capable of challenging and extending broader understandings of meaning-making, communicative competence, language ideologies, identity construction, and multilingual interaction.

Risk discourse and sustainability (organized by *Annelie Ädel, Jan-Ola Östman*)

Recent work has stressed the need for Risk Discourse as an approach in discourse analysis and pragmatics (e.g. Ädel & Östman, 2023; 2025; forthc.). ‘Risk discourse’ has been defined as referring to “texts, whether spoken, written or signed, that are concerned with matters of risk and related concepts (such as security and safety), whether involving experts and/or lay people, whether explicitly or implicitly dealt with, whether synchronously or asynchronously communicated, and whether framed as relatively negative or positive risk” (Ädel & Östman, 2025, p. 743). Risk Discourse has been discussed based on different languages, through different types of linguistic analyses, and in relation to concepts like responsibility and

ideology. In this panel, we would like to explore the concept of sustainability in relation to Risk Discourse.

Existing research on risk clearly foregrounds the ‘harm’ dimension, but there is another important side of the concept, viz. the ‘gain’ dimension of risk, which appears to be key particularly in a sustainability context. Sustainability as a concept raises our awareness that risks that are ignored are likely to lead to ‘harm’ and, conversely, risks that are dealt with are likely to lead to ‘gain’. Essentially, sustainability can be seen as based on the idea that the right kind of risk mitigation and risk management will lead to a positive outcome for society at large.

Both risk and sustainability involve a contrast between the present and the future. A risk is prototypically seen as something which may, but need not, happen. Participants in risk scenarios need to be mindful of potential futures that involve ‘harm’ or that involve ‘gain’. Sustainability also implies a focus on potential futures, through the general goal to meet the needs of the present in ways that do not to compromise the needs of future generations. Here we also see the need to be attentive to hypothetical futures that involve ‘harm’ or ‘gain’.

For this exploratory panel, we invite presentations on all aspects of sustainability in relation to aspects of risk, whether ‘harm’-oriented and/or ‘gain’-oriented. We especially welcome projects that consider not just negative, but also positive aspects of risk. Contributions may cover for example issues of climate change, the revitalization of and threat against minority languages and peoples, metaphorizations of risks and sustainability, aspects of responsibility in relation to risks and sustainability, and more theoretically the very concept of sustainability in (and outside of) language studies.

References

Ädel, A. & J.-O. Östman (eds.), 2023 Risk Discourse and Responsibility. John Benjamins.

Ädel, A. & J.-O. Östman, 2025. Positive and negative risk in adventure tourism discourse: Adrenaline hunting in “arctic Lapland”. *Text & Talk* 45(6): 725–748.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2023-0237>.

Ädel, A. & J.-O. Östman, forthc. The construction of the Arctic in tourism discourse: Sápmi, Svalbard and Greenland from the perspective of risk. In *The European North in Linguistics*. Brill.

Social Justice for Pragmatics (organized by *Ilkka Arminen*)

This panel explores how pragmatics can address injustice, inequality, and institutional power. Pragmatics has long examined meaning beyond the utterance: implicature, politeness, stance, deixis, presupposition, indexicality, conversational interaction, and interactional norms. These phenomena are not socially neutral. They shape whose voice is heard and whose is silenced, who is believed, whose communicative practices are treated as legitimate, and by whom.

One central focus of the panel is pragmatic injustice: situations in which speakers are misunderstood, dismissed, or penalized because their communicative practices differ from dominant expectations. Such injustice may involve racialized interpretations of “tone,” gendered judgments of assertiveness, norms concerning language choice, classed assumptions about politeness, or ableist expectations of fluency, eye contact, and turn-taking.

Pragmatic analysis can show how many so-called communicative “failures” are not individual deficiencies but socially structured asymmetries.

A second focus is institutional pragmatics. Courts, classrooms, hospitals, immigration interviews, workplaces, and digital platforms all rely on implicit norms about what counts as a legitimate question, an appropriate answer, a credible narrative, a respectful request, or a cooperative contribution. A social justice approach to pragmatics asks how such norms privilege some speakers while disadvantaging others.

The panel also considers methodological justice. Who is studied, who benefits from the research, and who participates in interpreting the data? Community-engaged pragmatics, multilingual research practices, and collaborations with activists, educators, interpreters, and legal advocates may expand both the relevance and accountability of the field.

Finally, the panel addresses pragmatics as intervention: how research on interaction can inform climate justice, accessible communication, public engagement, anti-racist pedagogy, restorative dialogue, language policy, and platform moderation. The central question is not only how social injustice appears in interaction, but how pragmatics can contribute to more equitable communicative worlds.

At the same time, social justice raises controversies. Whose justice is at stake, and in whose terms is it defined? How can researchers combine scientific standards with ethical commitments? This panel takes these challenges as productive tensions. It invites reflection on how commitments to social justice could shape the choice of phenomena studied, the methods used, and the interpretive compass guiding analysis.

References

Arminen, Ilkka (forthc.) Conversation Analysis and Social Justice: Implicature, Contrastive Analysis and Institutional Embedding. Rolsi.

Raymond, C. W., et al. (2025). Language policy as interactional practice in everyday public space. *Language*. Tadic, N. (2026). Conversation analysis for social justice. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*.

Solitude speech: Transcending the boundaries of pragmatics (organized by *Mitsuko Izutsu, Katsunobu Izutsu*)

Pragmatics is defined by the International Pragmatics Association—now celebrating its 20th conference—as the “the science of language use, in its widest interdisciplinary sense as a functional (i.e. cognitive, social, and cultural) perspective on language and communication” (IPrA webpage, *our italics*). This reflects the scholarly consensus that pragmatics is a study of communication because “communication is what language is all about” (Searle 1972). It is beyond doubt that interaction between two or more different speakers has been a central focus of theories and notions developed in pragmatics (e.g., speech acts, politeness, implicatures) and it represents the expertise of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics.

However, language is not only used for interpersonal communication. We also use language when talking to ourselves. Language is “a system for expression of thought” (Chomsky 1975:

22) or “tools of thought” (Vygotsky [1934]1986: 94). We speak even in the absence of an physical addressee.

The aim of this panel is to explore the following two agendas concerning solitude speech (self-talk or private speech).

How does pragmatic (or linguistic) research contribute to the understanding of solitude speech (self-talk or private speech)?How does research on solitude speech (self-talk or private speech) contribute to improvements or refinements of existing theories and notions in pragmatics (speech acts, politeness, implicatures, etc.)?

The first agenda is a fundamental imperative for linguists. Although solitude speech is a matter of language, it has been mainly studied in psychology, where linguistic facts have often been marginalized in favor of statistical analysis and trend observation. However, recent linguistic inquiries into solitude speech (self-talk) (e.g., Holmberg 2010, Krifka 2023, Wiltschko 2025, Izutsu and Izutsu 2025a) have revealed that lexico-grammatical elements—including self-referential pronouns, reporting verbs, sentence-final particles, and interjections—exhibit diverse manifestations across several dimensions: language (type), type of solitude speech (e.g., expressive, self-regulatory, self-directed, displayed), mode of speech (conversation, solitude speech), and others. It has also been demonstrated that the concept of adjacency pairs is useful to identify the dialogic nature of solitude speech (Izutsu and Izutsu 2025b).

The second agenda represents an important task to be undertaken by pragmatics scholars. Previous theoretical frameworks in pragmatics have been traditionally grounded on speaker-addressee interaction. However, we can find many cases where solitude speakers perform directive speech acts like “Wait” and “Don’t give up” (Izutsu and Izutsu 2025b, Latinjak 2020) or commissive speech acts like “I’ll do it tomorrow.” How can conventional theories of pragmatics accommodate these linguistic data produced when speakers are talking to themselves? Are there any speech acts that never occur in solitude speech? Furthermore, the absence of an addressee necessitates a reformulation of frameworks concerning demonstrative reference, social deixis, and information status—concepts traditionally analyzed in relation to the addressee’s knowledge state. Japanese researchers (Kuroda [1979]1992, Hasegawa 2007) attempt to incorporate solitude speech into their analyses of demonstratives, but comparative research needs to be extended to different languages and various linguistic domains.

This panel invites any and all contributions addressing either of the above two agendas, regardless of language types, linguistic phenomena, or methodological frameworks.

Speech Acts of Cooperation and Conflict (organized by *Frank Liedtke, Claus Ehrhardt*)

In performing speech acts, utterers aim at being understood by their addressees, and in addition they intend (mostly) that the propositional content of their speech act is fulfilled, realized etc. The former effect is called illocutionary uptake by J.L. Austin or illocutionary effect by J.R. Searle, the latter is specified as perlocutionary effect. In order to realize the illocutionary uptake or effect, utterers and addressees have to share a minimal basis of cooperation, as H.P Grice has pointed out. It otherwise seems that a mutual understanding is impossible.

Cases of dissent, dispute and conflictual communication constitute a challenge for this model of mutual understanding. At first sight, a distinction between illocution (cooperative) and perlocution (conflictual) seems to suggest itself, but in many cases even the illocution is affected in the sense that the illocutionary effect is not accepted by all participants of a talk exchange. These are not merely cases of misunderstanding, but of divergent opinions of what was said or stated.

What does this mean for basic pragmatic notions such as illocution, understanding and cooperation? With regard to the latter, do conflicting parties cease to cooperate mutually, or is there a technical sense of cooperation that allows to attribute cooperation to them even in cases of dissent, dispute or conflict? If this is the case, which of the maxims have to be followed in each case (e.g. quality), and which are weakened or controversial themselves (e.g. relevance)?

Furthermore, the question of the limits of understanding in nonconsensual communication arises. If even the illocution of the performed speech act is under debate, mutual understanding in the sense of illocutionary uptake may not only be the requisite, but also the object of the dispute. What, then, might be the ultimate basis for understanding, in the sense of a minimal recognition of the communicative intention of the respective counterpart?

Subjectification, Intersubjectification, and Textualization: Evidence from Asian Languages (organized by *Minju Kim, Michiko Kaneyasu*)

For decades, the question of developmental ordering among subjectification, intersubjectification, and related processes has driven one of the most productive debates in grammaticalization research and historical linguistics. In the foundational stages of grammaticalization theory, Traugott (1982) proposed that meanings tend to shift from propositional (truth-conditional and referential) through textual functions of discourse cohesion, and finally toward expressive meanings encoding the speaker's attitude and stance. This pathway was subsequently refined into the more articulated concepts of subjectification—the increasing orientation of meaning toward the speaker's own perspective—and intersubjectification—the increasing orientation toward the addressee's cognitive stance and social identity (Traugott & Dasher 2002; Traugott 2003, 2010, 2014). Crucially, Traugott (2003) argued that these two processes follow a developmental order, with subjectification necessarily preceding intersubjectification.

This ordering hypothesis, however, has not gone unchallenged. Adamson (1995) demonstrated that "de-subjectivisation" is attested; Cornillie (2008) showed that intersubjectification can precede subjectification; and Narrog (2014) introduced text/discourse orientation as a third process and proposed an alternative ordering. Collectively, these critiques raised a broader theoretical question: is there any generalizable developmental sequence at all?

In a striking recent reversal, Traugott has rescinded her earlier ordering proposals altogether. Introducing the concept of textualization—defined as a shift in how speakers attend to text-connectivity and invite addressees to interpret connective relationships—Traugott (2022, 2024) now argues that there is no generalizable developmental sequence among subjectification, intersubjectification and textualization. This new position draws heavily on English discourse structuring markers: she proposes that when adverbial phrases develop into

discourse structuring markers, textualization, weak subjectification, and weak intersubjectification occur concurrently by default, leaving no generalizable diachronic sequence among them.

This panel asks whether this new conclusion holds beyond Indo-European languages. Asian languages offer a compelling, typologically distinct testing ground. Korean and Japanese, in particular, possess exceptionally rich inventories of sentence-final particles, evidential markers, and honorific systems that inherently encode subjectivity and intersubjectivity. While both processes have been identified as major drivers of semantic-functional change in these languages (e.g., Rhee 2012; Kim 2021, 2025), their precise diachronic trajectories vis-à-vis textualization remain undertheorized.

Bringing together specialists in Asian linguistics, this panel examines a diverse range of grammaticalizing constructions—including discourse structuring markers, modal expressions, and stance markers in Korean, Japanese, and other Asian languages. The panel therefore invites contributions that examine these and related types of markers and constructions across different Asian languages. Our collective objective is to test whether these developmental paths support or challenge Traugott's revised claims, and to investigate whether the evolution of discourse structuring markers universally involves these three processes concurrently. By drawing on longitudinal corpus data, cross-linguistic comparison, and fine-grained semantic analysis, this panel aims to move the debate beyond its Indo-European foundations and toward a more typologically grounded account of how subjectification, intersubjectification, and textualization unfold across the world's languages.

