

Towards an Analysis of Discourse and Interactional Pragmatic Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models

Amelie Robrecht

Social Cognitive Systems
Bielefeld University

Judith Sieker

Computational Linguistics
Bielefeld University

Clara Lachenmaier

Computational Linguistics
Bielefeld University

Sina Zariß

Computational Linguistics
Bielefeld University

Stefan Kopp

Social Cognitive Systems
Bielefeld University

1 Introduction

Within the landscape of linguistic capabilities that have been studied and analyzed in Large Language Models (LLMs), a considerable amount of research has focused on phenomena on the level of morphology and syntax (Marvin and Linzen, 2018; Hu et al., 2020). Here, the community seems to have agreed on benchmarks and phenomena that an LLM should be capable of (e.g. agreement phenomena (Warstadt et al., 2020)). Various studies show that LLMs can handle a rich and diverse set of such phenomena (Chang and Bergen, 2023). Recent inquiries have expanded to investigate the proficiency of LLMs in pragmatic discourse processing (Ruis et al., 2022; ?; Sieker et al., 2023).

Pragmatic phenomena are often utilized when arguing for or against the reasoning capabilities of LLMs, which are a requirement for grounding in dialog. However, research on pragmatic abilities in LLMs remains more scarce and less systematic. We argue that studying the pragmatic competencies of LLMs is particularly interesting as it bridges aspects of 'core-linguistic' knowledge with the communicative, functional, and contextual aspects of grounding and is still actively discussed in current research (Mahowald et al., 2024). What does it mean when models can infer mental states while struggling with implicit meaning (Chang and Bergen, 2023)? Why do Language Models tussle, especially with phenomena that break language rules, such as humor, irony, and conversational maxims (?)?

To address these questions and categorize findings effectively, capabilities related to pragmatics and grounding must be mapped out clearly and defined in relation to one another. In this work, we want to give an overview on which pragmatic abilities have been tested in LLMs so far and how these tests have been carried out. To do this, we first discuss the scope of the field of pragmatics

and suggest a subdivision into *discourse pragmatics* and *interactional pragmatics*. We give a non-exhaustive overview of the phenomena of those two subdomains and the methods traditionally used to analyze them. We subsequently consider the resulting heterogeneous set of phenomena and methods as a starting point for our survey of work on discourse pragmatics and interactional pragmatics in the context of LLMs.

2 Pragmatics in Linguistics

Unlike other linguistic fields, such as syntax or phonetics, which focus on more structured and formal aspects of language, pragmatics encompasses a more heterogeneous set of phenomena that are often less systematic and more context-dependent (Ariel, 2010). Negative definitions like the investigation of meaning distinct from pure semantics (Cummings, 2013) are fuzzy, and therefore, pragmatics is sometimes even referred to as the garbage can of linguistics (Bar-Hillel, 1971). Cummings (2013) contends that defining pragmatics as the study of how context affects meaning or as language usage analysis is overly broad. Instead, she proposes to define pragmatics as all intentionally expressed meanings that go beyond what is literally said. However, numerous endeavours have been made to establish clearer definitions or categorizations within the field. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article on pragmatics, for example, distinguishes between 'classical' and 'contemporary' pragmatics, with classical pragmatics further divided into 'near-side' and 'far-side' (Korta and Perry, 2020). Near-side pragmatics focuses on explicit content, while far-side pragmatics explores implications beyond literal meanings. Contemporary pragmatics, on the other hand, includes works like Sperber & Wilson's relevance theory. Within these categories, Korta and Perry (2020) cover several pragmatic phenomena like ambiguity

and implicatures. Yet, notably, grounding-relevant phenomena such as turn-taking or repair are overlooked despite being clearly pragmatic in nature.

Nevertheless, or precisely because of the diversity in the set of pragmatic phenomena, subcategorization is needed. We propose to cluster them into two main categories: *discourse pragmatics* and *interactional pragmatics*. While the *discourse pragmatics* describe formal reasoning processes, including phenomena such as presupposition, implicatures and figurative speech (i.e., aspects of pragmatics that were considered in [Korta and Perry's](#) article and could be described as near-side pragmatics), the *interactional pragmatics* address conversational reasoning phenomena, such as politeness, turn taking or repair (which could be designated as far-side pragmatics). Discourse pragmatics is often addressed in classical pragmatics and Natural Language Processing. The phenomena are mostly connected to text coherence. They can be found in a dialog but do not require direct interaction. These phenomena have been in the center of attention for decades. Often, testing instruments – drawing from the field of psychology or psycholinguistics ([Ettinger, 2020](#); [Sieker and Zariëß, 2023](#)) – are established. Additionally, theories from discourse pragmatics provide frameworks to describe these phenomena ([Frank and Goodman, 2012](#); [Degen, 2023](#)).

