

Theoretical Foundation for the Pragmatic Study of Conversational Acts from a Didactic and Intercultural Perspective

Andrés Montaner Bueno, Ana Montaner Bueno

University of Murcia, Spain

**Corresponding Author: Andrés Montaner Bueno, University of Murcia, Spain*

ABSTRACT

In the last decades the analysis of the conversation has been developed from a socio-cultural ethnomethodological perspective. To study the development of different strategies and conversational skills that must be used to make communication effective, our research work assumes the analysis of them from an intercultural perspective. And it has been precisely the adoption of this point of view the main reason that has aroused our interest in this subject, because we believe it is necessary to enunciate the pragmatic-linguistic bases so that an intercultural conversation can develop cordially.

Keywords: Linguistics; interculturality; conversation; registry; idiomatic level.

INTRODUCTION

The article that we present here is framed within the scope of studies of Linguistic Pragmatics and, more specifically, the tendency that is responsible for analyzing the different factors and strategies that are part of the conversational analysis. In this regard, we must bear in mind that conversation is the most prototypical way in which the different languages of the world manifest themselves and it is also a social activity that has the characteristic of using the linguistic codes of each culture together with the mechanisms pragmatics that accompany the word. It can be defined, then, as "an oral verbal activity of interactive nature organized (or structured) in turns" (Cots et al., 1990: 59).

Paradoxically, despite being the most common form of communication among people, studies on conversation, from a linguistic perspective, have not been addressed until the second half of the twentieth century. As noted by Tusón (2002: 134), it was not until the late sixties and early seventies when scholars from Sociology, such as Goffman or Garfinkel; of Anthropology, such as Gumperz and Hymes or of Philosophy, such as Austin, Searle and Grice, highlighted the interest in studying people's daily conversations to understand better the functioning of social and cultural life, as well as to understand how creations of meaning and their interpretations work.

Therefore, among the applications that this study would have, one of them would be the much-needed integration in the teaching of foreign languages of the socio-cultural aspects of the country of origin, since this pragmatic-cultural knowledge will play a key role in the performance of future conversations. And as Coperías points out (1998: 31) "the imparting of contextual cultural knowledge that accompanies the linguistic is going to make the latter be used effectively and does not give rise to misunderstandings and communication breakdowns in the communicative exchanges between two people belonging to different cultures". Thus, our study will be shaped by the connection between pragmatic strategies, conversation and interculturality, taking into account also the existing anthropological studies on the different actions in the pragmatic-linguistic order presented by the different cultures of the world. Likewise, the pedagogical strategies that have been implemented in the last years in foreign language classes for the acquisition of intercultural competence will be taken into account, since we consider that one of the best means to avoid conflicts in conversational acts, is to train people prepared to know how to face them, solving them or fording them.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

As has been previously outlined, this research work pursues as its main objective the

construction of an ideal model of Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics in conversational acts. To do this, we conducted a review and theoretical foundation of the main pragmatic principles involved in conversational acts and how they are conditioned, increased or restricted in the case of communication between members of different cultures. It is, then, to describe and ground the ideal functioning, following the guidelines that other researchers have been pointing out, which should have the dialogical acts in which participants from different cultures are involved, in order that these may be successful.

In this regard, we should consider a concept such as the intercultural environment, which we can define as a particular conversation context in which the physical and relational elements that are part of the Linguistic Pragmatics and that intervene in all communicative interaction, will have some special characteristics, which are determined by the communicative exchange between people of diverse cultural origins.

In addition, in relation to this ideal model of oral conversation among intercultural actors, another objective pursued by our study is to describe how a speaker can achieve an adequate intercultural linguistic competence. The same, according to Meyer, (1991: 137) is one that "identifies the ability of people to act adequately and flexibly when faced with actions, attitudes and expectations of people from other cultures." The adequacy and flexibility in a conversation imply having the ability to solve intercultural problems resulting from the possible differences between the speakers. In addition, this intercultural linguistic competence includes the ability to stabilize one's identity in the process of mediating between cultures and that of helping other people to stabilize theirs.

Taking into account these objectives, the methodology has been based on the revision and foundation of theoretical notions of Pragmatics and on the delineation of a conversational model of Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics. To do this, we have divided our research into three distinct sections. Thus, in the first place, we focus on reviewing the theoretical notions on which the Linguistic Pragmatics is based from an intercultural perspective with the purpose of conceptually delimiting the different definitions that have been offered about it. Subsequently, we will dismantle the material and relational components that make it up in order to offer an

approximation to it from the pragmatic code concept. By using this notion we refer to the particular observation of the communicative maxims in each culture, that is, to the conventional pragmatic system established by each human group with a shared identity. Subsequently, we will delve into those aspects of the principles of cooperation, courtesy and relevance that need to be partially reformulated in order that conversational acts between members of different cultures may develop successfully.

Second, it is necessary to take a tour of the main issues related to conversational communication exchanges. According to this, we will study the general rules (both explicit and implicit) by which a conversation will be governed from its beginning to its end, as well as the intervening elements in it and we will consider the importance of the discourse, both verbal and non-verbal. verbal, from the social point of view and as a configurator of cultural identities. However, in this section we will not allude to certain issues related to the effective development of the conversation, because we reserve them to deal with them in more detail in the section on the conversational strategies to be observed in the field of Linguistic Pragmatics from a perspective intercultural

In the third place, it is our task to describe a pragmatic linguistic model of ideal intercultural conversation based on the contributions made by other researchers in this regard. This idealization does not refer, in any case, to that all the problems related to the development of intercultural conversational acts are resolved, but to encourage reflection on how they could be solved or alleviated in order for communication to be successful. To do this, after presenting it in the abstract, we analyze the pragmatic conversational strategies that are more sensitive to possible cultural disagreements and, subsequently, we propose the development of intercultural communicative competence and Interlinguistic Pragmatics from a transcultural perspective as the best ways to get a conversation optimal intercultural

Therefore, it is quite clear that the conjugation and interrelation of the first two sections will serve as theoretical support for the development of the third. It is the search for an ideal model of conversational acts, chaired by an Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics, which guides our text. Through its formulation, we try to offer a

possible solution to the communicative conflicts that sometimes arise in conversations between two people of different cultures. And, as pointed out by Ángeles Oliveras (2000: 10), in many cases "the problems arise from the fact that the participants in an intercultural conversation do not know the communicative norms of interaction and interpretation of the component of the other culture". Faced with this situation, the Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics proposes a conversation model through which mutual understanding based on real communication can be reached.

PRAGMATIC LINGUISTICS FROM AN INTERCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

If we try to offer a definition of Linguistic Pragmatics, we find that the concept as such of Linguistic Pragmatics has not been used habitually as a whole, but that Pragmatic science of Linguistic science has been differentiated in many occasions. We, however, will adhere to the vision of Pragmatics as a science that predominantly studies linguistic manifestations. In this respect, as Gutiérrez Ordóñez (2002: 32) indicates, Pragmatics is a discipline that includes Linguistics since communication goes far beyond the mere use of language. Thus, an author such as Fuentes (2000: 12) points out that it is necessary to adopt a pragmatic perspective of linguistic analysis to focus on "the morphosyntax and phonetics and phonology of a language taking them into account from the communicative environment". Taking into account these precisions, we are going to make a revision of the many and different formulations of Linguistic Pragmatics that have happened throughout the history of the discipline.

In this sense, one of the first scholars to try to define the scope of action of the Linguistic Pragmatics was Levinson (1983: 8-18). Among the many definitions offered to us, we will highlight two. A first in which he considers it as "the study of the relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or codified in the study of a language", specifying that the Linguistic Pragmatics only includes the approximation to those aspects of the relationship between the language and context that are relevant when writing a grammar. A second where he points out that "Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between language and context that are basic to account for the understanding of language." Matting this last contribution, Ducrot (1984: 177) indicates that

the Linguistic Pragmatics must deal with the study of the actions that are carried out through the use of language, taking into account the conditions of use of it. In this regard, he points out that what matters is not what should be done when speaking and listening, but what speakers and listeners do in fact, according to the statements issued or received. On the other hand, Reyes (1990: 17) points out that Linguistic Pragmatics is "the linguistic discipline that studies how speaking beings interpret statements in context". That is to say, the author considers that the discipline must deal with the study of language in terms of communication, which involves the investigation of the relationships between language and speakers or, at least, of some aspects of these relationships.

Another classic definition of Linguistic Pragmatics is offered by Mey (1993: 42), who states that it is the science responsible for the "study of the conditions of human use of language as determined by the context of society." For this author, the use of language for different purposes is governed by the conditions of society, to the extent that these pragmatic conditions determine the user's access to that means of communication, as well as the domain that he has of it.

In a similar sense, Bertucceli (1993: 23-24) points out that the Linguistic Pragmatics is configured as a set of studies on the ways and ways in which the language is used in the communicative processes, as well as on the cognitive capacities that preside over the communicative uses of language and on the universal properties that characterize languages as instruments to communicate. In this sense, the Linguistic Pragmatic includes contributions that extend from the Philosophy of the language to the Sociology, from the Ethno-anthropology to the Psychology and proposes new ways of study of the intercommunicative relations between the individuals.

With regard to this research, we will use the term Pragmatic Linguistics in the sense proposed by Escandell (1996: 13-14). She defines Linguistic Pragmatics as "the study of the principles that regulate the use of language in communication, that is, the conditions that determine both the use of a specific statement by a specific speaker in a specific communicative situation, as well as its interpretation by the addressee ". However, what

is most important for our research work is its conception of Linguistic Pragmatics as a discipline that takes into consideration notions such as transmitter, addressee, communicative intention, situation, context or knowledge of the world. Therefore, in its conception of Intercultural Pragmatics the emphasis is placed on the symbiosis, on the one hand, of the relationship of the meanings that both speaker and listener give to the words and to the facts and objects of the world that they try to describe or capture and , on the other hand, of the relation between the form of the expressions that are used and the attitudes that are taken when expressing them or receiving them.

On the other hand, in our study we are also going to emphasize, following Escavy (2009: 27), in the Linguistic Pragmatics as an action directed to the total comprehension of the communicative principles that base the acts of speech and reception of the speakers and the listeners. Recall, in this respect, that Austin (1962) and Searle (1980) defined speech acts as the basic unit of linguistic communication with which an action is performed. Since our intention is to delve into the speech acts included in intercultural conversations, the line of study of Linguistic Pragmatics that we are interested in is one that focuses its efforts on investigating how to interact in a dialogue to reach consensus and mutual understanding, thus avoiding misunderstandings.

In this line, and following Knapp and Knapp-Potthoff (1987: 2) we can define the Linguistic Pragmatics oriented to interculturality as that discipline that deals with the study of pragmatic rules that regulate the interaction between people of different cultures. Its more specific mission is to offer a series of strategies that help resolve the lack of shared knowledge when a conversational act takes place between them. In addition, taking into account that previously we have pointed out that Pragmatic Linguistics is the study of the principles and conditions that regulate the use of language in conversation, the notion that marks the difference of action of this new approach will be that of interculturality. In this way, with the addition of the same, it will no longer be only a pragmatic code that regulates communicative acts, but will come into contact with as many pragmatic codes as people from different cultures participate in them.

According to this and as pointed out by Hernández (1999: 26-29), the confrontation or contrast of different pragmatic codes will at the same time be a confrontation of the cultural facts of each one of the participants in the conversation. And it happens that the use of a pragmatic code is at the same time a cultural praxis whose rules will vary from one participant of the conversation to another. For this reason, from the point of view of the speakers of a culture that try to maintain a conversation with others of different cultures, the differences between their pragmatic codes can produce embarrassing situations, which can lead to the loss of social image of the interlocutors, abandonments of the conversation and other socially negative effects.