Sustainability: Knowledge, Stance and Responsibility (organized by *Polly Szatrowski*)

This panel welcomes papers on the use of language and multimodality to construct knowledge, stance and responsibility regarding sustainability. By “multimodality,” we mean the use of language together with the body (including gestures), objects in the surrounding environment, spoken and written texts, and graphical design cues (typography, imagery) to create meaning. Collectively, the papers in this panel address one or more of the following three questions: How are language and multimodality used to (1) create, negotiate, and modify knowledge related to sustainability? (2) display an individual's, group's, or corporation's stance towards sustainability? and (3) assign, deny, or display responsibility towards sustainability?

To understand key issues in sustainability, and to communicate sustainability-related aims and practices, research on sustainability has called for new frames, discursive strategies, and narratives (Friel, Schram, & Townsend, 2020; Cardonna, 2022; Rees, 2010). The use of particular words and metaphorical expressions reflects our conceptual systems and shape the way we view the world (Nakamura, 1977; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Modal and evidential forms can be used to adjust levels of commitment and confidence, and to indicate the source of knowledge, mode of knowing and reliability (Masuoka & Takubo, 1992; Chafe, 1986). Studies on how children's books can reframe the way we approach climate change (Orziewicz, 2023, Resler, 2024), indicate the importance of considering how people are socialized to practices that promote sustainability and climate literacy. The exploration of metaphors, terminology, and multimodal discourses in this panel reveals insights into people's knowledge, stance and responsibility for sustainability.

This panel will include the following papers:

The first paper by Polly Szatrowski “Negotiating knowledge of and responsibility for food sustainability at Japanese Sustainable Taster Lunches” analyzes the verbal and nonverbal construction of knowledge and responsibility in 12 conversations during a Sustainable Taster Lunch. The focus is on how Japanese participants from junior, middle, and senior age groups negotiate their knowledge of food sustainability and their information sources (using a variety of modal and evidential forms), and how they create, negotiate, and modify their views on sustainability and their sense of responsibility from personal, national, and global perspectives.

The second paper by Jon Coltz “Greenspeak and pre-emptive stance design.” proposes that “greenspeak” (Harré, Brockmeier, & Mühlhäusler, 1999) can be understood as a form of designed stancetaking. Advertising that uses greenspeak configures the interactional conditions under which future stances (on the part of the receiver, or audience) are more likely to occur. In this view, greenspeak operates through the pre-emptive design of evaluative, alignment, and positioning relations, shaping interpretation while leaving important aspects of evaluation unstated. The analysis shows that advertising may be understood not simply as persuasion but as the strategic design of stance fields within which consumers are invited to position themselves.

This panel contributes to research on multimodality and sustainability of our environment, food, etc. Understanding how language and multimodality are used to construct knowledge, stance and responsibility regarding sustainability across languages and discourse genres will help diversify perspectives and suggest new ways to approach sustainability.

Syntax-in-progress in a multi-semiotic ecology of social interaction (organized by *Yael Maschler, Jan Lindström, Simona Pekarek Doehler, Leelo Keevallik*)

This panel explores syntactic constructions-in-progress (cf. Lerner 1991, Auer 2009) as socially and materially situated accomplishments, emerging within multi-semiotic ecologies of face-to-face interaction. We ask how the simultaneous deployment of verbal language, prosody, gaze, gesture, bodily posture, and the manipulation of objects constrain and enable speakers as they construct turns at talk in real time (Gardner et al. 2025). The panel foregrounds the ways in which grammatical constructions are shaped by, and responsive to, the temporally unfolding coordination of heterogeneous semiotic resources (Goodwin 2018, Mondada 2014, Keevallik 2018).

Contributions examine how participants manage clause- and phrase-combining in the course of turn construction and turn continuation, as practical solutions to interactional contingencies. From this perspective, sentences are not pre-planned units, but emergent configurations assembled incrementally as speakers monitor recipients’ behavior and deal with the progressivity (Schegloff 2007) of the ongoing activity. Prosodic design, gaze behavior, gesture trajectories, and object manipulations may project continuation of action, invite uptake, project or block turn transition, or retrospectively reframe a turn-in-progress, thus constraining syntactic options.

By analyzing these phenomena in a variety of languages (English, Estonian, Finnish, French, Garrwa, Hebrew, Japanese, Mandarin, Russian, Swedish) and across diverse interactional settings, the panel addresses how features from various semiotic systems function both as a

source of constraints on grammatical form and as a resource for action formation. For example, we study how practices such as unit extensions and increments (Ford, Fox & Thompson 2002) are systematically linked to embodied conduct (Lindström, Maschler & Pekarek Doehler, forthcoming), revealing grammars that are sensitive to the ecology of participation. This approach advances an understanding of grammar as dynamically adapted to interactional environments, rather than as a fixed inventory of abstract rules (Hopper 1987).

The panel brings together work situated at the intersection of interactional linguistics (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018), conversation analysis (Schegloff 2007), and emergent grammar (Hopper 1987). It highlights the analytically productive notion of multi-semiotic ecologies for understanding how linguistic structure is locally occasioned, sequentially organized, and materially grounded. By focusing on grammatical constructions as evolving accomplishments embedded in embodied action, the panel contributes to broader debates on grammar, temporality, and social interaction, offering new insights into how language is shaped in and through multimodal conduct.

Taken for granted – Projective content, (not-)at-issueness, information structure, and the common ground (organized by *Jennifer Hüge, Britta Stolterfoht, Katrin Axel-Tober, Fabian Schlotterbeck*)

The panel seeks to advance our understanding of the nature of information that is ‘taken for granted’ in an utterance. Linguistic phenomena related to such information, most prominently presuppositions and conventional implicatures, received different analyses, e.g. as projective or not-at-issue content. Current debates center around the questions (i) whether a single analysis can capture all characteristics of this heterogeneous set of phenomena; (ii) how they connect to information-structural distinctions like focus-background or topic-comment; and (iii) how such information enters and is represented in common ground. To address these questions, the panel aims at bringing together researchers from different theoretical camps with the growing field of experimental pragmatics. Potential invited speakers are Judith Tonhauser (Stuttgart) and Todor Koev (Ben-Gurion).

Potts (2005) analyzed conventional implicatures, e.g., the content expressed by parentheticals, appositives and expressives, as not-at-issue, drawing a distinction between the asserted proposition (at-issue content), which is typically taken to be an answer to a question under discussion (e.g. Roberts, 1996/2012; Tonhauser, 2012; but see Koev (2018) for different conceptions), and a range of other entailments and presuppositions conveyed in an utterance (not-at-issue content). Since Potts’ seminal work, characterising the difference between at-issue and not-at-issue content sparked great interest in theoretical as well as experimental research (e.g. Tonhauser, 2012; Murray, 2014; Stevens et al., 2017; Stolterfoht, 2026). One line of research drew connections between projective content and not-at-issueness, stating that diverse phenomena can be subsumed under the premise that they all project because they do not contribute at-issue content themselves but rather serve as its background (e.g. Roberts et al., 2009; Simons et al., 2010). Despite this uniformity, recent experimental findings highlighted variability and gradience in at-issueness and projection (e.g. Tonhauser, 2018; Barnes & Ebert, 2023). Only recently, research focused on factors determining the observed variability by systematically testing the influence and interplay of lexical meaning, prior beliefs and at-issueness (e.g. Degen & Tonhauser, 2025). Moreover,

first attempts have been made to implement the effects of such factors in probabilistic pragmatic models (Scontras & Tonhauser, 2025). Another important desideratum is a model of how different types of content are processed incrementally (e.g. by introducing a second processing stage linked to a second layer of meaning designated to not-at-issue content; e.g. Axel-Tober et al., 2024; Czypionka et al., 2025), and also how the incremental left-to-right nature of language processing affects core properties of projection (e.g. asymmetric filtering; Mandelkern, et al., 2020; Kalomoiros & Schwarz, 2024; Tonhauser & Degen, to appear).

To shed further light on the issues sketched above, we invite contributions related to topics such as:

- Links between (not-)at-issueness, projection, and information structural concepts, and their representation in common ground
- Factors influencing the processing of projective or not-at-issue content
- Theoretical and empirical approaches to the gradience of at-issueness
- Differences/similarities of (conventional) implicatures and presuppositions

Talking about what and how: The value of ethnographic and semiotic engagement in illuminating our praxis (organized by *Judith Pine*)

The ethnographic and the semiotic are indelibly linked in linguistic anthropology. Foundational voices in the engagement between linguistic anthropology and semiotics make abundantly clear that we must ground our analysis in actual events, in what we describe as “the ethnographic” (Silverstein 1975, Silverstein and Urban 1996, Irvine and Gal 2000, Agha 2007). And yet, ethnographers encounter a tension when our analysis is of material from a culture other than our own. This tension also requires that we turn a critical gaze onto our own praxis, acknowledging its extractive colonial past. While an ethnographic praxis allows us to evade what Davis (2017) describes as linguistic extraction, or “the process of discussing languages and [...] movements removed from the personal lives, communicative practices, and embodied experiences in which they inherently are embedded,” we nevertheless find ourselves more often speaking for, rather than speaking with, our interlocutors. Hymes’s Ethnography of Communication since the 1960s/’70s has given us a helpful tool for identifying the what of the ethnographic, and adding to that, as linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar (2006) argues, the ethnographic may be best defined as a kind of logic, specifically an abductive logic informed by Peircean semiotics. The “thick” descriptions (Geertz 1973) that informs ethnographic writing in anthropology seeks to explain phenomenon via abductive inference. The Peircean semiotic lens which continues to be developed and refined in linguistic anthropology offers a complex mechanism for this abduction grounded in the observed speech events of the ethnographic how.

Inspired by the work of Bernard Perley, Maliseet linguistic anthropologist and artist, which invites both indigenous and non-indigenous audiences to engage in the multifaceted, multivocal complexity of indigenous being in the colonially-dominated world through intertwined stories presented in both text and multimodal installations, this panel explores the potential for semiotic conceptual frameworks. In particular, we draw attention to Keane’s notions of semiotic ideologies and representational economies (2002, 2007) and the

recognition that we as scholars operate within such ideologies, as tools for re-framing the presentation of ethnographic data to remove the West from the center and place all participants in dialogue with one another.

Taking to heart Perley's call for critical indigeneity, within which ethnography is intended as a "catalyst for action" as a form of engaged anthropology, and expanding this approach to consider a range of complex intersectional identities encountered by linguistic anthropologists, this panel asks what we can see through our semiotic lens as we engage ethnographically with indigenous, immigrant, and diasporic communities. When we look from a different center what do we see? How might this perspective inform practice for ourselves and our audiences?

The Mechanics of Meaning-Making: Analyzing Pragmatic and Structural Bias in LLM Discourse (organized by *Ghazala Kausar*)

The recent surge in artificial intelligence has caused an upheaval, transforming how we think and perceive. The rapid integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) has transformed digital communication, moving AI from a passive tool to an active participant in meaning-making. While their fluency and adaptability are unmatched, their handling of human language is questionable. Growing evidence indicates they also reproduce social biases embedded in the extensive datasets they are trained on (Bender et al., 2021). These biases—especially those related to gender, race, culture, and social identity—are not confined to isolated outputs but can systematically influence linguistic structures, thematic framing, and underlying assumptions in AI-generated texts. Because meaning is contextual and co-constructed between the AI and the human reader, these hidden structures quietly shape public discourse, educational content, and media narratives.

Linguistic bias, unlike overt discriminatory language, often manifests subtly—through lexical choices, syntactic patterns, or discourse framing that encode stereotypes and reinforce social hierarchies (Zhang, 2025).. Panelists will explore the mechanics of how biased meanings are structurally manufactured by LLMs and how human users interpret, negotiate, and resist these narratives in real-world contexts.

Panel Rationale & Objectives

- Advance the Methodology: Transition the AI bias conversation from rigid prompt-completion statistics to qualitative, pragmatic discourse analysis.
- Deconstruct Meaning-Making: Analyze how AI text actively assigns agency, constructs social hierarchies, and frames cultural identities.
- Bridge Theory and Practice: Examine the downstream societal impact of AI-mediated meaning on education, media, and public policy.

The normalization of authoritarianism across media: Interactional strategies, emotional repertoires, and adversarial footings in mainstream news, alternative media and social media (organized by *Marianna Patrona, Mats Ekström*)

In recent years, a large volume of critical scholarship has grappled with the media-enabled normalization of authoritarian discourses and far-right political agendas within liberal democracies. The panel contributes to this body of work by examining political actors' communication strategies and the broad discursive mechanisms at work in different forms of contemporary media, including mainstream news media, alternative and alt-right outlets, social media, and online news platforms. It thus sheds new light on how authoritarianism and far-right politics are articulated, reproduced, and authorized, by scrutinizing authoritarian

footings, emotional repertoires, and interactional practices building on exclusionary logics, antagonism, and polarisation, as they manifest in news production, and, also, in citizen engagement with news.