Besides, there is a field of pragmatics that we refer to as interactional pragmatics. Here, the focus is rather on the interlocutors' interplay. A lot of research has been done on conversation analysis ([Sacks et al., 1978](#); [Atkinson and Heritage, 1984](#)) or politeness theory ([Brown and Levinson, 1987](#); [Goffman, 1955](#); [Leech, 2014](#)). Conversation analysis utilises a strictly qualitative methodology borrowed from sociology and addresses the issue of "how we use language" at its core. The investigations on natural data focus on the organising principles that underlie human communication ([Sacks et al., 1978](#); [Atkinson and Heritage, 1984](#)). In politeness theory, nuances of spoken language are emphasized ([Brown and Levinson, 1987](#)). Research in computer science and computational linguistics often addresses similar questions from the perspective of human-robot interaction (HRI). [Kumar et al. \(2022\)](#) reveal the positive impact politeness has on the enjoyment, satisfaction and trust participants perceive in an interaction with a robot. And [Skantze \(2021\)](#) give an overview of research on turn-taking behavior in HRI. Also, further inter-

actional phenomena such as adaptation ([Robrecht et al., 2023](#); [Axelsson and Skantze, 2023](#); [Stange, 2022](#)) or grounding ([Jung, 2017](#)) have been subject to manifold approaches and studies in the field.

3 Approaches to pragmatics in LLMs

There are various examples of research that tests discourse pragmatic reasoning capabilities in language models. [Ruis et al. \(2022\)](#) investigate the extent to which LLMs such as OPT, T5 or GPT-4 may understand conversational implicatures. In-scale and between-scale scalar inferences in BERT are tested by comparing the model's abilities to the human performance by [Hu et al. \(2023\)](#). [Carenini et al. \(2023\)](#) take a look at the understanding GPT-2 has of metaphors, explaining their results using the Rational Speech Act theory. ? test seven discourse pragmatic phenomena (including maxims, metaphor, and coherence) in different versions of GPT-2, GPT-3 and T5. Moreover, the outcomes appear less promising when examining the study of interactional pragmatics in LLMs, the pragmatic category which covers most of the grounding-related phenomena. As this field of pragmatics is not as settled and the phenomena are harder to analyze due to their close connection to interaction, spoken language and spontaneous adaptation, there is a lack of instruments and measurements. [Milička et al. \(2024\)](#) show that GPT-3 and GPT-4 are able to decrease their cognitive abilities to simulate other personas. Also [Wilf et al. \(2023\)](#) test the perspective-taking abilities of GPT-3, GPT-4, and Llama2, using chain-of-thought prompting. Nevertheless, most research connected to interactional pragmatics focuses on Theory of Mind or related theories ([Gandhi et al., 2023](#); [Wilf et al., 2023](#)). It remains questionable whether these phenomena should be considered part of interactional pragmatics or not.

4 Contribution

We argue that there is a need for a more precise definition of pragmatic capabilities in research that studies the communicative behavior of LLMs. As a first step, we propose to distinguish discourse and interactional pragmatic abilities, for which we will discuss classification criteria and borderline cases. Further, we summarize which pragmatic phenomena have been tested in LLMs, how they are related to grounding, which methodology has been used, and which models have been considered.

5 Acknowledgments

Amelie Robrecht’s and Stefan Kopp’s research was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation): TRR 318/1 2021 – 438445824. Judith Sieker, Clara Lachenmaier and Sina Zarriß received financial support from the project SAIL: SustAInable Life-cycle of Intelligent Socio-Technical Systems: NW21-059A, funded by the program “Netzwerke 2021” of the Ministry of Culture and Science of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany.