To try to avoid them, we believe necessary a metapragmatic reflection and a cooperative attitude on the part of all speakers involved in a conversation of this type. But, in addition, we propose for the researcher concerned with studying the conversational acts of Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics, a contrastive study of the relationships between pragmatic codes and the behavioral habits or experiential schemes of a culture, as well as an approach to the intentionality of speech acts issued by each participant. And it is that the pragmatic errors in the analysis of this type of conversations constitute the most revealing manifestations of an erroneous cultural projection.

Some Precisions about the Notion of Culture in our Research

According to the above, we believe it is necessary to assume a concept of open culture, which allows the researcher to understand more easily the pragmatic relationships that occur in conversations between people of different cultures. In this way, we are going to ascribe to the definition of culture proposed by Geertz (1997: 27) who points out that

"Is the study of the warp of the complex conceptual structures that man has woven, many of which are superimposed or interlaced with each other, structures that are strange, irregular and not explicit to the agent external to it since to apprehend them is it is necessary to integrate them in some way, to interpret them first and to explain them later ".

This definition inevitably leads us to the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (1921 and 1956 respectively), which states that the different

cultural groups of the world not only have different languages, but have different worldviews that are reflected in their languages. In this way, as pointed out by Yule (1998: 280-282), culture is nothing more than an acquired social knowledge that depends and at the same time influences the linguistic variation of each human group. Thus, the different cultural influences will be reflected in the language of each group of people, as well as the language they use will influence the way they approach different cultural phenomena.

Deepening in this idea is very interesting the idea of culture that Escavy (2002: 20) exposes and to which we ascribe:

"Culture is a dynamic agent that moves from the daily socio-cultural reality in which a community is immersed, to language, so that this in turn can present us the world. The priority of language over thought and reality, or reality and thought about language, is subsumed in a relationship between both through the cultural patterns continually activated between reality and language and language and reality".

As a consequence of this, the study of pragmatic relationships in conversations between people of different cultures is not subject to explicit canons of validation, since the interpretation that can be made of them only allows to suggest possible models, not stating fixed laws. And it is that to carry out an integral analysis of the pragmatic-semiotic components that take part in an intercultural conversation, would imply to enter of plenary session in the conceptual world in which these subjects live, condition in no case realizable to the one hundred percent.

However, although it is practically impossible to have a complete knowledge of the cultural conceptual world of the subjects participating in an intercultural conversation, we can try to investigate what a researcher like Wierzbicka (1991: 25) calls cultural ethos, which is one of the factors that have the most influence on the configuration of a pragmatic code. By cultural ethos we must understand a set of action schemes with which each culture constructs, defends and enhances a social image before the rest of cultures. And as Palmer (2000: 23-30) points out, different cultural ethos represent different ways of constructing a social building, which in turn is formed by a shared imagery, that is, by different ways of understanding the world.

A communicative praxis that would reflect the variety of ways that different cultures have to function in the world would be, for example, the appropriate distance that two conversationalists should maintain among themselves. As Hernandez (1999: 150-154) points out, an incorrect assessment of this proxemic phenomenon can be a discomfort in two senses: negative evaluation of the behavior because one interlocutor invades the personal space of the other or, on the contrary, believes that the The interlocutor stays too far from the space in which a cooperative conversational praxis should take place. In this case, the problem would lie in the different way of measuring the physical space that both interlocutors need to delimit their personal identity and their autonomy of action.

To solve this and other problems that may arise in the conversation, the Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics places at the disposal of the interlocutors a series of strategies aimed at minimizing possible risks that may damage their image in the course of the conversation. And they take them from the own code of each one of the cultures that are part of the conversational exchange, since they are the ones that best know the degree of sensitivity with which the different pragmatic maxims have to be observed.

In relation to the above and assuming that the cultural ethos conditions conversational practices among members of different cultures, we believe that in the Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics it is necessary to address in a particular way the study of the three basic communicative principles that we have previously described for the Pragmatic Linguistics. To this end, we proceed in the following sections to make a description of them, delving into the aspects that will singulate certain performance maxims, given the intercultural nature of conversational exchanges.

Once the intercultural approach of the Linguistic Pragmatics has been defined, which in this text will interest us, it seems necessary to carry out a study of the material and relational components that make up this discipline. This will allow us to know in detail the different factors that intervene in conversational acts, which have to be taken into account when trying to establish an ideal model of conversational act between actors belonging to different cultures.

Material and Relational Components of the Linguistic Pragmatics from an Intercultural Perspective

Next, we will make a description of the material and relational components that make up the Intercultural Pragmatics from an intercultural perspective. In the first place and following Escandell (1996: 26-30), we can say that there are four main material components: the sender, the addressee, the enunciation and the space-time environment or situation. As far as the issuer is concerned, with this concept the person who intentionally produces a linguistic expression at a given moment is designated. In our case, we are only interested in linguistic expressions produced orally, since it is the usual way of developing conversational acts between participants from different cultures. In addition, we must consider that the issuer is a real subject, with their particular knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, able to establish a whole network of different relationships with their environment. On the other hand, we must specify that when we refer to the issuer we do not refer to an absolute category, but to a position determined by the circumstances. The sender is a speaker who speaks at a precise moment, and it is only when he issues his message. We must not forget that communication is carried out in the form of a conversation and that the interlocutors are constantly exchanging their papers, so that the sender becomes the recipient and vice versa.

Referring now to the category of addressee, we must understand the person (or persons) to whom the sender directs his statement and with the one (s) that normally exchanges his position in the conversational act. It must be clarified that, in our case, the term recipient refers only to persons and not to simple decoding mechanisms. Likewise, by recipient we must understand only the person (s) to whom the communicative message has been addressed. In this regard, it can not be considered a recipient to any listener who casually catches a conversation. The recipient is only the receiver chosen by the issuer since the message issued has specific characteristics -more in the case of intercultural communication- depending on the person to whom it is addressed.

Addressing now the third material component, the statement, we can define it as the linguistic expression produced by the issuer. From a physical point of view, a statement is only a modification of the environment carried out by an auditory stimulus. This stimulus is framed between two breaks and its duration is limited by the change of issuer. From an internal point of view, the statement has to be based on a

specific linguistic and cultural code, otherwise, we would be talking about a simple message that transmits any other type of non-linguistic code. On the other hand, it is convenient to differentiate the term enunciation from the term prayer. The basic criterion to define a pragmatic unit must be of a discursive type and not of a grammatical type and, although it is true that in many occasions a statement is, in fact, the concrete realization of a sentence, this is only a particular case, a more of possible situations.

Concluding with the fourth material element that is part of the Linguistic Pragmatics, we find the concept of environment, which can be defined as the physical medium in which the enunciation is made and which depends on two main factors such as space and time. Although Coseriu (1967: 313 ff.) Divided the contextual environment into six different categories (physical, empirical, natural, practical, historical and cultural), here we are only going to be interested in the concept of the physical environment, as a material factor that is, externally and objectively describable. And it is that space and time decisively influence the choice of statements and their pragmatic interpretation.

Proceeding now to describe the relationships that are established between the material components and that are part of the most interesting core of study of the Linguistic Pragmatics from an intercultural perspective, we go again to follow the text of Escandell (1996: 30-37), who indicates that the relational components are three: the pragmatic information, the intention and the social relation. Their analysis gives rise to subjective conceptualizations, which generate regulatory principles of behavior that are objectified in the form of empirical laws and that are, therefore, non-prescriptive in nature.

Starting by offering a definition of what pragmatic information is, by it we understand the mental universe that an individual possesses at the time of carrying out a verbal interaction with another. It is, therefore, the set of knowledge, beliefs, assumptions, opinions and feelings that the sender and receiver share fruit of their experience of the world. Also, this shared information causes each of the actors in the conversation to construct a hypothesis about the level of informational competence that they share with the other. Communication success

and understanding will depend to a large extent on the adequacy of these constructs.

The construction of the same, called the hypothesis of mutual knowledge, being of a markedly subjective nature, has received numerous criticisms from some linguists. One of the most common in the sense that an infra or overvaluation of the information that has the other actor of the conversation can lead to communicative conflicts. Thus, as Sperber and Wilson (1986: 28 et seq.) Point out, although two speakers belong to the same culture, one can never be completely sure of what the other knows and vice versa, so that the success of the conversation does not It can be guaranteed one hundred percent based on the supposed existence of a shared knowledge. However, from our point of view, we consider that, although the theory does not assure the total success of the communication between two speakers, because one can never know with absolute certainty what the other knows, it is usually enough in most of them. the cases to ensure communicative intelligibility.

The communicative problems increase in the event that the communicative exchange takes place between participants of different cultures that are absolutely unknown to each other, since the interlocutors, both those who have learned the language and the one expressed in their mother tongue, usually know very little or none of the pragmatic information of the other. When this happens, what Auwera (1979) considers productions of uninterpretable statements happens. It is at this point that intercultural linguistic competence would intervene, which would enable each of the participants in the conversation to master the three main components (knowledge, skills and attitudes) that constitute and support the cultural pragmatic information of the other.

Continuing now for the second element that is part of the relational elements of the Linguistic Pragmatics, we find the intention. This manifests as the regulating principle of the behavior of the speakers in the sense that it is the one that leads to use the means that are considered most suitable to achieve certain purposes. In this sense, from the point of view of the addressees, the recognition of the intention of the speech acts of the interlocutors constitutes an inescapable step in the correct interpretation of a conversation.

Therefore, we believe it is necessary to delve into the differences in the intentionality that an illocutionary speech act can have in a concrete conversation. In this way, Searle (1995: 450-455) indicates that the same type of illocutionary speech act can vary its intention in terms of:

- a. The purpose to which it refers. It is not the same that through an act of speech we direct an order, a promise or simply make a description of something to our interlocutor.
- b. In the direction of adjustment between words and the world. On some occasions, it is the words that conform to the events of the world and, in others, it is the world that accommodates our previous words.
- c. In the psychological states expressed. The sender always expresses some attitude toward the propositional content expressed in the speech act.
- d. In the strength or intensity with which the object to which it refers is presented. Thus, for example, a speech act that suggests or invites does not have the same force as another that insists or orders something.
- e. In the status or positions of the speaker and the listener. Depending on the force used in a speech act, we can usually determine which is the interlocutor with the highest status. Thus, normally a person of inferior social position will suggest or ask, while a person of superior social position will command or order.
- f. In the manner in which the broadcast is related to the interests of the speaker and the listener. Thus, a speech act in which one interlocutor congratulates another is not the same as one in which he expresses his condolences.
- g. In the relations with the rest of the speech. For example, a speech act in which a prediction is made will necessarily have its development in the rest of the speech that is made later.
- h. Between those that require extra-linguistic elements for its realization and those that do not. Some speech acts require a specific social position of the speaker or the listener for its realization.
- i. In the propositional content to which they refer. The content to which a speaker refers will cause a speech act to express a certain intention.

- j. Between speech acts that always are and among those that do not need to be performed as such. Certain acts do not need an effective realization, although they can be expressed through them, which will make explicit the intentionality of the issuer.
- k. Between those in which the verb of the speech act has a realizing use and those that do not. For example, a person can promise something through a speech act, but can not boast effectively through another.
- l. In the style of realization of the speech act. Some speech acts do things for themselves and others do not.