Panel contributions will bring together current discourse-oriented research that sheds light on diverse aspects of the complex interface between authoritarianism and news journalism, a relationship which extends far beyond the focus of previous research on how the media report on the far right. Across the panel, news media are analysed as sites, resources, and triggers through which authoritarianism is reproduced in (breaches of) journalistic practices, generic conventions, turn-taking norms, presuppositions, as well as in multimodal practices and aspects of positioning and social deixis in citizen engagement with news. The panel addresses the challenges that the often concealed normalization of authoritarian populism poses to democracy and democratic institutions at the present historical moment, and, notably, the role of journalism as democratic ‘watchdog’ in light of disruptions of established journalistic practice(s) and norms triggered by the ongoing surge of authoritarian populism.

Invited panel contributions should focus on practices and strategies of authoritarian discourse in various sociocultural contexts, including Europe and the USA. Moreover, contributions should rely on systematic discourse analysis, employing qualitative and/or quantitative methods, and depart from or combine different theoretical-methodological traditions, such as discourse analysis, conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, multimodal discourse analysis, automated text analysis, as well as language-centred framing theory.

Panel contributions will address, but are not necessarily limited to, the following topics:

- Authoritarian populists’ linguistic, interactional, and multi-modal strategies seeking to control the narrative and mobilize support for their agenda in different socio-cultural and media settings, and in different media genres
- Aspects of face-work, turn-taking, speech acts, and presupposition/implicature as interactional challenges to journalism’s watchdog role in encounters with authoritarian and populist actors
- Linguistic and communication practices of mainstream media outlets and news journalists vis-à-vis the far-right
- Discursive processes and multimodal practices enabling the normalization of authoritarian values, narratives, and agendas in media discourse
- The social indexicality of authoritarian discourse and the mobilization of adversarial footings: aggravation (or mitigation) of emotions, moral evaluations, and calls for aggressive measures in online settings
- The construction of stance in multimodal recontextualizations of mainstream news in social media, and their role in amplifying exclusionary and authoritarian narratives
- Hybrid and pseudo-journalistic communication strategies through which political actors appropriate journalistic genres to bypass or delegitimize professional media
- Journalism’s labelling, classification, and framing practices, and their role in normalizing or obscuring authoritarian politics

The pragmatics of (intimate) relationships at a distance (organized by *Andrea Rodriguez*)

Relationships emerge as a complex, joint, interactional accomplishment characterised by the tacit development of, orientation to, and commitment toward taken-for-granted relational expectations. The rise of digital technologies has played a crucial role in facilitating the initiation and maintenance of (intimate) relationships by reducing the sense of physical distance (e.g., family members and romantic couples living apart) and what might be

considered ontological distance (e.g., human-AI companion relationships). The quality of human relationships at a distance is an emerging interdisciplinary concern, mainly addressed through surveys and interviews that rely on participants' perceptions. There is, however, a growing body of interactional studies that scrutinise the granular details of naturally occurring conversation alongside the affordances/constraints of digital technologies to understand intimacy and relationships at a distance (Márquez-Reiter & Frohlich, 2020) in at least two ways. One has focused on how digital affordances enhance the accomplishment of closeness (see Licoppe & Morel, 2012; Licoppe, 2017; Rintel, 2015; Fitzgerald & Rintel, 2013 – on couples; Gan, et al., 2020; Gan 2021, 2022, 2023 – on parenthood at a distance; Choe, 2020, forthcoming; Boudouraki et al., 2022 – on family at a distance; Vold Lexander & Androutsopoulos, 2023; Rodriguez, 2026 – on transnational families). The other has explored how humans interact with human-like technology, including robots and AI companions (Habscheid et al., 2023; Tuncer et al., 2024; Hall et al., 2024), often engaging in 'relational' practices designed for bonding, such as teasing, and troubles telling. More recently, questions have been raised about how humans develop a sense of and commitment to sustaining intimate relationships with AI companions (e.g., AI girl/boyfriends, husbands/wives).

This panel brings together researchers from various disciplines working with interactional data and aims to expand current knowledge about the impact of technology on how relational closeness and intimacy are accomplished at a distance. It welcomes contributions that fit within the above-mentioned approaches. Topics of interest include (but are not limited to):

Technology-enhanced (intimate) human relationships:

Papers that examine how various technologies (e.g., messaging apps, video calls/conferences, social media, robot companions, virtual reality, etc.) help bridge physical distance and enable relational intimacy.

- The accomplishment of collective activitiesThe surfacing of implicit relational expectationsThe co-construction of emotional connectionDisplays of relational commitmentMultilingual transnational family practices

Human-digital companion relationships:

Papers concerned with how humans interactionally anthropomorphise digital technologies and how they establish (committed) relationships with AI companions.

- The meta-ontology of AIAction and agency ascriptionThe accomplishment of (relational) common groundConstruction of trust

The pragmatics of 'doing family' in everyday life (organized by Zhiyi Liu, Valeria Sinkeviciute, Andrea Rodriguez)

Family discourse, including interaction between parents and children, siblings and adult (extended) family members, is a complex social phenomenon where social meanings are jointly constructed and negotiated. For several decades now, various aspects of family talk have been explored with a focus on cultural patterns and interactional phenomena, examining the role of talk in shaping and invoking familial, social and cultural dimensions of family life (e.g. Blum-Kulka, 1997; Gordon, 2009; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018), including identity

construction (e.g. Ochs & Taylor 1995; Tannen et al. 2007; Butler & Fitzgerald 2010; Liu, 2023) and various aspects of the development of children's communicative competence (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1997; Wingard, 2006; Sterponi, 2009; Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2017; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2017; Declercq, 2021; Endo, 2021), and language and pragmatic socialisation (e.g. Zinken, 2016; Endo, 2021; Kim & Carlin, 2023). The continuing changes in society also contribute to changes in family situations, the way families interact, their norms, expectations and behavioural appropriateness. This is particularly relevant in today's globalised world, where family members (e.g. parents who migrate with their children) not only face the challenges of adapting to the linguistic environment of the new home country, while working to preserve their home languages, but also try finding ways in which to create and accomplish 'familial order' that has undergone multiple adaptations.

This panel aims to expand on the existing research on family discourse with a focus on the pragmatics of 'doing family' in everyday life. In other words, we invite contributions that explore various aspects (e.g. normative behaviours, (im)politeness, language socialisation, relationship management) of familial order and how those aspects are negotiated by (extended) family members (parents, children, grandparents) during their everyday routine activities. Using different methods, ranging from interactional pragmatics, interactional sociolinguistics to conversational analysis and membership categorisation analysis, all the papers will approach the doing of 'family' and its role in a broader society as a situated phenomenon that manifests itself in different ways, illustrating practices used in the management and negotiation of moral and relational matters. We particularly encourage submissions that include conversational data from various lingua-cultural contexts.

The pragmatics of doing 'being siblings' in talk-in-interaction (organized by *Valeria Sinkeviciute*)

In interactional studies, it has been observed that, in and through family conversations, children are socialised into and show their understanding of the social order through their enactment of pragmatic and normative behaviours as members of society (e.g. Minks, 2010; see also overviews in Cekaite, 2013; Kyratzis and Cook-Gumperz, 2015; Keel, 2016). Apart from the focus on linguistic and pragmatic resources, more recently, multimodal interaction studies have emphasised the role of embodied actions such as gaze, posture, gestures, emotional displays in children's accomplishment of interactional and relational goals (e.g. Cekaite, 2010; Goodwin et al. 2012; Goodwin and Cekaite, 2018; Morita, 2021; Goico, 2025).

In terms of children communication with each other, while considerable attention over decades has been paid to children in peer talk and peer pretend play (e.g. Maynard, 1985b; Goodwin, 1990; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1990; Zadunaisky Ehrlich and Blum-Kulka 2010; Church 2016; Church and Bateman, 2022; Gunnarsdottir & Bateman, 2022; Anatoli Smith and Cekaite, 2025; Burdelski, 2025), noticeably, to date, fewer studies (see e.g. Hester and Hester, 2010, 2012; Busch, 2012; Morita, 2021; Declercq, 2021; Liu, 2023; Goico, 2025; Sinkeviciute, 2026) have explored the co-construction and ongoing unfolding of talk-in-interaction among siblings. Since peer and sibling interactions vary because of different social relations between children in terms of family hierarchical roles, age, power, interests, etc. (see Goodwin, 2017), sibling interactions can be considered as a distinct interactional and relational context, where local social and moral orders are accomplished and negotiated.

This panel aims to focus on this under-explored type of interactions, thus advancing the exploration of how siblings (whether children or adults) communicate in family and institutional settings and how their (multimodal) conversations contribute to their relationship development. With a focus on a range of methodological approaches, including interactional pragmatics, interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis and membership categorisation analysis, the panel invites contributions that explore various ways in which doing ‘being siblings’ is interactionally accomplished across different activities and languages.

The Pragmatics of Generosity (organized by *Sandrine Sorlin, Laura Alba-Juez*)

In our digital age, much research has focused on verbal aggression and hatred. This panel proposes to adopt the opposite perspective by examining the notion of generosity from a pragmatic standpoint. Generosity in interaction can be construed as the ways in which interactants’ utterances, attitudes and feelings are welcome, supported and cared for – as opposed to rejected, dismissed or ignored. Pragmatic theory has only marginally addressed the notion. Generosity appears as the first maxim of Leech’s General Strategy of Politeness (2014), which recommends assigning high value to O’s wants but is restricted to such speech acts of giving as offers, invitations or promises. Arndt and Janney (1985) come close to a broader approach in their notion of the “supportive speaker”, defined as someone who behaves supportively by “giving empathetic support” based on interactants’ feelings and emotions. In his work on face, Goffman (1981) relates face work to making participants “feel good” rather than hurt, proposing a repertoire of face-saving practices. Approaches such as Positive Discourse Analysis (Martin 2002, 2004, 2006, 2012, 2019; Martin & Rose 2003, 2012; Martin & Stenglin 2006), which focus on the discourse of reconciliation and peace, can be said to implicitly focus on generosity/empathy as well. More recently, related concepts such as consideration (Haugh 2019), solicitude (Fukushima 2019), attentiveness (Fukushima 2020), morally appropriate behaviour (Reiter and Kadar 2015) and civility (Sifianou 2019, 2024) have enriched im/politeness theory. These approaches foreground care for the other’s face and needs, interactional warmth with regard to their well-being and the thoughtful anticipation of their rights and feelings. If face lies at the heart of generous and tactful acts protecting from shame or embarrassment, there nevertheless seems to be room for a deeper conception of generosity. Just as Sifianou (2024) distinguishes between surface and deep civility, generosity can either be merely a matter of conforming to prevailing moral norms or be heart-felt. In its deeper, self-less form, generosity may encompass acts of solidarity towards vulnerable or marginalized members of society.

This panel invites papers that theorise generosity in light of the notions outlined above—within politeness theory, Positive Discourse Analysis and beyond—and that examine concrete examples drawn from a variety of corpora. Contributions may address, but are not limited to, the following questions:

Are there identifiable markers of generosity in discourse? in turn-taking practices? How are they embedded in the structure of interaction?

How do helpful, thoughtful and supportive behaviours manifest themselves in both verbal and non-verbal interaction with regard to others' feelings, opinions emotions, and identities (e.g. ethnicity, gender, age)?

What kind of emotion work is involved in the sociopragmatics of generosity (Alba-Juez and Haugh 2025) and how is sociopragmatic empathetic support related to emotional intelligence (Pérez-González & Alba-Juez 2025)?

What might be considered the counterpart of generosity? What are the markers of non-consideration and inattentiveness (Haugh 2019; Sorlin 2026)?

Can we speak of overgenerosity in the same way that scholars discuss overpoliteness?How is generosity reflected in the appraisal/evaluation system of language and discourse?

The Pragmatics of Humour in Pop(ular) Culture (organized by *Michelle Weckermann, Christian Hoffmann*)

This panel combines two pragmatic research fields that have experienced recent growth and have thus received ample attention in research: humour and pop(ular) culture. Humour is a field with numerous facets and a well-established cornerstone in pragmatic research. Scholars have gone down different avenues, investigating (among others) its different sub-types (see, for instance, Haugh, 2017 for teasing and/or banter; Attardo et al., 1994 for jokes; Norrick, 1984 and Dynel, 2010 for puns and witticisms) and its interface with irony and sarcasm (Dynel, 2014; Gibbs et al., 2014; Wilson, 2017), aggression (Orthaber, 2018; Dynel, 2021), and (im-)politeness (Culpeper, 1996; Kotthoff, 1996).

The second field concerns pragmatic research on/in pop(ular) culture, which includes forms of communication designed for mass audiences with a “recreational/entertainment function” (Schubert & Werner, 2022, 1). Pop cultural artefacts can come in manifold shapes and forms, ranging from podcasts, blogs and reddit posts, advertisements, Internet memes, pop music lyrics, TV and movie dialogues, video games, comic books or graphic novels (Schubert & Werner, 2022). Most notably, linguistic research on pop culture has often been pragmatic in kind (see, for instance, Bubel, 2011; Messerli & Locher, 2021; Tünetti Tübben & Landert, 2022).