References

- Mira Ariel. 2010. *Defining Pragmatics*, 1 edition. Cambridge University Press.
- J Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. 1984. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Agnes Axelsson and Gabriel Skantze. 2023. [Do You Follow?: A Fully Automated System for Adaptive Robot Presenters](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*, pages 102–111, Stockholm, Sweden. ACM.
- Yehoshua Bar-Hillel. 1971. [Out of the pragmatic wastebasket](#). *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2(3):401–407.
- Penelope Brown and Stephen C Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*, volume 4. Cambridge university press.
- Gaia Carenini, Louis Bodot, Walter Schaeken, Luca Bischetti, and Valentina Bambini. 2023. Large Language Models Behave (Almost) As Rational Speech Actors: Insights From Metaphor Understanding.
- Tyler A. Chang and Benjamin K. Bergen. 2023. [Language Model Behavior: A Comprehensive Survey](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2303.11504 [cs].
- Louise Cummings. 2013. *Pragmatics: A multidisciplinary perspective*. Routledge.
- Judith Degen. 2023. [The Rational Speech Act Framework](#). *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 9(1):519–540.
- Allyson Ettinger. 2020. [What BERT Is Not: Lessons from a New Suite of Psycholinguistic Diagnostics for Language Models](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:34–48.
- Michael C. Frank and Noah D. Goodman. 2012. [Predicting Pragmatic Reasoning in Language Games](#). *Science*, 336(6084):998–998.
- Kanishk Gandhi, Jan-Philipp Fränken, Tobias Gerstenberg, and Noah D. Goodman. 2023. [Understanding Social Reasoning in Language Models with Language Models](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2306.15448 [cs].
- Erving Goffman. 1955. [On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction](#). *Psychiatry*, 18(3):213–231.
- Jennifer Hu, Jon Gauthier, Peng Qian, Ethan Wilcox, and Roger Levy. 2020. [A systematic assessment of syntactic generalization in neural language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1725–1744, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jennifer Hu, Roger Levy, Judith Degen, and Sebastian Schuster. 2023. [Expectations over Unspoken Alternatives Predict Pragmatic Inferences](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2304.04758 [cs].
- Malte F. Jung. 2017. [Affective Grounding in Human-Robot Interaction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*, pages 263–273, Vienna Austria. ACM.
- Kepa Korta and John Perry. 2020. Pragmatics. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Spring 2020 edition. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Shikhar Kumar, Eliran Itzhak, Yael Edan, Galit Nimrod, Vardit Sarne-Fleischmann, and Noam Tractinsky. 2022. [Politeness in Human–Robot Interaction: A Multi-Experiment Study with Non-Humanoid Robots](#). *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14(8):1805–1820.
- Geoffrey N Leech. 2014. *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Kyle Mahowald, Anna A. Ivanova, Idan A. Blank, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. 2024. [Dissociating language and thought in large language models](#). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, page S1364661324000275.
- Rebecca Marvin and Tal Linzen. 2018. [Targeted syntactic evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1192–1202, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiří Milička, Anna Marklová, Klára VanSlambrouck, Eva Pospíšilová, Jana Šimsová, Samuel Harvan, and Ondřej Drobil. 2024. [Large language models are able to downplay their cognitive abilities to fit the persona they simulate](#). *PLOS ONE*, 19(3):e0298522.
- Amelie Sophie Robrecht, Markus Rothgänger, and Stefan Kopp. 2023. [A Study on the Benefits and Drawbacks of Adaptivity in AI-generated Explanations](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents*.
- Laura Ruis, Akbir Khan, Stella Biderman, Sara Hooker, Tim Rocktäschel, and Edward Grefenstette. 2022.

The Goldilocks of Pragmatic Understanding: Fine-Tuning Strategy Matters for Implicature Resolution by LLMs. Publisher: [object Object] Version Number: 2.

Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1978. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, pages 7–55. Elsevier.

Judith Sieker, Oliver Bott, Torgrim Solstad, and Sina Zarriß. 2023. **Beyond the Bias: Unveiling the Quality of Implicit Causality Prompt Continuations in Language Models**. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, pages 206–220, Prague, Czechia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Judith Sieker and Sina Zarriß. 2023. **When Your Language Model Cannot Even Do Determiners Right: Probing for Anti-Presuppositions and the Maximize Presupposition! Principle**. In *Proceedings of the 6th BlackboxNLP Workshop: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 180–198, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Gabriel Skantze. 2021. **Turn-taking in Conversational Systems and Human-Robot Interaction: A Review**. *Computer Speech & Language*, 67:101178.

Sonja Stange. 2022. *Tell Me Why (and What)! Self-Explanations for Autonomous Social Robot Behavior*. Ph.D. thesis, Universität Bielefeld. Artwork Size: 9237985 bytes Medium: application/pdf Publisher: Universität Bielefeld.

Alex Warstadt, Alicia Parrish, Haokun Liu, Anhad Mohanney, Wei Peng, Sheng-Fu Wang, and Samuel R Bowman. 2020. BLiMP: The benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs for English. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:377–392.

Alex Wilf, Sihyun Shawn Lee, Paul Pu Liang, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2023. **Think Twice: Perspective-Taking Improves Large Language Models’ Theory-of-Mind Capabilities**. *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2311.10227 [cs].