In addition, as is logical, in a communicative exchange that takes place between actors of different cultures, the recognition and demarcation of mutual intentions will be more complicated since they are participants who do not share the same cultural context. In this line, Hallyday (1999: 12-13) points out that conversational situations can be described as an inherent part of a broader sociocultural environment. The problem lies in determining the extent to which culture affects conversations between two people from different backgrounds.

But, in addition, as Van Dijk (2012: 67) points out, it is necessary to consider the situational context in which the communicative exchange takes place between the two participants, in order to adapt their communicative intentions in a coherent way to it. In this regard, the situational context constitutes a specific example of the cultural context, since as Firth (1930: 155-178) points out: a) it will be influenced by the experiences of the daily life of the people involved in the conversation, b) only the relevant aspects of a specific social situation are included in it and c) it shows the social roles of the participants and of the societies to which they belong, as well as those of the genres and the discursive functions used.

It is therefore the degree of mastery of cultural and situational environments that will encourage or discourage participants from expressing themselves or not according to the pragmatic and behavioral codes required in them. And, as Malinowski (1923: 303) points out, "language has no existence or meaning apart from people, places, cultures, times and the means that stage it".

Referring last of all to the third relational component of Linguistic Pragmatics, we must

take into account the social relationship that exists between the actors that dialogue with each other. Since each of the interlocutors will play a specific role in the social structure, in conversational acts the social relationship will impose a series of selections that will determine the form of the statement. In this dialoguing interaction between members of different social positions, courtesy will play a prominent role, an element whose analysis we will address in the following sections

Communicative Principles Involved in the Linguistic Pragmatics from an Intercultural Approach

Next, we will focus on the analysis of what we believe are the three communicative principles whose respect has a greater influence in that conversational acts between two people of different cultures are successful. Thus, the first thing we are going to study is what the principle of cooperation consists of and in what maxims it is articulated, understanding that without its existence a coherent and rational conversation could not take place. Subsequently, we will deal with the principle of courtesy, especially considering that if two people do not share the same polite code, certain expressions (or the lack of them) can be seen as a disregard for the other. Finally, we will analyze the most internal part of the conversation, which is the one that has to do with the selection and connection of the discourse with reality, which both the speaker and the recipient make in the emission and reception thereof, and which comes governed by the principle of relevance.

The Need to Intensify some Communicative Maxims Related to the Principle of Cooperation

One of the most important communicative principles of the Linguistic Pragmatics that intervenes in conversational acts is what is called the principle of cooperation. Grice coined the same in his article "Logic and conversation" (1975: 45) in which to contextualize it indicates that "all the communicative exchanges between two people are the result of a cooperative effort since each participant recognizes in them a purpose or set of common purposes or, at least, an address accepted by all." In this way, based on the conception that speakers usually adopt a cooperative attitude in the interaction with their interlocutors, he formulated his well-known principle: Make his contribution to the conversation be, at each moment, the one

required by the purpose or the direction of the communicative exchange in which you are involved.

As can be inferred from the principle of cooperation of Grice, it is the community itself, the fact that we live in society, which imposes a certain behavior that must be adjusted to the limits of rationality and coexistence, a circumstance that is seen reflected also in conversational exchanges. In fact, as pointed out by Yus (2003: 90) "it is the conversational interaction itself that sometimes manages to give a greater sense of sociability, with the phatic side of communication as a basic element of the exchange". This is one of the most explicit manifestations of the cooperative attitude of the human being because when a participant in the conversation does not respond to a phatic initiative, the cooperation required to carry out the communicative exchange disappears.

Since Grice defined his cooperation principle looking for conversational acts to be as effective as possible, he found it insufficient with such a general postulate and deployed it in four maxims that each of the speakers had to observe if he wanted the communicative exchange to be successful. We will briefly summarize them based on Grice (1975: 45-47) and the valuable contributions of Escandell (1996: 79-80) and Escavy (2009: 99-100):

- a. Maximum amount. It is related to the amount of information that must be given to our interlocutor in a given situation. It is divided in turn into two statements:
 1. Make your contribution as informative as the communicative exchange requires. But on the other hand...
 2. Do not make your contribution more informative than necessary. That is, unnecessary prolixity must be avoided.
- b. Maximum quality. It is expressed by the maximum directive that indicates that it is necessary to treat that every contribution to the conversational act is true. In addition, it branches into two submaximies:
 1. Do not say something that you think is false.
 2. Do not talk about something that you know insufficiently.

- c. Maximum of relationship. It is related to the contribution made by each of the participants has to do with the content that is being treated. It could be formulated according to the statement Be relevant and say relevant things.
- d. Maximum of way. With it it is pointed out that the way of saying the things of each participant in the conversational act must be clear, in order that they are easily perceived. To achieve this clarity, the following requirements must be met:
 1. Avoid the darkness in the expression.
 2. Avoid ambiguity.
 3. Look for brevity.
 4. Follow the order in the expression.

The formulation of this principle of cooperation and the four maxims that are associated with it are a kind of preparatory condition that participants are expected to observe in order to make the conversation intelligible and meaningful. If there is no adjustment to these prerequisites, the conversation will be disjointed and absurd. In addition, although compliance with them is not prescriptive, the failure to comply with any of them may merit some kind of social sanction. Thus, in the event that one of the participants in a conversation decides to occasionally or constantly violate some of the principles of the principle of cooperation, is exposed to the other participants recriminate some action or even to exclude him from the conversation.

Despite what has been said and following Escavy (2009: 100), we must not forget that in a conversational act, together with the neutral principle of cooperation that advocates collaboration and the performance of joint acts for understanding among the participants, we also we must count on the appearance of acts that seek the benefit of both or of only one of the participants, and in this area, persuasion plays an important role. And this happens because the recipient of a message in a conversational act, apart from being a recipient of it in a cooperative way, can also be a patient of the action that a speaker carries out in pursuit of a specific purpose.

On the other hand, this principle will require special treatment and consideration in conversational acts developed by people of different cultures. Especially, it will be important to place emphasis on the

interpretation of implicit contents that are determined by the different linguistic-cultural areas from which the different interlocutors come. Consequently, in this type of conversations, the presence of an active collaborating receiver rather than merely a passive one will be required more than ever.

Thus, following Neubert and Shreve (1992), in an intercultural conversational act the receiver must be more attentive than in other types of conversations to the pragmatic-linguistic differences between him and his interlocutor in order to solve sociocultural issues that may arise. That is, it must be more willing to cooperate so that the maximums of quantity, quality, relationship and manner are fulfilled. Next we proceed to the description of those aspects related to these maxims in which it has to put more intense attention and dedication.

Referring in the first place to the maximum of quantity, it will vary significantly in the event that it occurs in a conversation between two people of different cultures. Thus, while one of them can understand that he needs to explain or that all the details about an issue are explained to him and, therefore, he must offer or be offered all kinds of details about it, the other, on the contrary, you can believe that offering or being offered a general overview of it is enough.

And this aspect is also determined by the culture to which each one of the participants in a conversation belongs, since, as Liebe-Harkort (1989: 103) points out, each cultural linguistic pragmatic system attributes a different degree to the total amount of information that is necessary so that the maximum amount is satisfied. As a result of this, in a conversation between people of different cultures, both participants must try to adapt, as far as possible, to the requirements of the other, in order to meet the expectations that each one will have depending on the cultural universe from which it comes.

Regarding the second of the maxims, that of quality, we already pointed out that it is the one by which the recipient expects the speaker to tell him the truth or that of which he has sufficient evidence, waiting for the speaker, for his part, to the recipient takes his words as true or based on evidence. Well, taking into consideration that in the conversation the actors are from different cultures, we believe that we should go deeper in the study of the truth of the discourse in function

of the linguistic-cultural context in which they are enunciated.

In this regard, there are domains of language in which the belief systems specific to each culture are made explicit with greater intensity and frequency in the statements and, therefore, allow a more detailed contrastive study of the maximum of quality. We are referring to many of the linguistic expressions that are used routinely. Within this domain highlights the field of phraseology, which usually crystallizes the belief system of each pragmatic linguistic cultural system. And, as is clear from Morant and Peñarroya (1995: 13-18), the phraseological expressions are decisively controlled by a cultural linguistic code so, through the study and comparison of the phraseological expressions of two linguistic codes -cultural, we can make interpretations of how each pragmatic code understands the maximum of quality. Thus, we can see how, in many cases, cultural truth does not correspond to the scientific truth of the facts stated.

An example in this sense can be taken from Spanish at the moment when a speaker tells another *Tardo* five minutes. Anyone who masters the pragmatic linguistic cultural field of Spanish will know that the statement, taken literally, is false. However, considering the referential value of this expression, among the connoisseurs of the pragmatic cultural code of Spanish there would be an agreement on the period of time that those five minutes would mean, undoubtedly greater than the promised one. In this way, if in an intercultural conversation a speaker uses this phraseological expression with a receiver not adapted to the cultural pragmatic code of Spanish, the latter could be offended to see that the first has not arrived after five minutes. For its part, a speaker who is familiar with the Spanish cultural pragmatic code will know that the time it will take for the interlocutor to return could be approximately ten to thirty minutes.

The third of the maxims, the relationship, to be based around the contribution that speakers make to the conversation has to do with the content they are dealing with, will be one of the most influenced by linguistic origin -cultural of each participant. Consequently, the conversational relevance will depend on the different ways in which the interlocutors have to understand what content is relevant to the conversation. In addition, what the speaker of

your mother tongue considers important and very purposeful for a conversation, may find understanding difficulties in a non-native speaker who is not used to the pragmatic code of the foreign language. And is that you must interact very frequently with different people in a country to understand what expressions and linguistic turns are usually used for what content.

Focusing on the maxim from an intercultural perspective and considering that it is based on avoiding unnecessary rhetorical complications when transmitting a content, compliance with it will be one of the keys to the proper functioning of the conversation. Also, from this intercultural approach, we must consider what is the best way to be really clear with the foreign interlocutor: Do we have to abound a lot in proxemics or is it not necessary? Should we use phrases that are syntactically simple or will this be harmful to the interlocutor?

The answer to these questions is the variable circumstance of the personal way of communicating the native speaker depending on their character and their way of being. Similarly, we must also take into account the characteristics of the language we use for the conversation. In a language with a rich morphology, the sentences are usually syntactically more complex and have a fairly large average length. On the contrary, in a language constituted by a poor morphology, the sentences will be short and syntactically simple. Therefore, if the interlocutor decodes this series of keys correctly, it will allow the speaker of the foreign language to feel comfortable talking and adapting to the new cultural ethos.

The Principle of Courtesy as a Fundamental Standard in the Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics

Following Lakoff (1973: 268 et seq.) We can define the principle of courtesy around two differentiated aspects: an external one, understood as the set of social norms that regulate the proper behavior of its members, prohibiting some forms of behavior and favoring others, and the other internal one, seen as a set of conversational strategies aimed at avoiding or mitigating conflicts between the interlocutors. However, it is quite evident that these two aspects of the principle of courtesy are interrelated in numerous acts of daily life. For example, when we treat people of a specific

social position with certain treatment formulas or social deictics. Expressed in maxims, the principle of courtesy could be defined in the observation of three guidelines:

- a. Do not importune,
- b. Offer alternatives,
- c. behave amicably.