Some studies have already tried to connect both research interests (i.e. humour and pop culture), examining, for instance, irony in fiction (Kapogianni, 2014) or humour in improv theatre (Landert, 2021). It seems research of this kind has arguably moved in tandem with compatible work on the pragmatics of fiction, which has similarly gained prominence throughout the last decade (Locher & Jucker, 2017; Locher et al., 2023). Despite the dual success story of the pragmatics of humour and the pragmatics of pop culture, respectively, we argue that - to this day - the intersection of the two has received surprisingly little attention.

To close this research gap, this panel welcomes all contributions focusing on humour in pop culture. This can be related to a particular pop cultural genre, e.g. rap song lyrics, film comedies, memes, sitcoms, or improv theatre (e.g. Dynel, 2011; Landert, 2021) or to the ways in which a specific type of humour is realised within or across different pop cultural phenomena, e.g. sarcasm, banter, teasing, putdown humour, or self-deprecating humour.

Submissions may contribute inter alia to the pragmatics of characterisation or include humour as a pragmatic (e.g. persuasive) device (e.g. strategic uses of self-deprecating humour or humour in flirting; see, for instance, Speer, 2019 and Scharrer & Weckermann, 2026, respectively). Another avenue fitting this intersection is the investigation of multimodal forms of humour, where humour is created through the interplay of visual and verbal means (Priego Valverde, 2024; Filani, 2025). Finally, contributions might wish to investigate how humour is typically responded to, i.e. through laughter (Glenn, 2003).

The Pragmatics of Institutional ELF: Multimodal Coordination, Negotiation, and Decision-Making in Task-based Interaction (organized by *Etsuko Yoshida, Midori Tanimura, Saya Ike*)

This panel investigates task-based English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) interaction as both a crucial methodological framework and an analytical lens for capturing contemporary multilingual institutional practices. As global workplaces and educational environments become increasingly multilingual, ELF has transitioned from a peripheral communicative phenomenon to a primary resource for global communication (Seidlhofer 2011). While early research heavily documented the linguistic features of ELF, recent scholarship has shifted significantly toward examining its localised application within high-stakes institutional domains. This includes specialised communicative ecologies such as academic settings (ELFA), medical contexts (MELF), and business environments (BELF; Kaur & Birlik 2021). Within these domains, communication is strictly goal-oriented. Consequently, there is an urgent empirical need to understand how participants achieve practical tasks when they operate from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Moving away from traditional monolingual baseline models, our inquiry is grounded in the pragmatic mechanics of communicative effectiveness, dynamic meaning-making, and collaboration in intercultural communication (Kecskes 2014). Specifically, the panel integrates both macro- and micro-level perspectives to achieve a holistic understanding of task-based interaction, examining how broad, macro-level communicative frameworks such as translanguaging (Li 2018) are practically manifested and sustained through micro-level conversational mechanisms. The contributing papers explore the specific conversational conflicts, interactional repairs, stance-taking, and utilisation of non-verbal elements that make these broader strategies successful in live environments (Konakahara 2023). Rather than treating verbal and non-verbal elements in isolation, the analytical focus centres on how these interactional adjustments are actively co-constituted through multimodality (Matsumoto & Canagarajah 2020; Mondada 2021), including the co-ordination of gesture, gaze, facial expressions, and spatial artefacts.

Through the analysis of data from goal-oriented activities, this panel maps the precise conversational mechanisms, such as collaborative decision-making, negotiation, and interactional repair, that allow participants to preempt or resolve communicative friction. Featured research within the panel draws on datasets simulating authentic workplace interactions within educational settings to investigate professional discourse and its direct applications to language education. Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods papers utilising empirical, interaction-focused frameworks to explore these pragmatic adaptations are highly welcome. Ultimately, the panel aims to foster interdisciplinary dialogue on how granular interactional research can inform communication pedagogy, optimise workplace

training, and foster genuine institutional inclusion for internationally mobile professionals and migrant workers.

<u>References</u>

Kaur, J., & Birlik, S. (2021). Communicative Effectiveness in BELF (English as a Business Lingua Franca) Meetings: “Explaining” as a Pragmatic Strategy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 105(3), 623–638.

Kecskés, I. (2014). *Intercultural pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Konakahara, M. (2023). *Conflict Talk in English as a Lingua Franca: Analyzing Multimodal Resources in Casual ELF Conversations*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.

Matsumoto, Y., & Canagarajah, S. (2020). The use of gesture, gesture hold, and gaze in trouble-in-talk among multilingual interlocutors in an English as a lingua franca context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 169, 245–267.

Mondada, L. (2021). *Sensing in Social Interaction*. Cambridge University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.

The pragmatics of literacy events in childhood (organized by *Joseph Iseri*)

There is strong evidence that early exposure to text is directly tied to children’s literacy outcomes and general language abilities (e.g., Dowdall et al., 2020). However, children’s interactions with texts are most often mediated through interactions with parents, caregivers, and peers. Pragmatics has a stake in studying the interactional organization of these literacy events (Heath, 1982, p. 50) in children’s lives because they also socialize children into sociopragmatic norms and cultural beliefs (e.g., Heath, 1984; Street, 1984). It comes as no surprise, then, that the majority of research on childhood literacy events primarily features teachers reading to children in the classroom (e.g., Church, 2010; Kasuya, 2026) with relatively fewer studies focusing on reading in the home (e.g., Heath, 1982; Waga Ozaki, 2025) or in other institutions of literacy (e.g., Sterponi, 2007).

Extending this line of inquiry, this panel brings together researchers who examine the interactional organization and pragmatic dimensions of literacy events in childhood, revisiting previous questions in new contexts and asking new questions of old ones. Specifically, it addresses the following questions:

- (1) How are literacy events of childhood organized as a social activity across different cultures and contexts (e.g., in schools, homes, and other institutions)?
- (2) What practices and actions, mediated through language, embodied action, and material artifacts, typify early literacy events in such contexts?
- (3) How do those practices and actions reveal relationships between literacy as a practice, social knowledge (e.g., social order, cultural norms, linguistic ideologies), and pragmatic competencies (e.g., stance-taking, politeness)?

(4) According to these findings, what practical courses of action can this strand of research offer those interested in teaching and learning literacy?

The panel therefore invites scholars of interaction, socialization, and childhood education who explore how literacy events play a role in children's acquisition of social, cultural, and pragmatic competence. Alongside the four tentative panelists working with data from Japanese, Chinese, Finnish, and German homes and classrooms, welcome is extended to scholars working on research dealing with (i) non-traditional literacy events and (ii) childhood writing.

References:

Church, A. (2010). Opportunities for learning during storybook reading at preschool. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1, 221–246. <u><https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110222654.221></u>

Dowdall, N., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Murray, L., Gardner, F., Hartford, L., & Cooper, P. J. (2020). Shared picture book reading interventions for child language development: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 91(2), 383–399. <u><https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13225></u>

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, 11(1), 49–76. <u><https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500009039></u>

Heath, S. B. (1984). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.

Kasuya, K. (2026). Mobilizing picture books: Multimodal practices of participation and socialization in Kindergarten read-aloud activities. *Linguistics and Education*, 93, 1-12. <u><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2026.101517></u>

Sterponi, L. (2007). Clandestine interactional reading: Intertextuality and double-voicing under the desk. *Linguistics and Education*, 18(1), 1-23.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Waga Ozaki, M. (2025). Shared stories, shared emotions: Empathy in Japanese and American parent–child reading. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, 9(1), 56–76. <u><https://doi.org/10.3138/rcsi-2024-0005></u>

The Pragmatics of Microaggressions and Covert Harm (organized by *Célia Vamiller, Ilse Depraetere*)

This panel invites pragmalinguistics and socio-pragmatic perspectives on microaggressions, and more broadly, forms of covert harm and interpersonal bias.

Research in linguistics and communication studies has extensively documented the harmful psychological and social effects of explicit offensive language, most notably hate speech (Bührer et al., 2024) and slurs (Popa-Wyatt & Wyatt, 2018). Such blatant verbal abuse is characterised by conversational transparency: there is a clear, often institutionalised intent to harm, marginalise or dehumanise specific targets. Due to their overt nature, these forms of aggression are easily identifiable and subject to legal and social sanctions.

However, interpersonal and systemic harm is frequently enacted through more opaque channels, as in the case of microaggressions. Operating beneath the conventional conversational surface, microaggressions are brief, everyday exchanges that send denigrating messages to individuals based on their marginalised group status (Friedländer, 2023). They are notably difficult to identify and challenge due to their inherent ambiguity (Holtgraves, 2023). Rather than relying on overt derogatory language, microaggressions exploit everyday conversational structures and the multi-layered mechanisms of implicit communication (Elder, 2021). This nesting of bias within ordinary interaction grants the speaker plausible deniability, allowing them to bypass accountability while weaponizing language to offend, exclude, and disempower marginalised groups (Freeman & Stewart, 2021). The question of intentionality is likewise crucial: it has been shown in theories of impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011) that it is the target's response that is key rather than the speaker's intention to hurt.

By connecting pragmalinguistic and socio-pragmatic approaches to linguistic bias, this panel seeks to highlight the linguistic mechanisms through which speakers inflict harm, reinforce stereotypes, and perpetuate discrimination without enacting explicit verbal aggression (Glover, 2024). Central to this panel is the investigation of how semantic and pragmatic features interact to construct microaggressions.

We welcome theoretical, empirical, corpus-based contributions addressing various types of interaction where covert harm, bias, and discrimination are manifested. We invite papers that examine these phenomena from various perspectives, including, for example:

- Presupposition and Implicature: The use of implicit mechanisms to introduce biased or stereotypical descriptions without asserting them directly.
- Lexical Semantics:

- The role of specific word choices and parallel meanings in triggering microaggressions.
- Plausible Deniability: How speakers exploit indirect meaning to avoid accountability when challenged.
- Speech Acts and Impoliteness: Intersections of speech act theory and impoliteness frameworks in evaluating the illocutionary force of microaggressions and their perlocutionary effects on targets.
- Social-psychological and discursive approaches: How diverse sociocultural backgrounds affect the detection, negotiation, or dismissal of covertly harmful utterances in everyday discourse.
- Cognitive approaches: What psycho-linguistic methods reveal about the processing and reception of microaggression.

We envisage at least three 90-minute sessions, with three 30-minute talks (20 for presentation, 10 for questions).

The Pragmatics of Microaggressions: Conceptual, Analytical, and Pedagogical Perspectives (organized by *Noriko Ishihara, Gregory Paul Glasgow*)

In an era of heightened attention to issues surrounding social justice, marginalization, and inequality, the role of language in reproducing and perpetuating social inequities has received increasing scrutiny. One salient example is the phenomenon of microaggressions (Sue & Spanierman, 2020), in which members of dominant groups may convey subtle messages that invalidate or insult the experiences, identities, or social positioning of marginalized individuals and communities. While initiators of microaggressions may not intend to offend their interactants, they may derive different meanings and feel alienated or insulted. When such smaller incidents accumulate, they can trigger serious consequences such as anxiety,

depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, and adverse physical conditions (Glasgow & Kim, 2025; Williams et al., 2021). Although microaggressions have been extensively examined within social and clinical psychology, they have only recently begun to receive sustained attention from applied linguists. Yet, because microaggressions are fundamentally communicative acts in which illocutionary force, implicature, interpretation, and perlocutionary effects are central, their examination through the lens of pragmatics is further warranted and offers significant analytical and pedagogical possibilities (Ishihara, 2025).

The primary aim of this panel is to highlight current contributions that pragmatics researchers are making to the conceptualization, analysis, and pedagogy of microaggressions.

Presentations draw on a range of approaches, including but not limited to: sociopragmatics, metapragmatics, discourse analysis, conversation analysis, speech act theory, rapport management theory (RMT), and instructional pragmatics. Collectively, the panel explores how pragmatics can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how microaggressions are interpreted, negotiated, resisted, and addressed across institutional, interpersonal, and pedagogical contexts. The organizers of the proposed panel would invite contributions that empirically investigate microaggressions in intercultural settings, either in-person or in internet-based, as well as those that examine effects of relevant critical interventions.

References

Glasgow, G. P., & Kim, M. (2025). Microaggressions in Japan: Foreign-origin university students' lived experiences and metapragmatic reflections. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2025.2598759>

Ishihara, N. (2025). Criticality and creativity in L2 pragmatics: Supporting linguistic justice through pragmatics instruction *JALT Journal*, 47(2), 181–195.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ47.2-3>

Sue, D. W., & Spanierman, L. B. (2020). *Microaggressions in everyday life* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Williams, M. T., Skinta, M. D., & Martin-Willett, R. (2021). After Pierce and Sue: A revised racial microaggressions taxonomy. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(5), 991–1007. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691621994247>

The pragmatics of online influence: Persuasion and authority in online coaching discourses (organized by *Daria Dayter, Sofia Rüdiger*)

From the perspective of pragmatics, coaching can be understood as a communication-based, co-constructed discourse genre in which coach and client jointly build meanings, goals, and courses of action turn by turn (see Fleischhacker & Graf 2023). Rather than merely transmitting information, coaching works through persuasion: it relies on speech acts such as advising, evaluating, goal-setting, while also managing uptake and creating an expert identity for the coach (see Weininger 2016, Dayter & Rüdiger 2022). Both existing work on seduction coaching (Dayter & Rüdiger 2019) and on e.g. financial influencers (Biri 2025) shows how coaching may be built through terminology-heavy language, narrative framing, and interactional strategies resembling sales discourse including asymmetries of conversational power.