On the other hand, Leech (1983) focuses on the phenomenon of courtesy as a principle that seeks to establish a balanced adaptation with the social distance that separates the interlocutors. In this sense, it evaluates the courtesy in economic terms of cost and benefit and divides it into six maxims: tact, generosity, approval, modesty, agreement and sympathy. Likewise, it makes a classification of the statements related to courtesy around four categories:

- a. those that support courtesy, such as compliments, acknowledgments and congratulations,
- b. those that are indifferent to courtesy, such as a statement institutional, an informative note, etc.,
- c. those that come into conflict with the courtesy, such as a petition or a complaint and
- d. those directed frontally against the courtesy, such as insults, reproaches or ridicule.

Other authors who have studied the principle of courtesy have been Brown and Levinson (1987) who propose a model based on the concept of public image to develop their theory. For them, every human being has an image before others that he / she intends to preserve, and the best way to do it is to preserve the image of other people. Likewise, as indicated by Carrasco (1999: 2-8), both authors start from the idea that all people have a positive image, which translates into the need to be appreciated, and a negative image, which is made explicit in the I wish not to be bothered. In this way, and given that the image is vulnerable, during conversational acts with others, all people try to avoid putting their image in danger by developing the first strategy of not endangering the image of others or, if they do it, they try to mitigate it through courtesy.

In accordance with these principles, the authors establish a classification of the statements expressed by the interlocutors in a conversation from more to less threatening. We see it:

- a. Statements expressed openly and without any type of reparation that mitigates the damage to the public image of the subject.
- b. Expressions expressed openly but containing a repair in the form of positive politeness.
- c. Expressions expressed in an open manner in which a reparation is included in the form of negative courtesy.
- d. Covert statements that do not damage the public image.
- e. Non-realization of the statement.

On the other hand, it is of great interest for our study, as Lorés (1997-1998: 305) points out, the fact that the principle of courtesy varies from one society to another since its successful application in conversational acts will depend if both partners share the same courteous code in the relations with their friends, their relatives, professionals, etc. In this regard, it is easy for members of different cultures that interact with each other to behave toward each other in a discourteous or inappropriate manner. This type of situation shows us that in order to give respect to the principle of courtesy in a conversation between participants from two different cultures, it is necessary that both partners have a minimum knowledge about sociology and linguistic customs of the area from which they come. the other. In this way, they will try to negotiate the role that courtesy will play in their communicative exchanges, as well as the principles that they expect each one to respect.

And that is because the use of politeness in the pragmatic level of conversation depends on how it is codified in each culture. What happens is that, precisely because of that coding, many of its characteristic elements become part of the internal levels of each cultural ethos and, to know them, it is necessary to have been linked to that social group previously. This lack of clarification, sometimes, gives rise, due to ignorance, to a series of misunderstandings and conflicts in conversations between people of different cultures, since it is not always enough for the interlocutors to try to alleviate their errors by means of a clarifying explanation, but that, many times, pragmatic errors attempt in such a way against the image of the other person, that this gives, in an irrational way, the conversation that is concluded.

One of the solutions to overcome this type of misguided reactions, as proposed Hernández

(1999: 169), requires the adoption, by the person who has been damaged in his image, a rational attitude that allows him to put on hold, even if only for a few moments, your own image in the conversation. During this putting in suspense, the person who has suffered the damage in his image has to perform a metacultural exercise by which he reflects on the conditions of use of courtesy in his communicative-pragmatic code, arriving at the conclusion that it deals with one more manifestation within an open set of other possible uses in other communicative-pragmatic codes. This exercise of metacultural reflection is associated with the relativization of cultural ethnocentrism, through which it is necessary to reach the conclusion that all cultures are equally important and valid.

In this order of things, if the receiver, after reflection, considers that the damage suffered by his issuer, can be explained and justified according to an error committed by ignorance of the new pragmatic code in which he is trying to communicate, There are two options for action: exculpate or correct it. The first option would suppose that the pragmatic error would settle in the code of action of the emitter, since, when not being corrected, it would find his pragmatic conduct adapted and according to the circumstances. The obvious problem of this neglect of a pragmatic error is that the speaker will probably repeat it when a propitious situation presents itself again and, if the error is socially serious, it can have negative consequences. In this sense, the option of explicitly correcting the error - trying not to damage the image of the interlocutor -, besides constituting the necessary intensification of the maximum cooperatives that we already indicated, can reach the status of moral imperative, in the sense that contributes to the shared construction of a social code of conduct.

Regarding this issue of correcting a discourteous expression as an ethical responsibility, Kreuz and Roberts (1993: 250) state that "pragmatic errors should be corrected by native speakers, because they have the responsibility to indicate that they do not understand what is what his interlocutors have wanted to say with a concrete expression ". However, it is clear that the correction of an error can be an uncomfortable act, to the extent that the demonstration of an incorrect social use implies a high risk for the image of the person who sees his corrected behavior. For this reason, we believe that the

correction must be followed by some kind of reflection on the relative nature of the pragmatic error, based on the communicative behaviors prevailing in each culture.

According to what has been said, and following Olza (2005: 99), the steps of overcoming pragmatic errors could be summarized as follows:

- a. the sender of the message commits a pragmatic error and compromises the maximum of courtesy, its social image and the one of its interlocutor,
- b. the receiver manages to unravel the ambiguity of interpretation of the message - is the violation of the deliberate pragmatic category? - and arrives at the conclusion that the issuer has made an error,
- c. the receiver overcomes reflective the threat to its social image that has led to the pragmatic error of the issuer and
- d. the receiver tries to correct the error explicitly trying not to excessively damage the image of the issuer by offering, if possible, a reflection of metacultural relativization about its mistake pragmatics.

Similarly, with the same objective of trying to avoid such disagreements in conversations resulting from pragmatic errors, another of the proposals that in our opinion is more effective is to develop inter-code courtesy. This proposal is that the speaker who intends to converse with another in the mother tongue of this, must be trained to master the main pragmatic categories related to politeness. For this, we believe that it would be necessary that, from the foreign language classes, the interactive conversational practice be promoted, emphasizing the use of the pragmatic elements linked with the courtesy. And it is that, although not all the pragmatic categories related to the courtesy are explicit, at least yes that can be incidir in the study and the knowledge of a series of ritualized formulas of courtesy according to its context of use.

However, we must not forget that not all the conflicts that occur in an intercultural conversation come from an ignorance of the inter-code linguistic courtesy on the part of the speaker who has learned the language, but, in many occasions, as Hernández points out (1999 : 164), "given the close relationship observed between the different realization of the pragmatic categories between two languages, and the different manifestation of certain

cultural values, the problems are not strictly linguistic, but also and, above all, cultural " The great difficulty with which we find ourselves when the differences that separate two people in a conversation are cultural, is that these people are generally not willing to recognize and solve them. People are, in general, more inclined to recognize, understand and resolve interlinguistic differences than cultural differences, perhaps due to the cultural ethnocentrism that every speaker has to a greater or lesser extent.

The Growth in Importance of the Principle of Relevance in the Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics

Now is the time to approach the third communicative principle of Linguistic Pragmatics that matters most to us for our study: the principle of relevance. Our interest lies, in part, in pointing out some deficient aspects of Grice's cooperation principle and offering us another point of view from which to analyze intercultural conversational exchanges. What, above all, differentiates this model from the principle of cooperation is that, in it, Sperber and Wilson (1986) put the emphasis on the deductive mechanism used by speakers when interpreting, pragmatically and according to context, the literal meaning of the words of their interlocutors.

In this way, the principle of relevance is formulated according to optimal conditions, for which compliance it is necessary first to verify a series of preparatory premises. These have to do with two specific factors that intervene in the conversational acts and that are the context and the relationship of the phenomenon referred to in question with the receiver thereof.

Beginning with the context, Sperber and Wilson point out that an assumption is relevant if and only if it has some contextual effect in that context. But it is also indicate that contextual relevance involves two factors, such as the effect that has what is transmitted in the context of the speakers, and the amount of effort that must be made by the recipient to apply the implicit message to that context. A) Yes:

- a. An assumption is relevant in a context insofar as its contextual effects in that context are large.
- b. An assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that the effort required for processing in that context is small.

Following the influence of the recipient individual, the inferential stimulus proposed by the issuer will only be relevant for him if:

- c. The contextual effects that are achieved by processing it are extensive.
- d. The effort required to process it optimally is small.

In this way, the principle of optimal relevance would be formulated as follows: an inferential assumption that the issuer wishes to make clear to the recipient is relevant if the recipient deserves the penalty, considering the effort required and the effects it will have according to the context in which it is found, start up the ostensive mental processing in charge of decomposing the implicit content of the message.

As indicated by Escandell (1996: 109-114), at the time of formulating the principle of relevance, Sperber and Wilson started from two basic ideas that are connected to each other. The first one goes on to say that communication goes beyond sending an issuer packing his thoughts or ideas and sending them in the form of words to the recipient so that, when unpacking them, he will recover exactly the ideas and thoughts of the sender, since the representation Semantics that makes the statement the receiver, can not be exactly the same as the sender had in his mind. The second emphasizes the fact that human communication is not simply a matter of coding and decoding explicit information, since within that information implicit, non-decipherable content can be integrated by means of a literal interpretation of the words.

Consistent with these two premises, Sperber and Wilson indicate that two different types of mechanisms intervene in conversational acts: one governed by the codification and decoding of messages, and another based on ostension and inference from them. The first mechanism is of a conventional type since it consists of deciphering the literal meaning linked to the message issued. The second is unconventional in nature and consists in attracting the interlocutor's attention to some specific aspect of the message, with the aim of inferring some particular fact that is intended to communicate.

And it is on this second ostension-inference mechanism that the authors are going to build their model of relevance. According to his

theory, ostensive-inferential communication consists of the issuer creating a series of evidences implicit in the explicit discourse with the intention that the recipient inferred to which reality he is referring and for what purpose. But it is also that the receiver has to accept the truth and the relevance of the explicit discourse, considering the context in which they find themselves, in order to infer the implicit content encrypted by the sender. Consequently with this, it can be said that the inference is an assumption that creates from another one so that it can be observed from an angle different from the original one.

Therefore, following Carston (2004: 634-636), so that a conversational act in which a speaker includes one or several implicit stimuli in his speech is carried out successfully, the recipient has to take into account three aspects:

- a. that the stimulus that the sender has included in his message is intentional,
- b. realizing that the stimulus is referred to him, and
- c. being aware that the stimulus is a modification of the environment made to attract his attention to some set of acts. In addition, from this first recognition must be able to infer:
- d. what information is being signaled through the intentional stimulus and
- e. what is the intention pursued by the issuer to indicate it.

In this way, according to what has been stated up to now, the appearance of a relevant stimulus in a conversation will start up the previous contents of the receiver, making him recover a series of ideas that were latent in his brain. Thus, as pointed out by Pons (2004: 19), "when a situation requires it, the ideas stored in the mind of the recipient are recovered thanks to the inferential stimulus of the issuer, that is, they become accessible or manifest and become part of our cognitive environment. " From our point of view and relating it to the objective of our study, the biggest problem we can find with inferential stimuli in intercultural conversational acts is that, if two people already share a set of knowledge about reality due to their cultural attunement , they may have problems in the interpretation of the same because their cognitive environments do not match, the difficulties will still be greater in a situation where two people talk whose ways of

understanding the world, linked to the previous knowledge they have of this and conditioned by their respective cultures, are radically different.

In addition, since the relevance principle places emphasis on the deductive capacity of speakers to interpret the contents implicit in conversational statements, a person from a different culture will have more difficulties interpreting them than a native speaker. This is so because, as we indicated, any implicit transmission of information supposes an enhancement of the role played by the listener, which puts into play all his linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge to make sense of what has been communicated to him.

As a result of this situation, as Hernández points out (1999: 118-120), the issuer's recognition of the interpretive capacity of the receiver for the interpretation of the implicit ones will condition the way in which the receiver formulates his messages. Thus, possible communicative actions that deviate from the interpretive field of the recipient, will be unsuccessful or require a reformulation by the issuer.

According to this, we will make a description of the different types of implicit that can take place in a conversation. The objective of the same is that the native speaker is aware that his own pragmatic-linguistic code can make him encrypt a message without him wanting it. And this circumstance can lead to problems of interpretation of conversational statements by a non-native receiver.

In this way, Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1986: 12 and ss.) Distinguishes two general types of implicit: one that he calls pre-literal or presuppositional and another one that he calls postliteral or implied. The first types of implicit are those with which the speaker tells so that their literal expression makes sense and does not constitute an empty and decontextualized statement. An example of it in Spanish would be for a speaker to use the expression The door is open, having previously agreed with his interlocutor that it should not be so and, therefore, is implicitly asking the latter to close it. The second types of implicit, meanwhile, represent contents that are superimposed on a literal statement, which in itself was endowed with meaning. With this addition, reference is made to the need to modify the situational context in which the conversation is taking place. An example would be given by a situation in which, during a cold winter afternoon, two speakers are chatting in a

house where one window has been left open and suddenly the visitor tells the other How cold it is! Based on the expression of this sensation, the host will interpret that he must close the window, in order to try that his visitor can better protect himself from the cold.

As we see, the implicit transmit very relevant information for an adequate development of a conversational act. What happens is that speaker and listener must share the same pragmatic cultural linguistic code so that the meaning of them is guaranteed. In this respect, as Strawson (1950: 324-329) points out, the pre-literal implicit ones are easier to identify by a speaker of a foreign language because they are more logically subsumable than the post-literary ones. However, this ease of recognition also means that post-literates have the most pragmatic relevance in the conversation.

In this sense, the postliteral implicit are also more heterogeneous in nature than the pre-literal ones. And it is that the operation of overwriting contents to what is literally expressed is done with criteria that can be very different in nature. Thus, as indicated by Gumperz (1982), the use of words or phrases can have conventionally associated certain connotations, but also derive implicit according to the communicative situation in which the words are issued. Thus, in some cases, there are implicit ones that are contradictory with respect to what is literally expressed (as when the word is used ironically) and others that only have a tangential and very vague relation with the enunciated.

On the other hand, Gallardo (1997: 10) defends the existence, together with the preliteral and postliteral implicit, of another type of implicit metalinguistic nature that serve to regulate the dynamics of the conversation. These correspond to conversational strategies such as, among others, the completion of a speaking shift, the presence of silences in the conversation, the use of nonverbal communication, etc. These strategies are intimately linked to the implicit preliteral and postliteral and must be taken into account when analyzing a conversational act.

Once the types of implicit that can appear in a conversational act have been described, it should be noted that the farther from the literality there is an implicit and, therefore, more present cultural specificity, the more frequent will be the errors in the interpretation of them. Following Anscombe and Ducrot (1983: 75), the two types of most expected errors in an

intercultural conversation are: a) those that come from situations in which the implicit referent handled by the issuer is not perceived by the receiver and b) the that are produced by an inadequate derivation of an implicit by the receiver, which was not foreseen in the enunciation of the issuer. In any case, the biggest problem will reside in that the speaker who expresses himself in the foreign language will lack a rule or general criterion by which to derive the implicit and this can lead to confusions and pragmatic mistakes.

To alleviate this deficit of knowledge of a pragmatic rule for the deduction of implicit, the best solution is for the foreign language speaker to spend maximum time interacting with the native members of the latter because, as noted by Guervós (2005: 181), as "the Pragmatic is interpretation of the language in use and to interpret data are needed, which can be learned, the more data you have, the better it will be interpreted". And also points out that, for the apprentice to know how to derive many of the implicit inserts by a native speaker in a conversation, he must know how to interpret, not only the verbal acts, but also the non-verbal acts of the culture he studies.

CONVERSATIONAL ACTS

Components, Conception and General Guidelines for its Sequential Development

Before formally defining the term conversation, we believe it is necessary to describe the different units that make up the same. In this sense, it should be noted, following Briz (2000: 54-56), that a conversational act is divided into what are called monological units or lower units and dialogales or higher. The first are formed by the statements and interventions and the second by exchanges and dialogues. As regards the monologue units, first of all, we find the statement, which we can define as the minimum unit of action and intention capable of functioning isolated in a discursive context, that is, independently. Secondly, there is the intervention whose concept refers to each of the utterances of a speaker issued continuously or discontinuously and linked by a unique strategy of action and intention. In this regard, interventions may be initial, that is, interventions that attempt to provoke subsequent speech (questions, judgments, invitations, games, reproaches, requests, etc.) or reaction, which are caused by a previous appeal (answers, conformities, acceptances, excuses, concessions, assessments,

etc.). Regarding the dialogical units, we find ourselves first with the concept of exchange. It can be defined as the successive appearance of two interventions by different speakers. On the other hand, the dialogue can be defined as the combination of successive exchanges, which are thematically limited by units.

Continuing now to offer a general definition of conversation, if we consult the Dictionary of the Spanish Language of the Royal Spanish Academy (2013) we find the term *conversar* comes from the Latin *conversare* and is formed by the preposition *cum* (*con*), and *versare* (*go around*), and the following definitions appear: "Said of one or more people: talking to another or others. // Live, live in the company of others. // Said of one or more people: treat, communicate and have friendship with another or others ". In this way, as indicated by Tusón (1997: 12), "we can appreciate that the definitions refer to the most typical relationships of the human species: those of coexistence, treatment and friendship".

In this line, conversation, like any other human activity that requires the coordinated participation of two or more people, has a logical development. At first, these people have to agree to initiate the communicative exchange; Secondly, they have to develop the activity in a coordinated and cooperative way and, finally, they have to decide jointly when and how to finish the activity.

With regard to how to start a conversation, as noted by Tusón (1997: 39-43), the possibilities are varied but, first of all, there must be the willingness of people to carry out such a communicative exchange. In this sense, the first strategy to start a conversation would be the explicit one in which one person approaches another to ask or beg for a time to talk. However, the most common is that conversations begin without an explicit beginning or that it is marked by a greeting, a question or an exclamation.

Starting with the analysis of the greeting as the starting mechanism of the conversation, we must indicate that this by itself is not an invitation to initiate a communicative exchange, since there are greetings that only pretend to be polite and consist of a minimum oral exchange. For the greeting to be effectively a proposal to start the talk, we have to take into account the paralinguistic and extralinguistic factors that work as contextualizing clues. Thus, normally a

Hello or a Good morning uttered with an ascending-descending intonation usually indicates that the other person wants to initiate the conversational act.

In addition to the greeting, the beginning of the conversation may be marked by the enunciation of a question or an exclamation from one person to another. Some questions are: How are you doing? How are you doing? How are you? They can be accompanied by typical greeting formulas or by themselves, constituting in themselves the opening of the conversation. On the other hand, the exclamatory expressions can be of the type Long time without seeing you!, How nice to see you!, What a joy to meet you!, etc.

In addition to opening the conversation itself, when initiating a conversation, people must agree on the tone of the interaction they are going to use, which represents the degree of formality-informality in which the communicative exchange will take place. Also, they have to decide which of the possible roles they have to use, that is, what image each one wants to offer to others and which image they are willing to accept from others. Finally, they have to reach an agreement on the shared presuppositions of those who are going to start talking, so that the conversation can move forward with agility in search of trying to meet the expectations of each one of them.

Later, once the conversation has started successfully, both participants will have to put into play a series of strategies to continue with it. Thus, as Tusón (1997: 44) points out, they have to agree on:

- a. maintain or change the subject,
- b. maintain or change the tone,
- c. maintain or change their purposes,
- d. maintain or change their papers and their image and
- e. make sure that it is clear what they are saying.

Therefore, throughout the development of the conversational act, each participant has to give indications to their interlocutor (s) about the state of the interaction, about their purposes and about their reactions to what others say.

Finally, people who dialogue have to agree on when they will end a conversation, which is a delicate task because a good part of the success of it depends on having a good ending. The

participants have to keep the feeling that they have said everything they had to say and that the conversational exchange has not lasted longer than it should. In this regard, both parties must know how to conclude the conversation in a non-abrupt way but that does not become annoying for the other. For this, there are a series of strategies that manifest the will of the other to end the conversation. Some of them are explicit and consist of saying phrases of the type: Hey, it's that now I'm in a hurry, we keep talking later, okay? Others, however, are implicit and can be seen in the tone of speech and in the gestural attitude of the other, as well as in the use of concluding sentences.

Thus, we observe how in a conversation the speakers have to deploy a whole series of skills and strategies in order to give meaning to the verbal and non-verbal material they are receiving. This occurs because the negotiation process during a communicative exchange is incessant; in each intervention of the participants, the rest have to recognize their movement and express their acceptance or rejection. And it is that these movements carry with them a maintenance or a change of the state of things, in such a way that those who participate in the conversation have to make continuous interpretative inferences putting at stake all their cognitive and pragmatic knowledge.

But, in addition, in order for speakers to correctly infer the intention of the movements of each of the participants in the conversation, they must consider each and every one of the intervening communicative facts that, following Hymes (1972: 35-71) are:

- a. The situation. This refers in the first place to the spatial and temporal location in which the conversation takes place, considering both the external and internal borders. The first are the limits of the place where the communicative interaction takes place (a park, a house, a soccer stadium ...), while the second would be marked by the internal organization of the space that affects communication (the park bench, the sofa of the house, the bench of the football stadium ...). Secondly, the situation is also related to the psychosocial atmosphere that makes people associate certain conversations and not others with a space and place. For example, some friends watching a soccer match together will develop an informal

verbal interaction, while in a job interview those same people interact in a formal way. Third, it is also important the spatial place occupied by one person in relation to another in a conversation. The situation that they take will grant them certain rights and duties regarding the use of the word and will indicate the role that each one exercises and, consequently, the power of the one invested in the conversational act.

- b. The psychosocial characteristics of the participants. The sex, the age, the social class, the ethnic identity, the status or the baggage of knowledge of each one of the participants, will play a fundamental role because it will create a certain communicative atmosphere. According to these characteristics, as Reyes points out (1995: 24-25), each person in a conversation will expect from the others a certain type of discursive behavior.
- c. The aims pursued in the conversation. These can be social (relate to a friend) or institutional (talk to a doctor about the state of another person's health) and can have an individual or collective character.
- d. The arrangement of the conversation sequences. This component has to do with the way in which the themes are developed, combined and changed throughout the communicative interaction.
- e. The prevailing tone in the conversational act. It can be serious / playful, intimate / distant, friendly / conflictive, etc. and the normal thing is to be deployed in a combined way and to vary during the development of the communicative exchange, although there will always be one or some that predominate over the others.
- f. The instruments used to talk. Among them are:
 1. the channel, which is the medium through which the message circulates and which, in the case of face-to-face conversation, is auditory and visual and, in the case of the telephone is only auditory.
 2. the ways of speaking, which have to do with the type of language used by each of the participants (dialect, sociolect, idiolect, fasolect, etc.).
 3. the non-verbal elements used.
- g. The norms that guide the conversational exchange. These guidelines have to do both

with the articulation of the interaction between the components, and with the interpretation of what each of them says. The first ones regulate the taking of the word, that is, who can intervene and who can not and in what way they should do it (interrupting, waiting for their turn, overlapping the intervention of another, etc.). On the other hand, the second ones will be in charge of adjusting the frames of reference that the speakers share and that have to do with concepts such as courtesy, implicature, presupposition, etc., which allow the participants to carry out processes of interpretation of the intentions of others depending on what they say and how they say it.