This panel will involve a series of presenters whose work addresses persuasion and authority in online coaching contexts. It will encompass, for example, one-to-one sessions, courses, and subscription-based coaching (e.g., dating coaches and membership-based financial coaching communities), where commercially driven authority and expertise are negotiated through situated pragmatic practices. We are also interested in discourses produced by influencers in the realm of health, finance, dating, and lifestyle on various social media platforms such as TikTok, YouTube, Instagram, Facebook, etc.

The panel will focus on empirical studies of persuasive strategies, the construction of authority, and the performance of expert personae. We especially invite contributions that critically examine problematic or harmful forms of persuasion, including malicious influence and bad-faith sales practices operating under the guise of coaching. The aim of this panel is to open up discussion of how persuasive strategies are enacted within ‘coaching’ discourses and to relate these practices to linguistic understandings of authority and expertise.

The panel consists of both full (20+10 minute) and work-in-progress (10+5 minute) slots and we list below potential invitees/colleagues who have already expressed an interest in participating. We endeavor to recruit additional presenters via an open call, with the aim of representing different approaches to coaching discourses and persuasion, both empirically (e.g., corpus linguistics, multimodality, discourse analysis) but also in terms of the topical coaching spheres and social media platforms under scrutiny.

References

- Biri, Ylva. 2025. Creating engagement through metadiscourse in YouTube financial advice videos. Presentation at the AFinLa symposium, November 6, 2026, University of Eastern Finland.
- Dayter, Daria & Sofia Rüdiger. 2019. ‘The Language of Attraction’ Used by Pick-Up Artists. *English Today* 35(2): 13-19.
- Dayter, Daria & Sofia Rüdiger. 2022. *The Language of Pick-Up Artists*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Fleischhacker, Melanie & Eva-Maria Graf. 2024. New Ways of Investigating Coaching: Linguistic Research on Executive, Business and Workplace Coaching. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice* 17(1): 90–118.
- Weinzinger, Caroline. 2016. “genau darum gez doch”: (Nicht-)Wissenszuschreibungen als vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen im Online-Coaching. In: Alexandra Groß & Inga Harren (eds.), *Wissen in institutioneller Interaktion*, Berlin: Peter Lang. 113-144.

The Pragmatics of Organized Crime and Conflict: Identity, Ritual, and Transnational Mediations (organized by *Takako Kawabata, Daniela Cesiri*)

Criminal organizations such as the Italian Mafia, the Japanese Yakuza, and Hong Kong Triads are not merely illicit enterprises; they are complex socio-linguistic systems governed by strict pragmatic codes, hierarchical speech acts, and ritualized communication. This panel invites contributions that explore the pragmatic dimensions of organized crime across various media, genres, and cultural contexts, ranging from cinematic masterpieces such as Francis Ford Coppola’s *The Godfather*, Hideo Gosha’s *Yakuza Wives* (*Gokudō no Onna-tachi* / 極道の妻

たち), and John Woo's A Better Tomorrow (Yīngxióng Běnsè /英雄本色), to television dramas, manga, digital narratives, and real-world legal or ethnographic discourse.

In line with the IPrA 2027 Special Theme "Building Bridges", the panel seeks to examine how conflict, antagonism, and social division are negotiated through language and pragmatic practices within organized crime narratives. Particular attention will be paid to how criminal families and syndicates utilize language to construct identity, negotiate power, manage loyalty and betrayal, and mediate tensions between the organization and wider society.

A central focus is the pragmatic reinterpretation of the 'family' model. For instance, while Western cinematic tropes often frame the organization as a patriarchal, blood-based lineage, Japanese narratives frequently reconfigure this into a pseudo-familial structure (the oyabun-kobun relationship) grounded in social roles and symbolic kinship. Hong Kong crime cinema similarly foregrounds brotherhood, loyalty, and betrayal through ritualized speech and interpersonal negotiation. Across these traditions, conflict is enacted not only physically but also linguistically, through silence, indirectness, threats, honorifics, apology, and strategic ambiguity.

We welcome contributions that address the following pragmatic and multimodal themes:

Speech Acts and Authority:

How commands, threats, refusals, intimidation, apology, and "offers that can't be refused" function as performative utterances within specialized power structures.

Politeness Honorifics, and Hierarchy:

The role of ritualized language, address terms, and key vocabulary in maintaining strict internal hierarchies, solidarity, and 'face'.

The Pragmatics of Secrecy and Silence: Strategies of omertà (code of silence) coded communication, and indirectness used to mediate conflict, loyalty and exclusion.

Family Brotherhood, and Betrayal:

Linguistic constructions of kinship, solidarity, loyalty, exclusion, and conflict.

Gendered Pragmatics: Representations of female agency, conflict mediation, and gendered pragmatics in works such as Yakuza Wives.

Cultural Translation and Adaptation:

How criminal narratives migrate across linguistic and cultural borders transforming global tropes (e.g., the 'Godfather' archetype) into local socio-cultural frameworks.

Multimodal Representations: The interplay between verbal expressions and visual symbolism (tattoos, gestures, attire) in signaling belonging and 'otherness'.

By investigating the linguistic and semiotic dimensions of organized crime narratives, this panel aims to clarify how conflict, identity, and social belonging are mediated through language and cultural representation across global contexts and how these continue to evolve through cultural mediation and transnational media.

The Pragmatics of Ostensibility (organized by *Daniel Kadar, Juliane House*)

The aim of the proposed panel is to bring together experts working in the field of ostensible language use. The panel will provide a much needed platform for discussing collaborative research between leading experts. Starting with the classic work of Searle, the concept of ostensibility has been important in pragmatics, and it has been explored from different angles, including speech act theory (e.g. Isaacs and Clark 1995; Link and Kreuz 2005), politeness theory (e.g. Dynel 2018), rituals (e.g. Koutlaki 2020; Kadar 2024) and contrastive pragmatics (e.g. Abdelhady 2025). Yet, to the best of our knowledge, no attempt has been made to explore how to synthesise such different areas of inquiry into ostensible behaviour. This lack is regretful for different reasons. Firstly, ostensible behaviour has proved to be a key for studying the pragmatics of a variety of different languages, such as Persian, Arabic and Chinese. Little thought has also been given to the question of how politeness, humour and other pragmatic phenomena in these languages can be studied in comparable ways. Secondly, with the growing importance of more interactional views of speech acts (for an overview see House and Kadar 2023), it would be timely and to consider how more traditional approaches using the concept of ‘ostensible speech act’ can be merged with newer approaches. Thirdly, the study of ostensible behaviour continues to be dominated by the infamous ‘East-West dichotomy’, i.e. it is often assumed that in so-called ‘Eastern’ languages ostensible behaviour is more important than in Western languages. The proposed panel aims to fill these knowledge gaps.

Along with invited experts, we hope to involve both early-career researchers and scholars who work on understudied languages in particular. We will advertise the panel also on LinguistList, in order to attract further contributors. We also hope to capitalise on the momentum created by this panel and edit a journal special issue after the conference.

The organisers of this panel has extensive collaboration experience, and they are confident that they will be able to deliver a high-quality event. They have published broadly in the area of ostensible behaviour and are currently working on a monograph dedicated to this area.

The Pragmatics of Religious Rhetorics in Politics: Perspectives from the Global South and North (organized by *Herbert Rostand Ngouo Tchio, Hanna Acke, Khushal Naik, Ellen Lund*)

The intersection of politics and religion has increasingly been at the centre of sustained scholarly attention, with researchers approaching the phenomenon from multiple theoretical and methodological vantage points. This intersection has become more pronounced with the emergence of different forms of religious-inspired nationalisms over the past decade (Miller, 2023; Goldberg 2006; Clarkson, 2019; Cesari, 2018; Jong & Ali, 2023, etc.). Even in societies that once asserted strict policies of secularism, there is a burgeoning movement to reclaim a national, cultural-religious heritage in response to rising multiculturalism. At the centre of this shift is political discourse, where language is used to construct or deconstruct

national realities. While there are numerous studies on the facets of politics and religion, pragmatics has traditionally been used in the analysis of religious discourse, just as pragmatic theories have been applied to the analysis of political discourse (Pan, 2024). However, the aspect which requires further empirical and theoretical attention are pragmatic perspectives on religious rhetorics within the political sphere in all parts of the world.

‘Religion’ is defined in a very broad sense as a unified system of beliefs and practices oriented toward the supernatural or ineffable (Durkheim, 2008 [1915]; Hjarvard, 2008). Specifically, ‘religion’ is understood and defined by its use in a functional

– as opposed to substantive – sense; the function of religious discourse to assert a political-religious position. For instance, religious discourse has been used to construct powerful political myths around morally charged binaries such as good and evil (Charteris-Black, 2011). Often, these result from a sense of ‘ontological insecurity’ (Kinnvall, 2004), where the persuasive function

of religious discourse in politics extends beyond explicit theological arguments. Dontcheva-Navratilova et al. (2020) identify persuasion as a central mechanism through which religious ideology, analogously to political ideology, seeks to shape social norms and behavioural standards. In this way, language operates as a vehicle of ideological construction and contestation. From a pragmatic standpoint, speech act theory is particularly illuminating: the capacity of language to enact new or reinforce hegemonic social realities.

This panel seeks to explore language use in political contexts across the Global South and North. The objective is to highlight and expand the contribution of pragmatic theory understandings of the intersections of religious rhetorics in politics. Central to these religious expressions are rituals and speech acts used to connect with the supernatural to influence socio-political agendas.

The following and further related research questions can be addressed:

What is the pragmatic nature of religious discourse in political contexts?

What similarities and divergences exist in the use of these speech acts within and across different religious ideologies and cultures?

How is political religion weaponized through faith-based stances to assert or challenge religious identity and secularity?

By examining how language is used to claim heritage or construct secular nationalism, this panel aims to illuminate how the invocation of ‘religion’ serves as a performative intervention, ultimately determining whether religion acts as a unifying force or a divisive factor in national cohesion.

The Pragmatics of Wisdom (organized by *Carsten Levisen, Adam Glaz*)

This panel explores how ‘wisdom’ is conceptualized, articulated, and spoken about across diverse linguistic and cultural settings. A particularly rich point of departure is the

contemporary resurgence of ‘wisdom talk’ in the context of planetary crises: ecological degradation, technological acceleration, democratic decline, and anxieties surrounding the future of humanity. In such conditions, appeals to wisdom often index both anxiety and aspiration. They may foreground indigenous knowledges, endangered knowledges, and pluricentric forms of knowledge production, while also raising methodological and epistemological questions for pragmatic studies.

Across cultural contexts, speakers have oriented themselves to sayings and words that carry the aura of wisdom: proverbs, aphorisms, ancestral sayings, and the speech of sages and wizards. At the same time, these discourses are shadowed by their opposites: accusations of shallowness, silliness, short-sightedness, or stupidity. The panel is interested in this tension, and in how wisdom and its opposites are interactionally negotiated, pragmatically framed, and discursively contested across contexts.

While most existing studies of wisdom have emerged from cultural psychology, religious studies, classics, and philosophy, the pragmatics of wisdom seeks to broaden and decentre these conversations by approaching wisdom through multiple languages, diverse discourses, and everyday meaning-making. In other words, this panel will seek to retell the story of wisdom through the parameters of variation afforded by linguistic pragmatics. Is, for example, talk about ‘wisdoms’ justified – by analogy to ‘knowledges’ (the two being related but not the same)? If so, are ‘wisdoms’ social and cultural constructs or can ‘wisdom’ be only discovered “from within” or received “from above”?

The panel brings together perspectives from (i) cultural pragmatics and linguistic anthropology, (ii) ecopr pragmatics and environmental humanities, (iii) sociohistorical and postcolonial pragmatics, and (iv) interactional pragmatics in its broadest sense, including online and offline interactions, ritual communication, and the discursive construction of advice-giving, decision-making, and public deliberation.