- h. The gender type of the conversation. Depending on whether it is a spontaneous conversation, a political debate, a medical consultation, etc., people will use some linguistic or other uses. Thus, as pointed out by Jakobson (1981) for each type of interaction there is a dominant discursive sequence (dialogical in a spontaneous conversation, argumentative in a political debate on the economic situation of a country, etc.) with which other sequences are presented. discursive embedded and secondary.

On the other hand, focusing now on the description of the characteristics that differentiate a conversation from any other speech act, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 700-702) specify the following:

- a. The change of speaker is recurrent or, at least, occurs. That is, one of the characteristics of the conversation is that it is dialogical.
- b. In general, does not speak more than one person at a time.
- c. Overlaps (two-or more-participants speaking at the same time) are common but brief.
- d. The most common transitions between the words shift and the next one are those that occur without intervals or overlaps, or those that occur with a short interval.
- e. The order of the word shifts is not fixed.
- f. The duration of the speaking shifts is not fixed, although there tends to be a certain balance.
- g. The duration of a conversation is not stipulated previously.

- h. What the speakers say has not been previously specified.
- i. The distribution of the word shifts has not been previously determined.
- j. The number of speakers may vary.
- k. The speech can be continuous or discontinuous.
- l. There are techniques for the distribution of shifts.
- m. There are mechanisms to repair errors or transgressions in the speech.

The Conversational Sense: The Articulation between Linguistic and Non-Linguistic

Although for the study of the conversation it is necessary to describe how is the mechanics of the verbal exchanges that take place in it and the components that intervene in it, the analysis of it should not remain exclusively in this, but, as pointed out by Tusón (2002: 135), must reveal how the meaning is constructed among those who participate in it. In this regard, we must point out that the meaning of the conversations is created individually, since, although people always contribute their own pragmatic code, their knowledge and their expectations before a meeting, is in the course of it when they are negotiating and giving a sense to the communicative exchanges.

In this regard, as pointed out by Gallardo (1991: 26-27), it is necessary that the receiver have his own space in the linguistic-communicative Pragmatics. And in the construction of conversational meanings both the sender and the receiver intervene, but it is the latter who interprets the statements of the speaker and the first who tries to modify them if the inference has not been optimal. For all this, we must bear in mind that conversation is a dialogical act and that it is constructed in convergence rather than what was said previously, with what each receiver interpreted from the other's words.

Since, in short, the conversation is a process of interpretation of intentions, are the participants in it, and particularly the recipients, who are inferring them through the verbal and non-verbal manifestations of others. And it is these last ones that are going to interest us the most since, as Goffman (1991 (1964): 130 points out), "the aspect of discourse that can be clearly transcribed to paper has been studied for a long time. Today the diffuse aspects of discourse are increasingly examined. The tongue that is

shaken in the mouth turns out to be no more than a part of a complex act, whose meaning should be investigated equally in the movement of the eyebrows and the hand ". We must consider, according to this and following Cestero (2006: 65-67) that the non-verbal aspects fulfill a plurifunctional task in the conversation and usually perform, at any moment of the interaction, one or more of the following fundamental functions:

- a. They add information to the content or sense of a verbal statement or they qualify it. This can be done in any of the following ways:
 - 1. Specifying the content or meaning of a verbal statement. The tone, intensity or longer duration of some sounds will specify the type of statement that is: agree, consent, disagreement, anger, etc. Likewise, the type of voice or facial gestures with which a statement is uttered will communicate the state of mind of the issuer.
 - 2. Confirming the content or meaning of a verbal statement. For example, at the moment when the issuer sketches a smile while saying the phrase I love it.
 - 3. Reinforcing the content or meaning of a verbal statement. It would be the case when a high tone is used to warn a child that something is not done.
 - 4. Weakening the content or meaning of a verbal statement. So, if one person tells another, you do everything wrong, huh? with a paternalistic tone, what it does is to take iron from his statement.
 - 5. Contradicting the content or meaning of a verbal statement. It would be the case in which a person says yes, while moving his head in a negative direction.
 - 6. Camouflaging the true meaning of a verbal statement. For example, if a person says in a tone under a statement like I do not care that he has not chosen me, he may be trying to camouflage his true feelings.
- b. Communicate, replacing the verbal language. Some nonverbal signs can be used, in a single communicative act, instead of verbal

signs. In this way, for example, you can express the desire that someone go verbally (Would you mind leaving?) And nonverbal (making a gesture with your eyes and eyebrows towards the exit door).

- c. They regulate the interaction. It is quite usual for conversational activities to be regulated and organized through non-verbal signs. Thus, as examples we have that a tonal descent, a pause, a fixed look at the interlocutor or a lengthening of the final sounds serve to distribute the word shift; a smile or a nod with the head are used to support the ideas enunciated by the issuer and the hesitations, clicks or aspirations fulfill a function of trying to take the floor.
- d. They correct verbal deficiencies. The non-verbal aspects also serve to avoid conversational or discursive gaps caused by momentary verbal deficiencies or by ignorance of the corresponding elements of the linguistic system of the participants in a conversation.
- e. They are very useful in simultaneous conversations. In this way, the non-verbal aspects make it possible to keep more than one conversation at a time, expressing two statements simultaneously. The most common example would be given by a person who is talking on the phone and at the same time making signs or gestures to other interlocutors with whom he is face to face.

According to this, we will analyze some non-verbal aspects that are essential to understand a conversation in all its dimensions. The first would be the prosodic elements-melodic curve, tone, timbre, volume, rhythm, pauses-which sometimes transmit the intention of the rest of the words. Do not forget that the same statement can convey irony, sweetness, aggressiveness, seriousness, joy, etc., depending on how it is said. The second prosodic element includes the vocalizations of noises of the type *buf*, *mm*, *aha*, *pss*, *wow* and some others that have to be taken into account in the course of a conversation since they provide an undeniable communicative meaning and are interpretable, in one another sense, by the participants in a conversation.

Other nonverbal elements that are very important for the complete understanding of the conversation are the prior knowledge shared by the participants and those that they will refer to

in a more or less direct or veiled manner. They are divided into:

- a. aspects of location, which include the socio-spatial framework and the deictic elements of person, time, place, text and social,
- b. aspects of oral and written verbal behavior,
- c. aspects related to the language, such as the use of certain cohesive marks or the use of certain discursive genres; and
- d. aspects of an extra situational context, in which conversational presuppositions are included.

On the other hand, we must indicate that we have left aside the analysis of the kinésicos and proxemic elements, since we will allude to them in the section dedicated to the most important conversational strategies that intercultural participants have to possess.

Thus, as we have seen, we must consider the importance of the articulation of nonverbal and verbal elements to create the particular context of each conversation and to give it full meaning. And, as Cicourel (1992: 294) shows,

"Have a knowledge of the location, of the perception of others, of the linguistic and non-linguistic aspects, of the necessary conditions for their social organization, of the characteristics attributed to the intervening individuals and of the necessary conditions for their social organization, it is a necessary imperative to give full meaning to a conversation".

The Importance of Discourse according to the Social Position of the Speaker in the Conversation

As conversational acts are one of the most common ways in which the language is put to use and, based on the fact that our aim is to build an ideal model of intercultural conversation, we believe it is important to devote a section to analyze to what extent the discourse of each participant is relevant, considering that it inevitably transmits the cultural and social vision of each intervener, that its enunciation has a certain pragmatic code associated with it, that its acceptance and importance depends on the social position of each person and that it goes to influence in one way or another the image and the mind of the speakers.

In this regard, we are going to study the function of discourse as it is a linguistic act that allows recipients to infer certain cultural, social and personal meanings with respect to the person who issues it. Likewise, we will take into account in our research that through its enunciation, as it emerges from the study of Scollon and Scollon (1994), the intentions and intentions of the speakers are hidden, which will vary according to the cultural context in which they are, depending to a large extent, among other factors, on the dominant ideology, on the majority religious beliefs, on the prevailing moral values, etc. And as Schiffirin points out (2011: 6-8) it is necessary to analyze how different discourses are carried out in different cultures since a petition, an accusation, a sentence, a story, a law, etc., have different properties in every culture.

In this sense, following Van Dijk (1980: 97 et seq.), We will define discourse as an interactive communicative event that occurs in a specific social situation with a specific intention. But, in addition, we must bear in mind that the meaning of the discourse is not built only with the audible elements, although obviously the words and sentences declared are an integral part of it, but depending on the person who states it, it will include a series of cognitive representations that will influence the processing, understanding and interpretation on the part of the receivers, as well as in the distance or the social proximity that they take with respect to the issuer.

In this regard, one of the factors that influence the time to make your own speech in a conversation has to do with the axis of hierarchy that divides human groups by their social importance. And it is, as Tusón (1997: 89-93) points out, in any human community there are cultural, historical, economic, political factors, etc., that distinguish some groups from others. And one of these differences is marked by conversational practice, which shows shared elements (rhetorical resources, expressive resources, phrases, etc.) by the members of that group. In this sense, social inequality can be expressed symbolically in conversations in which a member of a marginalized social group interacts with another of a well-off social group.

In this order of things, we must consider that there is a big difference around the number of linguistic uses well valued by society that can be accessed by a person depending on the social group to which they belong. As Bourdieu (1982:

31-39) points out, not all people have the same volume of linguistic-discursive capital and, therefore, do not have the possibility of accessing the benefits that the greater amount of this gives. Thus, there are often conversations that we could describe as asymmetric or hierarchical in which there is a person to whom socially or institutionally more power is assigned.

However, this does not mean that there is not some room for maneuver between both participants that allows, through linguistic uses, or turn those unequal power relations into a power game in which both parties act as forces capable of react to the movement of the other, or subvert the relationship so that the strongest party submits to the weaker without it having the possibility to act on their behalf. However, the most common is that in a conversation between two people belonging to different social groups, the one of the most valued social group is the one that dominates the conversation, since it has a greater variety of linguistic uses through which to exercise power.

Another factor that influences the development of discourse in conversation is marked by the axis of familiarity or not in which its participants are located. The more trust there is between two interlocutors, the more linguistically close the participants will be to each other. In this regard, Escandell (2005: 60) points out that the components that intervene in the configuration of the family discourse are:

- a. the degree of prior knowledge: two people who know each other a long time or have a more familiar relationship than two strangers and
- b. the degree of empathy: two people who, for different reasons, sympathize also have a closer relationship than two that do not, independently of other factors, such as the degree of prior knowledge.

The familiarity or not in a conversation is going to have its linguistic-pragmatic repercussions since it is going to have or not the possibility of tackling personal issues and topics, using tacos, making jokes, etc.

In this sense, following Tusón (1997: 93-96) it is interesting to analyze what happens in conversational situations familiar or between equals, which normally are friendly or amorous dialogues and in which the participants look for complicity, sympathy, love of the other, etc.,

and put into practice the discursive strategies that they consider most convenient to achieve these ends. Thus, in this type of conversation all the participants involved enjoy the same possibilities of movement and, although both can pursue the same objectives, each party is also free to reject the proposals made by the other party and try to persuade them about its other possibilities.

The best paradigm of this type of conversational acts is represented by those established between men and women. In this regard, there are studies on masculine and feminine discourse, among others that of Martín Rojo (1996: 6-17), which suggest the existence of differences in the conversational strategies of men and women, which have their roots in the field anthropological and cultural. And is that, although children belong to the same culture, they grow in a partially different way that has its reflection in multiple aspects: clothes, toys and, above all, ways of relating and communicating.

In this line, a study carried out by Maltz and Borker (1982: 195 ff.) Indicates that, as they grow up, it is verified that children generally base their relationships more on physical action and girls more on the conversation. On the other hand, children are discursively more direct and girls more indirect. And it is this daily way of living that makes them develop and consolidate their own conversational habits and partially different in many ways. One of the most significant refers to an aspect that has to do with the feedback of the speech. Thus, the use of expressions such as mm, aha, light-clear as assent to the content of what the other is saying is more frequent in women than in men.

As a result of these differences, during a conversation between a man and a woman of the same status, it may happen that the woman thinks that the man is not listening to him attentively and that the man believes that the woman is completely in agreement with what he says. what, if afterwards she expresses her disagreement, he will be surprised at such an assertion. Likewise, to these factors we must add other intervening aspects in the conversations, such as the differences between the lexicon they use and the subject they usually address. Thus, for example, the lexicon of women tends to be sweeter than that of men,

which is more vulgar and vulgar, and, on the other hand, women tend to prefer talking about topics that are more related to the private sphere (family, house, etc.) and men tend to like to share more about issues related to the public (politics, sports, etc.).

The problem is that, in an androcentric society like the one we live in, paradoxically to what one might expect, the way men communicate is more valued than that of women. And, therefore, a private conversation between a man and a woman of the same status in which, in principle, there is equality of conditions, is almost always conditioned by the public discourse that values more and sees better the way of communication of the males. And this social contamination causes that in the private conversation they overfly the public stereotypes and see the woman's speech as corny, chaotic, insecure or hysterical and the masculine discourse as firm, assertive, direct and calm. For this reason, we can no longer speak of a conversational act on equal opportunities, but we start from a hierarchical dialogue in which the discourse of the male has primacy over that of the woman.

IDEAL MODEL OF CONVERSATIONAL STRUCTURE IN INTERCULTURAL LINGUISTIC PRAGMATICS

At this point, we will proceed to describe what would be an ideal intercultural conversation model for us. Obviously, this only makes sense in the practical interaction so that the theoretical elements whose revision or qualification we are going to propose, must be subject to a contextual adaptation for each situation of intercultural communication. Likewise, we believe that the foundation of the intercultural conversation model must be based on linguistic aspects and non-linguistic aspects. In this regard, as Raga points out (2012: 6),

"The conversational information can be transmitted using verbal language to explicitly express beliefs or customs, but can also be transmitted without using it through certain attitudes, such as refusals to perform, or fail to perform, certain actions, which may include the presence of certain objects with a certain symbolic charge".

According to this, and following Hernández (2003: 24), in a conversational act, the

Theoretical Foundation for the Pragmatic Study of Conversational Acts from a Didactic and Intercultural Perspective

interpretation and understanding of the other is something more than an intellectual act. It is always -in a greater or lesser degree- an act of an empathic nature. Therefore, in our opinion, the construction of the ideal model of intercultural conversation would be achieved through a receptive individual negotiation on the part of each one of the interlocutors with respect

to the different verbal and non-verbal aspects that in their communicative exchange will prevail or they will be tolerated by each speaker. Let's see, then, what our ideal model of intercultural conversation would be like, considering the dichotomous division of them in close or distant models made by Raga (2012: 7).

Models of Intercultural Conversational Acts			
	Model Next	Model Distant	Model Ideal
<u>Non-verbal aspects</u>			
<i>Space distribution</i>			
Distances	Tendency to approach	Tendency to separate	Average distance, with agreed approximations and distances and, therefore, tolerated by both parties
Physical contact	Admitted	Very unusual	Regular physical contact, without bothering the other person. However, this is subject to agreements reached by both participants
Visual contact	Usual	Very unusual	It will be allowed as long as it is not expressly vetoed by the pragmatic code of any of the cultures that intervene in the conversation
Hands, face and body	A lot of expressiveness	Little expressiveness	Each participant will be the expressive that he / she thinks appropriate, respecting the way of expressing oneself
<i>Temporary distribution</i>			
Sequences of greeting	Brief and not very informative	Long and very informative	They will be the informative that each member considers
Transit between sequences	Little marked	Very marked	Each member will respect the transit that the other needs to start his speech
Order in turn taking	Free	Preset	An agreement will be reached in each conversational exchange on this matter
Length of shifts	Not admitted	Admitted	he length of shift that each participant wants to do will be respected
Silences between shifts	Few and short	Many and long	Average amount and average duration of the rests, unless otherwise agreed
Overlaps	Frequent	Not frequent	The participant who overlaps will be respected, although they will be asked not to be too frequent
<i>Paralanguage</i>			
Degree of emphasis	High	Low	Each participant will place the emphasis he or she deems appropriate without intimidating the other
<u>Verbal aspects</u>			
<i>Content</i>			
Information exchange	Abundant	Scarce	The greater or lesser amount of information exchanges will be respected according to the different interlocutors
Compromised topics	Frequent	Not frequent	It will be each participant who decides if he / she carries out a conversation with another about a committed topic, respecting those who do not want to have it
<i>Veracity</i>			
Social lies	Not frequent	Frequent	The way of being of the other will be respected, leaving him free to express himself lying or telling the truth, although it will be preferable that they communicate sincerely
<i>Way</i>			
Language	Direct	Indirect	Speakers have freedom of choice in their way of referring information
Treatment	Informals	Formals	An agreement will be reached - either oral or express - before beginning the conversation

Main Conversational Strategies that the Speaker and the Listener must Possess

Starting from this ideal model of intercultural conversational act, one of the first requirements that this paradigm must fulfill is that its participants master, in the best possible way, the main strategies that govern the conversational exchanges of the other. To do this, we must bear in mind that these strategies are conceived differently depending on the cultural origin of the participants. All social groups have an identity and, one of the ways in which it is reflected, is in the existence of a series of own rules that help their communicative exchanges to develop effectively.

One of the most common strategies that each culture develops according to its pragmatic codes is what governs the change of turn in a conversation. In this respect, although Sacks, Jefferson and Schegloff (1974) designed a basic model for the shift change in conversations that has become, by its generality and simplicity, one of the best resources to approach the study of this topic, The variability of existing rules in each of the cultures makes it necessary to have a particular observation of each intercultural conversation.

One aspect to highlight within the rules that govern the shift change in intercultural communication is that of the existence of overlaps in the conversational act. That is, the receiver before the issuer has finished his turn to act, interrupts him and speaks over him to show his agreement or disagreement with what he is saying. In this regard, certain studies on conversational analysis have emphasized that the practice of overlapping between shifts is minimal and very socially negative, since those that are called relevant places of transition should be used. These are points of the speech, near the end of a turn, in which implicitly announces the end of a turn and allow the coordinated transition to the next turn.

However, the problem with these studies is that they start from an ethnocentric point of view and are based on the conversational exchanges that take place between Anglo-American speakers. For this reason, we believe that the overlaps between interlocutors are more important than those studies indicate. In addition, it should be noted that in many cultures there is a positive assessment of speaker overlaps since, as Fant (1989: 260-262) points

out, these symbolize liveliness, interest and affective involvement in the conversation, since they are the same to emphasize cordiality and empathy in conversational acts.

Another of the rules to consider in the establishment of an intercultural conversational act, would be the opening of the same conversational framework in which the communicative exchange will be developed. In this order of things, when it takes place over the phone, it will change communication strategies, depending on the way in which each culture relates to this medium. Following Hernández (1999: 140-141), there are three general types of solutions to answer the telephone and start the conversation for which each culture can have, in turn, characteristic idiomatic forms. Thus, the first one would be given because the response time to the telephone appears differentiated from the greeting shift, the second as associated with the greeting shift and the third as associated with the identification shift.

In any case, a problem associated with the principle of courtesy would appear when the speaker who has made the telephone call can not be identified by the voice. As it is uncomfortable for the receiver of the call to make an identification request to the sender of the call, it will turn out that in many occasions the conversations end without knowing the exact identity of the interlocutor. This happens because it is usually preferred not to damage the image of a receiver who is demonstrating to know his interlocutor.

In general, given the inter-linguistic and intercultural variability when presenting the framework in which a conversation is going to take place, it would be necessary that in the language and culture classes of a foreign language, special attention be paid to practicing with the opening formulas of the same that the pragmatic code of the language provides them. However, as indicated by Kasper (1989: 192-199), the characteristic conversation of the language classroom unfortunately does not focus on practicing this type of formulas for opening the conversation, but often this is done in the native language itself of the students. In our opinion, this is an error because the lack of knowledge of this type of formulas causes the learner to develop an inhibitory effect that will not know how to start a conversation and will offer a negative image to the speaker.

Another area that influences the use of strategies in an intercultural conversation, takes place in the development of three specific situations such as the formulation of compliments, an invitation and the negotiation of the sale of some good. In general, it has been observed that the majority of speakers, regardless of their culture, tend to receive compliments with expressions of discrepancy, followed by reaffirmation by the person who formulates them. However, it is not the only possible reaction since in some cultures, as Lewandoswska-Tomaszczyk (1989: 75-76) points out, the response to a compliment is gratitude, and in others there is even a tendency to express disagreement in the face of flattery.

On the other hand, regarding the subject of the offers or invitations, it also offers variability of reactions according to the culture, which is why they should be taken into account when developing a conversation. In this case, the differences lie in the nature (formal or informal) that speakers of different cultures have of making and accepting an invitation. That is, there are cultures in which to make an invitation has a merely symbolic nature, since it is not intended to fulfill the same and both parties are aware of it and, on the other hand, there are others in which the formulation of the invitation requires a necessary observance of the same, since if it is not met is considered an affront.

Accordingly, the most obvious conflict may arise when a person from a culture in which the invitations are given a symbolic value, makes an offer to another in which they are seen as unbreakable promises. If the person who has received the invitation does not see her satisfied within a certain period of time, she will feel that she has been mocked and offended in her image. In this way, to avoid this type of cultural misunderstandings, as indicated by Castro (1966), a prior investigation of cultural meanings must be carried out when acquiring certain verbal commitments on the part of each of the speakers or, in any case, negotiate them during the conversation.

Regarding the issue of negotiating a sale, the most interesting thing is whether it really needs the development of a conversation or not. This will depend on the way of understanding the same that each speaker has, which will come again determined by its cultural origin. Thus, on the one hand, there are cultures that do not understand the act of sale without talking, since they see in it an exchange of goods that is

reached by a verbal agreement between both parties, and that agreement can not be reached without talking. On the other hand, on the other hand, there are other cultures that understand that in a buying and selling business the conversational exchange should be reduced to the minimum possible.

In view of these two conceptions of the buying and selling business, the conflict may arise when a person, accustomed by his culture to talk in such acts, wants to interact with his buyer or his seller, and this, adapted to his where he does not he talks, he wants nothing more than to carry out the exchange efficiently, without exchanging words. On the one hand, one of the people will feel offended because the other does not want to interact with her and the other annoyed at the insistence of the first for wanting to talk about the business. Therefore, if both people do not do their part and realize that it is the culture that determines whether there is conversation or not, they will probably reach such a high degree of tension among themselves that the sale will not take place.

Another topic of interest regarding conversational strategies is the distinction that exists between cultures regarding the use or not of ritual formulas. Some consider that certain facts must always be commented verbally using certain ritual words, and others, in view of the same facts, consider that an extraverbal reference is only necessary on the part of the interlocutors. In this respect, there are cultures that give greater importance to the extraverbal than others, because they do not consider it necessary to use words before certain events.