We invite pragmatic contributions that engage with, but are not limited to, the following lines of inquiry:

- Conceptualisations of wisdom and “wisdom-like” notions across eras and linguacultures
- Proverbs, sayings, and other paremiological forms as sites of condensed social knowledge– Studies of wisdom discourse in ecological, posthuman, and polycrisis contexts
- The metapragmatics of “wise methods”: how claims to sustainability, decoloniality, or ethical attunement are linguistically crafted, authorised, and contested
- Pragmatic studies of indigenous knowledges, pluricentric knowledge and epistemic diversity
- Discourses of judgement and decision, and the interactional positioning of speakers and other actors as “wise” or “unwise”.
- Platitudes, clichés, and pseudo-wisdom: the pragmatics of formulaic “wise talk,” including parody, inflation, and critique
- The invocation of past wisdom in present discourse, including mythopoeia, metaphor and imagined continuity in public discourse

The prosody and phonetics of particles and discourse markers in interaction – A cross-linguistic perspective (organized by *Pia Bergmann, Beatrice Szczepek Reed*)

Particles or discourse markers such as ‘okay’, ‘right’ or ‘well’ are often characterised by multifaceted functions in spoken interaction. These functions touch on issues concerning turn-taking, action formation and stance-taking. Additionally, functional variation can impact the lexical semantics of an element. For instance, the German stand-alone evaluative affirmative 'gut' ('good') can be used as a semantically bleached turn-initial particle in conjunction with 'aber' ('but') (Arens, 2023).

Studies from different theoretical backgrounds indicate that prosody and phonetics contribute to the delivery of semantic and pragmatic functions of elements as such (e.g. Barth-Weingarten et al., 2009.; Ford et al., 2004; Sohn & Kim, 2014). Nevertheless, there is still need for further research to uncover how prosody and phonetics are connected to semantic and pragmatic functions in these elements, and how they interact with visual resources. In addition to this general need, a cross-linguistic perspective on phonetic and prosodic means for semantic and pragmatic functions of particles and discourse markers is still missing. This is considered an important perspective, because prosodic and phonetic means are based on embodied articulatory resources that are shared across languages. Yet they are also subject to language-specific phonological and prosodic regularities. A cross-linguistic comparison therefore will not only shed light on language-specific prosodic-phonetic properties of particles and discourse markers. It also promises to open the perspective to interactional properties of prosody and phonetics that operate irrespective of the phonology of a single language.

The panel invites research on particles and discourse markers from different theoretical backgrounds and on different languages. Cross-linguistic research as well as research on a single language is welcome. Possible questions to address are:

- How do prosody and/or phonetics contribute to pragmatic functions (turn-taking, action formation, stance-taking and more), potentially in combination with visual resources?
- How do prosody and/or phonetics and potentially visual resources vary with, or in the context of, semantics (e.g. in the context of grammaticalisation)?
- How do the prosodic and/or phonetic means used for pragmatic purposes correspond to a language-specific phonology?

References

Arens, K. (2023). Strukturieren und Evaluieren im Gespräch. Lexikalische Diskurspartikeln als Ressourcen der Gesprächsorganisation. Winter.

Barth-Weingarten, D., Dehé, N. & Wichmann, A. (Eds.). (2009). Where Prosody meets Pragmatics. Emerald.

Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A. & Hellermann, J. (2004). "Getting past no". *Typological Studies in Language*, 62, 233–269.

Sohn, S.-O. S., & Kim, S. H. (2014). The Interplay of Discourse and Prosody at the Left and Right Periphery in Korean: An Analysis of kuntey ‘but’. In K. Beeching & U. Detges (Eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery* (pp. 221–249). Brill.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004274822_010

The following researchers confirmed their interest to contribute to the panel: Emma Betz, Jihyeong Cha, Nicole Dehé, Alexandra Groß, Aino Koivisto, Michal Marmorstein, Nadav Matalon, Rasmus Persson, Jeanne Vigneron-Bosbach. The panel organisers will also contribute two presentations.

The Sociopragmatics of Mediated and Digital Stylization (organized by *Jan Chovanec, Christian Ilbury*)

In their everyday communication, individuals adopt various social styles and enact a range of identities, both matter-of-factly and strategically (Coupland 2007, Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Such discursive performance of identity is realized via stylization, i.e., the speakers' conscious and intentional use of linguistic resources that reflect their concern for self-presentation (Goffman 1981). This can take the form of a speaker performing a highly stylized persona or doing 'being ordinary' in order to maintain a para-social relation with their audiences or express a range of other indexicalities and social meanings (Agha 2007, Rampton 2009).

In this panel, we are interested in two complementary issues related to identity performance and discursive stylization in mediated and digital contexts: not only the communicative practices that underlie such acts of identity display but also their perception by recipients in terms of the assumed 'authenticity' of such acts. We wish to explore, among other things, what forms of discursive authentication are used to legitimize one's identity performance, as well as how such performance is seen as (un)successful in relation to the speaker's 'authentic' self.

The papers will draw on spoken, written, as well as multimodal data from various mediated and digital genres (TV broadcasts, social media, video platforms, etc.). They will address the strategic use of diverse linguistic devices (phonological, lexical, and semiotic) and discursive strategies (style shifting, double-voicing, crossing, etc.) that are involved in identity construction and performance, and ultimately in identity perception by recipients. Methodologically, the papers will draw on sociopragmatics and digital discourse analysis. They will include case studies as well as theoretical discussions of issues related to identity-related stylization from sociopragmatic and metapragmatic perspectives.

The presentations will address some of the following questions:

- How are stylized identity constructions discursively constructed, authenticated, evaluated, undermined, deconstructed, imitated or challenged?
- How does stylization intersect with the perception of authenticity, ordinariness, expertise, authority, and trustworthiness?
- What effects do stylized performed identities have on recipients and what reactions do they generate?
- How are performances of stylized identities subsequently recontextualized, re-entextualized and resemiotized, e.g. through mocking, ridicule and reuse for humorous or critical purposes?
- How is interlocutors' metapragmatic awareness manifested in their verbal reactions, emotive stances, and other forms of discursive practice that reflect on the salient features of stylized personas?

References

Agha, A. (2007) *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: CUP.

Bucholtz, M. and K. Hall (2005) Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.

Coupland, N. (2007) *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: CUP.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rampton, B. (2009) Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society*

38, 149–176.

Timed bodies: the in situ coordination of embodied actions in social interaction

(organized by *Mathias Broth, Lorenza Mondada*)

While the complex relations between temporality and sequentiality in the organisation of social interaction have from early on been abundantly explored in Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics with a focus on talk (Levinson & Torreira 2015), these issues have only more recently been discussed in relation to embodied actions in interaction. One pressing question is how sequential organisation deals with the multiple temporalities of embodied interactions (Mondada 2018). Multiple temporalities refers on the one hand to the timed deployment of a wide array of multimodal resources mobilized by participants to build the accountability of social interaction, and their perceptual and sensorial accessibility for co-participants (Deppermann & Streeck 2018; Goodwin 2018). But this notion refers on the other hand also to other multi-layered forms of organisation, involving multiactivity (possible engagements in more than one activity at the same time, Haddington et al. 2014), forms of simultaneity and micro-sequentiality (Mondada, Tekin & Koda 2025), and multiple and changing participation frameworks (e.g., as one or more persons participate in more than one interaction, Heath 2014). Moreover, embodied interaction also implicates engagements with the unfolding sequential orders of actions dealing with materiality and the physical environment, responding to the relevancies and adequacies set by the ongoing physical engagements rather than to the linear successivity of turns at talk. Hence the question: Are the relevancies, opportunities, contingencies shaping the sequential organisation of situated embodied tasks and activities the same as those characterizing talk-in-interaction? If not, what are their specificities, constraints and possibilities? And how are these sequential complexities enhanced by mobile arrangements of bodies?

This panel will explore, from an Ethnomethodological and Conversation Analytic perspective, the complexities of timed sequential organisations of social interaction in a variety of settings and activities in which embodied and manual actions play a central role. It does so by including papers focusing on different social and institutional contexts, on different activities, in diverse material ecologies. It furthermore encourages contributions dealing with a diversity of languages.

References

Deppermann, Arnulf, & Streeck, Jurgen (Eds.), 2018. *Time in Embodied Interaction: Synchronicity and Sequentiality of Multimodal Resources*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Goodwin, Charles. 2018. *Co-operative Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haddington, Pentti, Keisanen, Tiina, Mondada, Lorenza, Nevile, Maurice (Eds.), 2014. *Multiactivity in Social Interaction: Beyond Multitasking*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.187>.

Heath, Christian, 2014. *The Dynamics of Auction: Social Interaction and the Sale of Fine Art and Antiques*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C., Torreira, Francisco, 2015. “Timing in turn-taking and its implications for processing models of language”, *Frontiers in Psychology*, no. 6, pp. Article 731.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2018. “Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: challenges for transcribing multimodality”. *Res. Lang. Soc. Interact.* 51 (1), 85–106.

Mondada, Lorenza, Tekin, Burak, Koda, Mizuki, 2025. “A sequential approach to simultaneity in social interaction: the emergent organization of choral actions.”. *Lang. Commun.* 102, 1–14.

Towards Constructive Public Discourse: Pragmatic perspectives on solution-oriented communication in media, politics and society (organized by *Wout Van Praet, Astrid Vandendaele, Lutgard Lams*)

Public discourse is increasingly characterised as adversarial, polarised, and problem-saturated. Across political communication, news media, and social media, negativity tends to attract attention and dominate public agendas.^{[1],[2]} It has been argued that, while critical scrutiny and debate are essential to democratic communication, an excessive focus on crises and conflict may contribute to public disengagement, cynicism, and reduced civic agency.^[2] Within journalism studies and practice, the concept of Constructive Journalism has emerged as a response to the ‘negativity bias’, perceived to be underlying public discourse in Western democratic societies.^{[2],[3]} It combines critical reporting with a solution-oriented and future-focused approach that contextualises societal problems while seeking to engage audiences and foster democratic conversation.^[3]

This panel aims to extend these insights into the broader domain of public discourse – including journalism, political communication, and social media discourse – by developing a pragmatically grounded framework for Constructive Public Discourse that draws on stancetaking, (im)politeness, interactional pragmatics, and, where text meets image, multimodal pragmatics. The central idea is that constructiveness is not a journalistic genre or a measurable effect but a pragmatic accomplishment, or communicative orientation, that combines critique with solution-seeking, highlights possibilities for change, and fosters public engagement. We treat constructiveness as an analytic category, not an endorsement, asking how it is claimed, performed, and contested, including where ‘constructive’ framings mask or defuse legitimate conflict.

Bringing together scholars from pragmatics and related fields (e.g. discourse analysis, media studies, political communication), the panel invites contributions exploring how constructiveness is linguistically and interactionally realised across contexts (e.g. via framing, stance-taking, management of (dis)agreement). Central questions include: What are the pragmatic markers of constructive discourse? How do speakers and writers balance critique and solution-orientation? How are stance, affect, and epistemic positioning mobilised to

encourage engagement rather than polarisation? How is constructiveness negotiated during production before it reaches audiences.^[4]

The panel aims both to analyse existing communicative practices and to develop conceptual and methodological tools for identifying constructive discourse in institutional and public settings. We invite papers that address (but are not limited to) the following themes:

- pragmatic features of constructive discourse (e.g. framing, stance-taking, managing of (dis)agreement);
- solution-oriented communication in journalism and politics;
- constructive interaction in debates, interviews, and social media;
- production of constructive discourse
- audience engagement and civic participation;
- tensions between critique and constructiveness;
- methodological approaches to identifying and analysing constructiveness.

Both theoretical and empirical contributions are welcome, including corpus-based, experimental, ethnographic (interviews and newsroom observation), and interactional approaches.

References

^[1]Soroka, Stuart & Stephen McAdams. 2015. News, politics, and negativity. *Political Communication* 32(1). 1–22.

^[2]Haagerup, Ulrik. 2014. *Constructive Journalism: Why negativity destroys the media and democracy and how to improve journalism of tomorrow*. Rapperswil: InnoVatio Publishing.

^[3]Mast, Jelle, Roel Coesemans & Martina Temmerman. 2019. Constructive journalism: Concepts, practices, and discourses. *Journalism* 20(4). 492–503.

^[4]NewsTalk&Text Research Group. 2011. Towards a linguistics of news production. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(7). 1843–1852.

Toxic Language: Pragmatics of Harm (organized by *Xi Chen, Lucien Brown*)

Language has the capacity to cause profound social and interpersonal harm. Through interaction and discourse, individuals and groups may be excluded, dehumanised, stigmatised, marginalised, or subjected to moral condemnation and social control. In this panel, we explore this harmful side of language via the notion of “toxic language.”

Within pragmatics, toxic language is rather an underrepresented concept, compared to impoliteness, rudeness, offence, and aggression. However, it offers a distinct and productive framework for understanding the pragmatics of harm. According to Chen and Brown (forthcoming), toxic language refers to discursive linguistic practices that categorise individuals and/or social groups by marginalising them from the speaker’s conception of humankind, evaluate them by positioning them in opposition to the moral values claimed by the speaker, and regulate them through the authority assumed by the speaker. This definition, gleaned from extensive analysis of first-order data, reflects how the term “toxic” is commonly used by laypersons as an emic description of harmful interactions, discourses and personhoods, such as “toxic relationships,” “toxic fans,” and toxic masculinities. The concept of toxic language has already been widely adopted in Natural Language Processing (NLP),

particularly for discussions of the engineered efforts to detect harmful content online. However, within NLP, it has lacked a clear definition. Bringing these strands together, this panel aims to advance pragmatic understandings of toxic language by focusing on how language is used to produce, legitimise, and perpetuate harm.

This panel welcomes contributions on all areas of toxic language and linguistic harm. Potential themes for paper contributions to this panel include, but not restricted to, (i) the diversity of categorisation, (im)moralisation, and authorisation practices in real-world toxic language; (ii) the linguistic, contextual, and distributional properties of toxic language; (iii) forms of toxic language, for example, profanity, social biases, discrimination, which harm social equality; (iv) machine-generated toxicity, e.g., social biases in AI, and (v) cross-cultural variations in toxic language. By bringing together these themes, the panel aims to establish toxic language as a productive object of pragmatic inquiry and to advance understanding of how language contributes to social harm. In doing so, it seeks to build connections between pragmatics and sociolinguistics through a shared concern with social equality and inclusion. Perhaps more timely, the advances in toxic language through this panel will help to connect the rich tradition of impoliteness studies in pragmatics with the growing body of research on harm mitigation in AI systems. We particularly welcome contributions from understudied languages and marginalised communities, whose experiences of toxic language remain underrepresented in existing scholarship.

Translation and Ideologies: Revisiting the relationship between the source-language text and the target-language text (organized by *Momoko Nakamura, Shigeko Okamoto*)

This panel encourages the participation of scholars in sociocultural linguistics and pragmatics who are interested in exploring the question of how translators relate the source-language (SL) text to the target-language (TL) text. The panel pays special attention to the ideological aspect involved in the complex process of relating the SL to TL texts—a hitherto understudied issue.

The relationship between SL and TL has been widely examined in translation studies. One of the major foci has been whether the translator takes SL-oriented, or foreignization, strategies or TL-oriented, or domestication, strategies (e.g. Schleiermacher (2004[1813]; Venuti 2004). The former strategy largely uses direct translations that make the reader aware of the SL culture, and the latter strategy adapts to TL cultural norms. But recent studies have tended to go beyond this dichotomy, taking the sociocultural linguistic approach and the pragmatic approach, although these approaches are not mutually exclusive.

The sociocultural approach, often focusing on dialogs of characters in fiction, examines the frequency and distribution of linguistic and other semiotic features that comprise a sociolinguistic style (Coupland 2007) such as women's language (Furukawa 2024; Vitucci 2025), men's language (Suzuki 2020), regional dialects (Hiramoto 2009) and the styles crafted specifically for nonnatives (Nakamura 2020). Conceptualizing translation as the interlingual movement between the style systems of SL and TL (Inoue 2003), it has been shown that the degree of SL or TL orientation may shift according to relevant social categories of characters in fiction, including gender, sexuality, ethnicity, class, age, and nationality (Nakamura 2025; Okamoto 2025), which actively contributes to (re)producing stereotypes and social inequality for the TL audience (Ranzato 2025).

The pragmatic approach views translation as language contact and borrowing (Amouzadeh & House 2010; House 2019), mainly analyzing pragmatic linguistic features such as swearing and greeting (Guillot 2023; Hosaka & Shimada 2022) and concepts not found in the TL culture (Astrauskienė 2025; Shinohara 2013). Notably, examining the degree of SL or TL orientation of the translators' strategies (Pedersen 2005), they have found that the SL-oriented strategies tend to produce TL texts which may prompt the TL readers/audiences to search for innovative meanings.

Building on these accomplishments, the panel attempts to transcend the foreignization-domestication dichotomy by stressing the importance of considering linguacultural ideologies. Specifically, the panel addresses the following research questions:

- What kinds of TL linguistic and other semiotic resources are chosen in translation and how they differ from the SL, particularly regarding the social and pragmatic meanings?
- What linguacultural ideologies mediate the process of choosing TL semiotic resources? That is, what stance does the TL text take toward the linguacultural norms of the SL and TL societies?
- What innovative social and pragmatic meanings and values does the translation produce in the TL? And what social and pragmatic meanings in the SL texts are lost in the TL texts?
- What implications do the differences between the SL text and TL text have for the perception of the social structure in the target culture?

Turns with(out) grammatical objects: argument structure in bodily-material ecologies
(organized by *Taiane Malabarba, Arnulf Deppermann, Leelo Keevallik*)

This panel advances a functional, situated, and embodied theory of syntax by focusing on a specific order of linguistic organization, i.e., argument structure. The goal is to investigate the interactional deployment of different argument-structure patterns in turns that organize practical activities, such as cooking, dancing, and physiotherapy sessions.

In normatively oriented approaches to grammar, verbs are typically treated as coming with a fixed set of participant roles (arguments). Each verb is assumed to require a specific number of arguments to complete the action it denotes (e.g., to give requires subject ('agent'), direct object ('theme') and indirect object ('recipient')) (Allerton 1982: verbs' "valency frame"). If obligatory arguments are missing, they are considered elliptical, null argument, or zero-argument constructions (Chavez et al. 2025; Fillmore 1985).

However, in naturally occurring interaction, arguments considered obligatory in normative grammars are often omitted. Prior research on conversational data has shown that argument omission often relies on "structural latencies" from prior discourse (Auer 2014). Other research in conversation analysis and interactional linguistics has shown that syntax is adapted to the interactive, material, and temporal ecology of talk-in-interaction (Keevallik 2018). Although argument structure has received little attention from interactional approaches to grammar, recent research has shown that lean syntax – realizations of argument that are more condensed than their full argument frames (Deppermann 2025) – do not lead to understanding problems. This suggests that argument realization may be shaped by interactional, embodied, and material contingencies.

The panel welcomes contributions in any language based on naturalistic video-recorded data that examine the multimodal, micro-sequential conditions under which certain verb arguments are variably realized or omitted.

The panel addresses the following questions:

- When do participants use complete argument structures, and when are some “obligatory” arguments omitted?
- To what extent can such omissions be accounted for by the multimodal configurations of situated action?
- What multimodal circumstances make missing or minimal arguments interpretable (e.g., joint attention, object use, gestures)?

- What accounts for the use of a lexical versus a pronominal argument beyond anaphoric and other textual concerns?

References

Allerton, D. J. (1982). Valency and the English verb. Academic Press.

Auer, P. (2014). Syntactic structures and their symbiotic guests: Notes on analepsis from the perspective of on-line syntax. *Pragmatics*, 24, 533–560.

Chaves, R. P., Kay, P., & Michaelis, L. A. (2025). Unrealized arguments and the grammar of context. Cambridge University Press.

Deppermann, A. (2025). Lean syntax: How argument structure is adapted to its interactive, material, and temporal ecology. *Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft*, 35, 7–46.

Fillmore, C. J. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica*, 6, 222–254.

Keevallik, L. (2018). What does embodied interaction tell us about grammar? *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(1), 1–21.

Understanding Interactional Dynamics in Interactions with Autistic Children: A Multimodal Perspective (organized by *Vivien Heller, Katja Dindar, Alessandra Fasulo, Friederike Kern*)

Research in conversation analysis has explored in depth how children on the autism spectrum use embodied resources such as gaze, body orientation, posture, head movements, prosody, and verbal talk in specific, yet communicative ways. With regard to gaze, for instance, Dickerson et al. (2005) observe that children on the autism spectrum, while looking at their interlocutors less frequently than neurotypical children, nevertheless use gaze systematically for communicative purposes, such as addressing particular participants or establishing reference through the coordination of gaze, pointing, and talk. Similarly, Korkiakangas (2018) showed that autistic children tend to use gestures or changing body positions rather than gaze to signal engagement.

Studies have also zoomed in on the conversational partners. Bottema-Beutel et al. (2020) demonstrate that caregivers play a key role in supporting children’s contributions through coordinated embodied resources. However, when autistic children’s embodied displays diverge from neurotypical expectations, conversational partners need to orient to these

actions as communicative and to provide uptake that supports intersubjectivity. Such interactions are therefore susceptible to interactional trouble, and may require creative adjustments or the development of familiar conversational routines (Sterponi & Fasulo 2010).

Based on the fundamental theoretical stance that interaction is co-constructed by participants, this panel aims to expand current research on interactional dynamics in interactions with autistic children by adopting a multimodal conversation analytic perspective. It brings together contributions that examine how participants orient to, interpret, and support each other's actions in situ across multiple semiotic resources.

Drawing on data from family, classroom, and therapeutic settings, contributions (may) focus on:

the role of material resources such as objects and physical environment in interactional sequences,

the organization of social actions, including proposals and various forms of requests,

the display and negotiation of (dis)affiliation and affect,

the interpretive and supportive practices of both peers and adults,

observation of agency and competence in embodied practices.

By examining these phenomena, the panel seeks to deepen our understanding of the interactional dynamics of interactions with autistic children. It also aims to contribute to broader discussions in pragmatics and interaction research regarding multimodality, participation, and the situated accomplishment of social action.

Alongside the nine committed panelists from Finland, Germany, Norway, United Kingdom and the US, the panel invites scholars who explore interaction with autistic children from a multimodal perspective.

Bottema-Beutel, K., Oliveira, G., Cohen, S. R., & Miguel, J. (2020). Question–response–evaluation sequences in the home interactions of a bilingual child with autism spectrum disorder. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 55(2), 216–230.

Dickerson, P., Rae, J., Stribling, P., Dautenhahn, K., & Werry, I. (2005). Autistic children's coordination of gaze and talk: Re-examining the 'asocial' autistic. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 19–37). Palgrave Macmillan.

Korkiakangas, T. (2018). *Communication, gaze and autism: A multimodal interaction perspective*. Routledge.

Sterponi, L., & Fasulo, A. (2010). "How to go on": Intersubjectivity and progressivity in the communication of a child with autism. *Ethos*, 38(1), 116–142.

Understanding Personal Interactions at a Larger Scale: Connecting Qualitative Data to Social Issues (organized by *Arisa Koba, Mugiho Kojima*)

In research on personal interactions, we tend to focus on the local processes, such as how participants understand each other, how they describe events in their lives, and how they identify themselves at the moment of interaction. In this panel, we discuss how researchers studying personal narratives can build a bridge between individual interactions and more collective, structural issues on a larger scale. We address a long-standing question faced by narrative researchers and qualitative researchers more broadly: how can we extend our analyses to engage with wider social, structural, and global issues?

In the narrative analysis approach, narratives are considered “verbal acts” (Bauman, 1986) and “social practices” (Georgakopoulou, 2010) that emerge through interaction. A narrative told in interactions is not an objective account of facts but a pragmatic process through which meanings are constructed (Matsuki, 1999). Many studies have employed this approach; however, they tend to focus on narrators’ subjective understandings of narrated events, such as how the events are understood and depicted by narrators. As a result, the broader contribution of the narrative approach may be limited. In response to this issue, there have been some linguistic attempts employing Bakhtin’s (1981) notion of the chronotope, which can be broadly understood as the inseparability and interrelationship of time and space. Lee (2023), for example, demonstrated how one immigrant’s narratives map out historical, cultural, and social dynamics through socio-semiotic cultural chronotopes. Similarly, Perrino (2015) highlights the importance of examining narrative content (the story event) within the social, cultural, and historical context of the narrating action (the storytelling event). According to her, chronotopic analysis enables researchers to uncover underlying social conditions, broader historical processes, and implicit ideologies.

Baynham (2015) argues that one way to make a connection between large social processes and the micro focus on interaction, or to understand “the jump from one scale to another: from the individual to the collective” (Blommaert, 2006), is to become more sensitive to spatio-temporal orientations in narratives, or more specifically, to the socio-symbolic spatial meanings in them.

Similar arguments can be found in psychological research on the master narrative approach to identity development. McLean and Syed (2016) criticize the tendency in narrative studies to focus less on how individuals interact with or relate to master narratives, as well as the overemphasis on individuals’ agency and the lack of attention to the constraints that cultural contexts may place on it. In their words, we must understand the structures embedded in personal experience and take objective constraints more seriously.

While we have discussed how personal interactions can be understood on a larger scale through the narrative analysis approach, this panel welcomes a wide range of studies in sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and other disciplines that explore the interrelation between personal interactions and larger-scale social structures. We hope to create an interdisciplinary bridge among scholars who address societal issues through more micro-level interactions.

Undoing meaning: Moving back and forth through conversational turns (organized by *Kasia Jaszczolt, Maciej Witek*)

‘I didn’t mean to say that...’, ‘I didn’t mean to suggest that...’ are among the most common ways to ‘undo’ meanings, whether intended or unintended, foregrounded or presupposed, explicit or implicit, and conveyed overtly or covertly. There is also the ‘unsaying’ function of

silence, irony, non-serious uses of language, ostensible speech acts, and other discursive strategies. Undoing meaning is gradable along different scales, such as intentionality, explicitness, overttness, plausibility, or success. Further, it can be implemented at different stages in conversational interaction and initiated by different participants. Finally, the functions and social effects of ‘unsaying’ can also differ, as well as perspectives from which it can be analysed. And yet, as we demonstrate through this workshop, there are conceptual, theoretical as well as practical advantages to perceiving it as an essentially unary phenomenon. This unified perspective is very much needed, as there is a tendency in the extant literature to proliferate concepts that cover some, often overlapping, aspects of its occurrence – frequently concepts limited to an intra-theoretic utility, to wit theoretical and practical cancelling, denying, disavowing, correcting, repair of conversational breakdown, retracting, annulling, clarifying, to name a few. The rationale behind this panel is to offer a unified perspective on undoing meaning that presents it as a generic but broadly unary phenomenon, while also exploring its internal diversity and the specific research questions and objectives associated with different perspectives and theories. For example, while post-Gricean pragmatics focuses on the intended/unintended distinction, commitment-based approaches focus on the power of deniability of the meaning recovered in typical or otherwise strongly relevant contexts, and as such the speaker meaning/hearer meaning distinction and the intention-convention interface. Speech-act-based approaches add the perspective of ‘dynamic unsaying’ through an interaction between consecutive speech acts in ‘undoing’ felicity conditions or/and propositional content. In view of this multiplicity of foci and perspectives, we propose in the introduction a concept of ‘generalized unsaying’ and invite contributions that take it in different directions, with the uniting umbrella concept in view. The panel is envisaged as a combination of (i) contributions elicited through advertising and (ii) talks by some core representatives and of the ‘unsaying’ debates across post-Gricean pragmatics, commitment-based approaches, speech-act research, Conversation Analysis, argumentation theory, and combinations thereof. Its main strength and uniqueness are combining the broad, cross-theoretic perspective with the attempt at introducing order and rigour through a more global, generic perspective on ‘unsaying’.

Unfolding learner discourse: how do we explain what learners say? (organized by *Line Winkelmans, Lieven Buysse*)

The development of an additional language has occupied many researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). While this field is well established, attention has primarily been given to the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary, and less so to other components of communicative competence, such as pragmatics. Nevertheless, within the domain of pragmatics, a great deal of attention has been given to the pragmatic competence of learners of a language in comparison with native speakers.

Pragmatic marker studies, for instance, have shown that learners often deviate from native speaker practices in their use of pragmatic markers. It has proved difficult to explain why learners use certain markers very frequently, but others hardly at all. The most evident explanation for learners’ behaviour is how they use similar items in their mother tongue. In many studies, both in SLA and in pragmatics, negative L1 transfer is mentioned to explain divergences from native speaker practices. Although differences between the L1 and the target language are often hinted at (e.g. Müller 2005, Liu 2013, Haselow 2021), there are

generally no comparable usage data available for the first language of the learners being studied, making this explanation rather tentative.

Recent publications on learners' use of pragmatic markers by, for instance, Han (2024), Magliacane and Sánchez-Hernández (2025), Pan (2025) or Tilburghs and Vande Castele (2024) have shown that the study of learners' pragmatic behaviour has captured abundant research interest. This panel, therefore, invites contributions tailored to the pragmatic study of learner discourse. In particular, we invite talks that address the question: how do we explain learners' pragmatic behaviour, especially when this behaviour deviates from native-speaker practices? The aim is to corroborate, find limitations to, and expand previous tentative explanations of learner behaviour on the basis of more sound evidence. Concerning prospective speakers, Tilburghs B. has already agreed to contribute to this panel.

References

Han, K. (2024). Corpus-Based Qualitative Analysis of Pragmatic Marker Acquisition in Second Language Learners. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics (Online)*, 10(3), 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10325>

Haselow, A. (2021). The acquisition of pragmatic markers in the foreign language classroom: An experimental study on the effects of implicit and explicit learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 186, 73–86.

Liu, B. (2013). Effect of first language on the use of English discourse markers by L1 Chinese speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45(1), 149–172.

Magliacane, A., & Sánchez-Hernández, A. (2025). Development of pragmatic awareness during study abroad: A focus on pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*.

Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pan, Z. (2025). The Use of English Pragmatic Markers by Learners of English from Different Linguacultural Backgrounds. *Contrastive Pragmatics*, 6(2), 435–462.

Tilburghs, B., & Vande Castele, A. N. (2024). Pues como marcador de toma de turno en español L2. *RILCE. Revista de Filología Hispanica*, 40(3), 1109–1141.

Violence and language: Pragmalinguistic perspectives on aggression, disinformation, and power practices (organized by *Elke Montanari, Beatrix Kress, Sylvia Jaki, Dariia Orobchuk*)

Violence often goes hand-in-hand with linguistically violent practices as violence is supported, announced, justified and, in the best case, prevented or resolved by linguistic actions. This panel focuses on the diverse forms and dynamics of violence in and through language (Silva 2017). Allen & Anderson (2017) suggest to define violence as “an extreme form of aggression that has severe harm (usually physical injury or death) as its goal.” Recent attempts to define violence move away from one-fits-to-all-definitions and target specific constellations; they distinguish between institutional violence, e.g. school-related violence (Miller 2023), and violence between individuals or family violence (Tucker et al. 2025). They touch upon physical and verbal violence as well as rivalry and bullying among siblings and subsume them under the concept of violence.

Building on theoretical approaches from pragmalinguistic research and on how power can be exercised linguistically (e.g. Culpeper 2025), language is discussed as a social arena where violence-accompanying actions of power, exclusion and offense take place.

Language will serve as the bridge to make violence reflectable and recognisable, for example through the contrast between information and disinformation, the identification and countering of verbal violence in hate speech, and the engagement with historical documents and narratives by children who experienced violence. We will also discuss the general potential of language for being a bridge for reflecting on violence.

We propose the following topic areas:

- Cutting bridges: Disinformation, manipulation and linguistic violence – lies, frames, euphemisms and rhetorical violence as means of political and media influence
- Building bridges from hate speech to non toxic social arenas – forms, functions and effects of linguistic measures against hate; pragmalinguistic classifications and counter-strategies
- “What we were unable to shout out to the world”: Narrations of violence as a bridge to remember history. How violence is phrased, remembered or suppressed in children’s reports from the Warsaw Ghetto .
- Silent Bridges: Silence about violence – silence as a pragmatic act situated between protection, complicity, and structural violence

The aim is, within an interdisciplinary panel of pragmatics, media and discourse linguistics, to relate the different manifestations of linguistic violence to one another and to critically further develop analytical tools of pragmatics.

Allen, J. et al. (2017): "Aggression and violence: Definitions and distinctions." The Wiley Handbook of Violence and Aggression 1: 1-14.

Culpeper, J. et al. (2025) "Impoliteness reciprocity online." Journal of Pragmatics 242: 216-236.

Ebner, J. et al. (2022). Is there a language of terrorists? A comparative manifesto analysis. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism 48(6): 601-628.

Miller, T. (2023): "School-related violence: Definition, scope, and prevention goals." School Violence and Primary Prevention. Cham: Springer. 3-18.

Silva, D. (2017): Language and Violence: Pragmatic perspectives, Benjamins.

Tucker, C. et al. (2025): Clarifying labels, constructs, and definitions. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships 42.7: 1800-1817.

Voices of crisis: Reporting in crisis discourse (organized by *Minna Nevala, Hanna Limatius, Jenni Räikkönen*)

This panel focuses on the pragmatics of direct and indirect reports in different crisis-related texts. In particular, we are interested in the ways in which various voices are expressed or suppressed in crisis discourses. In public discussions about a crisis, the inclusion and exclusion of specific voices affects citizens’ impressions of the crisis in question. Therefore, different voices can also be used strategically by authorities and the media to influence these impressions (Limatius & Koskela 2024; Räikkönen 2026). For example, as a specific

linguistic strategy, intertextual reporting can be used to bring out the voices in different discursive contexts, affecting the way in which we report, what is reported in general, and when (cf. Collins 2001; Nevala & Palander-Collin 2010).

Furthermore, during crises, different segments of the populace need to feel that their concerns are understood. For this reason, the discursive representation of various voices in public discussion is crucial. For example, if crisis communication fails to platform the voices of minorised groups that are affected by the crisis, or their voices are only represented in ways that enforce negative stereotypes, trust in crisis management efforts within these groups is likely to suffer (Limatius 2025).

We welcome abstracts focusing on pragmatic studies of various aspects of voice and reporting in crisis discourse. Possible topics include but are not restricted to:

- How and in which contexts are direct and indirect reports used in different crisis-related texts?
- What types of differences are there in how the voices of different social groups are reported and expressed?
- Whose voices are represented in specific genres of crisis discourse / texts about crises?
- To whom is the language used in specific crisis-related texts targeted?
- How are crisis messages received by different demographic subsets?

We welcome contributions dealing with various different types of crises (e.g., large-scale societal crises on a global or local level, institutional or organisational crises, inter-personal crises) and exploring different types of data (e.g., news reporting, social media data, political language). Proposals for contributions to this panel should follow the general instructions for individual paper abstracts of IPC20.

References

- Collins, D. 2001. Reanimated Voices: Speech Reporting in a Historical-Pragmatic Perspective. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.85>.
- Limatius, H. 2025. “The impacts are not evenly distributed”: Representation and inclusion of marginalized groups in authorities’ COVID-19 communication. *Discourse & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265251353793>.
- Limatius, H. and M. Koskela. 2024. Voices in government crisis communication in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic: A rhetorical arena perspective. *VAKKI Publications* 16: 90–107. <https://doi.org/10.70484/vakki.145712>.
- Nevala, M. and M. Palander-Collin. 2010. “O England! England! She says – my Father – my Sisters – my friends! – shall I ever see you more?” – Reporting in 18th-century correspondence. In *Discourses in Interaction*, ed. by S-K Tanskanen et al., 133–50. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.203>.
- Räikkönen, J. 2026. Epistemic authority of experts in the New York Times and the New York Post: A corpus-assisted comparative study. *Discourse & Communication* 20(1): 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813251412081>.

What Words Do: Lexical Meaning as a Resource in Social Interaction (organized by *Sophia Fiedler, Emma Betz*)

Words are often treated as having stable, context-independent meanings. In talk-in-interaction, however, lexical items are not interpreted against a static context; their meanings are flexible (Lieberman, 2012) and actively implicated in building social action. Interactional linguistic research has demonstrated how grammar

and prosody shape turns and sequences (Ochs et al., 1996; Selting, 2010), but the role of lexical semantics remains underexplored. Lexical items are commonly approached from syntactic or functional perspectives (Pekarek Doehler & Lindström, 2020), foregrounding grammaticalization or functions that are largely independent of lexical meaning. The systematic study of how meanings associated with particular parts of speech (PoS) shape action is only beginning, notably in the emerging area of Interactional Semantics (Deppermann, 2011; Greco & Traverso, 2016).

Work in Interactional Semantics suggests that meaning is collaboratively achieved and dynamically reconfigured (Deppermann & Schmidt, 2021; also Bilmes, 2011). Because meaning is usually treated as shared until problems occur, frictions in intersubjectivity provide an important entry point for studying lexical semantics, yielding observable practices for attributing and explicating intended meanings (Deppermann, 2020). Another entry point is knowledge-focused interaction (argumentative talk, teaching), where defining practices play a crucial role in negotiating knowledge claims (Deppermann, 2005; Helmer, 2020).

Building on these insights, our proposed panel investigates lexical items on the PoS-level as semantically specified resources for social action whose meanings are consequential for the projection and organization of turns and sequences. This perspective furthers our understanding of how semantic properties become interactionally implicative. We seek to broaden existing work through inviting cross-disciplinary research and focusing on PoS that have received less interactional linguistic attention (e.g., adjectives, nouns). The panel's particular emphasis lies on word meanings and their interplay with action projection. For instance, while noun variation in projector constructions such as *die Sache ist* ('the thing is') in German has been treated as functionally similar (Günthner, 2007), emerging findings suggest that constructions like the question/problem/point differ in their sequential implications depending on noun semantics. This indicates that single lexical items within otherwise similar formats can systematically affect how turns/sequences unfold (see also work on particles: Golato, 2018).

This panel explores the following questions:

- How do semantic properties of lexical items contribute to organizing turns/sequences?
- How do different lexical choices within similar formats shape sequential trajectories?
- How can boundaries of lexical units be conceptualized?
- What analytical features and theoretical approaches are relevant for conceptualizing an 'Interactional Lexicology' (Deppermann & De Stefani, 2023)?

We invite empirically grounded studies from various fields that examine how lexical semantics interface with sequential organization. We particularly encourage submissions expanding the range of phenomena studied, including underexplored PoS, multimodal environments, and cross-linguistic perspectives. We welcome theoretically-oriented contributions that reconceptualize the lexicon in interaction, integrating semantic, lexical, sequential, and action-oriented approaches.