In any case, it does not seem to be such a controversial topic because, as Hernández points out (1999: 144-145), verbal rites are almost always essential. And this is due to two fundamental reasons: a) they constitute a type of social agreement with which a comfortable and economic solution is given to certain situations, such as giving condolences, asking for marriage, excusing oneself, etc. and b) the verbal ritual component is functionally necessary since it allows to create the framework or point of reference from which to distance ourselves to give a formal character and meaning to our expressions because the occasion so requires. In this sense, the differences in a conversation can be given depending on what they are and when the ritual verbal formulas required in each

situation must be said, which are expressed differently in each culture.

Continuing with the analysis of the strategies that must be taken into account in a conversation, one of the most important is the assessment of the silence that each participant makes during the same. Silence, as Braithwaite (1990: 321-327) points out, is the cognitive activity that favors the absence or suspension of verbal activity and, in perceptual terms, can be considered as the background that allows words to be given meaning and value. In addition, silence must be understood as something inherently associated with verbal language and its semiotic universe.

In addition, silence has had and has a very important value in the evolution of the complexity of languages since, as indicated Hernández (1999: 146), "languages evolve thanks not to their expressiveness, but rather to their lack of expressiveness, or deficit expressiveness, which continuously tries to be countered or overcome. A parenthesis of silence is necessary as a prelude to any creative act." In this way, silence is an act (or a non-act) that communicates as much as a verbal expression.

Considered that way, and understanding that the valuation of silence is the valuation of another way of communicating, we must bear in mind that, in a conversation, we can meet people who have different ways of considering silence, according to their cultural code. In this regard, we can speak of cultural ethos in which silence has a greater presence, compared to others in which the word is more relevant. In this regard, it seems that the positive assessment of silence has to do with the fact that, as it is rarely abandoned, when it is done it is understood that it is because of a real need to make authentic verbal expressions. On the other hand, the positive evaluation of the word depends on the degree to which it clarifies the ambiguous social relations and determines the social position of the people who talk. Thus, the value of the word will be more consistent with cultures in which social relations are more indeterminate or unpredictable, and the valuation of silence in those in which the social structure determines fixed and predictable relationships.

With regard to the introduction of silence in a conversation, it can be said that on certain occasions it acts as an expressive means of a concrete communicative action. In this way, the functional value of the same and the ability of

speakers to discriminate what function meets according to the conversational context in which it is located, will make a conversational exchange requires a smaller number of verbal expressions. On the other hand, as we have indicated previously, the functional value of the silences in an intercultural conversation will depend on the evaluation of these participants in it. Thus, it is possible to discover quite important divergences in the different pragmatic-cultural domains with respect to the appearance of silences with significant intentionality according to which contexts.

In an already classic study on the evaluation of silences in conversations, Basso (1971: 215 et seq.) Indicates that there are cultures in which the use of the word is insufficient to establish a new social relationship or to repair a social relationship. transiently broken. To be able to access the use of the word in these situations, it is necessary first to maintain a period of silence in which the substrate is created, which, later, will make the use of the word feasible and justified. In this sense, this assumption of the use of the word is very different from other cultures in which, to initiate a new social relationship or repair another that was transiently broken, the use of the word is needed.

In another research on the use of silences in the intercultural conversational field, Scollon and Scollon (1981: 33-49) focus on the difference between cultures regarding who should take the initiative of a communicative exchange in a job interview. . For the members of some cultures, it is necessary that in the conversations, it is the person of dominant social position (in this case the interviewer) who takes the initiative over the dominated position (in this case the interviewee). Therefore, when a component of one of these cultures goes to a job interview, it will always wait for the person who receives it to take the initiative and lead the conversation. However, in another type of cultures the opposite occurs: it is expected that the person of a lower social position will speak and try to convince the interviewer of their aptitude for such work.

For this reason, if a job interview is set up with an interviewer who expects the interviewee to take the initiative and vice versa, there will be an uncomfortable situation among the interlocutors who will remain silent waiting for the other to take the initiative. This

circumstance could lead to the end of it due to cultural misunderstandings. And, while some cultures expect the subject of dominant social position to be exhibited, in others it is preferred that it be a mere spectator who evaluates the capacity of the dominated position, who must take the initiative in the conversational act. . In this sense, to avoid conflicts, each interlocutor must take charge of the nature of certain social encounters in each culture, as well as the roles associated with the use of the word or the silence that they have in it.

Finally, the last of the conversational strategies that we are going to deal with here is that of non-verbal communication. The first thing that must be pointed out is that, although there have been numerous approaches to the subject throughout the history of linguistics, it was Merleau-Ponty who, in his work *Phénoménologie de la Perception* (1945), showed that both the elements Paraverbal, the proxemics, as the kinésica had the same communicative value as the verbal elements. And it is that even this as those have an essential value to understand the ways of communicating people. We, here, will focus on the study of two of the most important subdisciplines of nonverbal communication that intervene more frequently in intercultural conversational acts, such as proxemics and kinesics.

As regards the proxemics, within it a series of aspects that have to do with the scenario in which the conversational exchange is going to be developed are included. Among them, one of the most interesting for the study of Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics, is the distance that the interlocutors must maintain among themselves. As we pointed out earlier, there are cultures that need less proximity for a conversational act to take effect and others, however, that need more distance to not feel their image in danger. In this respect, in an intercultural conversational exchange between two people with opposite conceptions regarding the distance that must be maintained, it is necessary that previously an agreement be reached between both so that the two feel comfortable talking.

More interesting if possible is the study of kinésica in intercultural conversational exchanges. And is that many of the gestures used by speakers, apart from serving as deictic marks of what is said and sometimes function as regulators of certain conversational strategies, also play, as Poyatos (1994) points out,

representative functions of language. The variability of this function also moves according to the pragmatic code by which the different cultures are governed. As an example it would be worth pointing out that, with the same gesture with which the Spaniards indicate that we want to eat, in China they indicate that they want to talk. Therefore, in an intercultural conversation in which the interlocutors do not know the non-verbal code, misunderstandings associated with the meanings that each culture attributes to the different gestures can also occur.

How to Avoid Misunderstandings in Intercultural Conversational Acts. The Use of Interlinguistic Pragmatics from a Cross-Cultural Approach

At the moment when two speakers coming from different cultures come into conversational contact, misunderstandings, conflicts and pragmatic-linguistic errors may occur due to ignorance of their respective pragmatic codes. And it is that, following Garnica (1998: 45-55), we must bear in mind that the exercise of conversation involves breaking into the territory of the other in some way. Therefore, in the same way that normally great care is taken to avoid physical shocks with unknown persons, the same should occur with conversational contact: we must avoid as much as possible, and to the extent of the possibilities of each speaker, the emergence of misunderstandings and conflicts.

In this line, as Essama (2008: 41) points out, "it is very frequent that two people collide with each other's linguistic-cultural barrier when they come into contact for the first time, because until they have the opportunity to learn the uses, the customs and, above all, the pragmatic code of their interlocutor, will commit functional errors typical of intercultural communication ". In this respect, Thomas (1983: 93 et seq.) Refers to two main types of error in intercultural conversation: the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic. The first one has to do with the incorrect valuation of the performative or interactive value symbolically associated with a certain linguistic form. To exemplify this error, we present the following conversation:

French host: Will you drink cognac?

Irish Guest: Thank you (said man wanted cognac but he was not served)"

This error has to do, as Blum-Kulka points out (1996: 185-186) with the difference in degree between the French and Irish inhabitants when it

comes to expressing their intentions in a clear or transparent way. While the Frenchman expects the answer to be direct and diaphanous, the Irishman expresses his wishes wrapped in a courteous statement.

The second error is related to the incorrect assessment of the context of use of a pragmatic category. As an example of this error, we are presented with the case of a Swedish teenager who visited an exchange visit to France and started calling all the adults of you, when he had to do it for you. In this case, the problem is that the Swedish teenager has ignored the difference in status that French culture attributes to adults from those who are not yet.

Although these two types of errors are of a very subtle nature (they are only incurred in very specific conversational contexts), there are other cases of errors of a more frequent pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic nature. Thus, Márquez-Reiter (1998: 143-155) points out the case of Spanish speakers who use the imperative mode in the English language inappropriately when asking them to inform them of the time it is. So, instead use the courteous expression: Could you tell me what time it is? they ask for it saying Tell me the time, which is a serious attack against the social image of the other person and demonstrates an essential ignorance of the treatment formulas that must be used when addressing an unknown person.

However, this type of error has a simple solution, which is none other than that of the employment on the part of the speaker of the foreign language of the Interlinguistic Pragmatics. It is located within what is called transcultural competence and is that the learner of the foreign language enters the pragmatic-linguistic code of culture, and study in a practical way and the appropriate verbal expressions and markers for each conversational situation. The peculiarity that Interlinguistic Pragmatics presents is that this analysis of the pragmatic code is done by comparing it with that of the culture of origin.

In this regard, as Ardila (2002-2003: 18-20) points out, any transcultural approach carried out from the perspective of Interlinguistic Pragmatics must provide the student with an advanced knowledge of the manifest differences between the protocol of a language and a culture. and a determined foreign language, in order to articulate a pragmatic code of conduct

in the foreign language that avoids conflicts that would otherwise inevitably arise. It is, then, to adopt an essentially anthropological perspective and analyze the connotations of the messages expressed by each culture in identical situations, considering both the discourse and the paralinguistic characteristics of it. And, as Escavy (2011: 171) correctly points out, "every society has its behavior codes codified in urbanity, which are usually accompanied by linguistic condensations that accompany the performance, of verbal formulas suitable for that purpose, along with the way to execute the verbal act itself".

And is that to avoid conflicts and misunderstandings in a conversation, a very important issue is to respect the rules of courtesy marked by the other culture. For this, as indicated by Goffman (1955), foreigners have to carry out an image work in their relations with the natives of the language, in order to ensure that the communicative exchange is cordial and preserve the images of the people participating in the dialogue and the societies that each of them represents. In this regard, it must be made clear that knowing a language in a holistic way means not only learning its grammar rules of operation, but knowing how to use it socially in interpersonal relationships, as circumstances dictate.

Thus, it seems fundamental to us that the speaker of a foreign language knows all the aspects that can be related to the Interlinguistic Pragmatics in order to commit serious pragmatic errors since, if he does not do so, he will offer a poorly maintained image and be exposed to suffer the detriment of other speakers. In this regard, we must not forget that not only will the image be damaged but that of the entire group of learners of that language who have their same origin, since the human mind usually categorizes the individual facts elevating them to the status of universals.

The Development in the Speaker / Listener of a Complete Intercultural Linguistic Competence. The Need to Implement it in the Teaching of Foreign Languages

To finish delineating the ideal model of intercultural conversation, we believe that its delineation requires, in addition to the study of the Interlinguistic Pragmatics of the foreign language, for the acquisition and development of the intercultural linguistic competence of the participants of the same in the foreign language

classes. And it is that, since in the intercultural conversation members of all cultures will take part, each one with its own pragmatic code, a general solution to try to avoid misunderstandings and conflicts is that each one of its members develops this competence.

It can be defined, following Friedman and Berthoin (2005: 75) as:

"The ability of the individual to explore their own life repertoire and actively build an appropriate strategy to communicate with others. The intercultural competence involves, then, the separation of the limitations inherent in the repertoire of the person, culturally shaped, and the creation of new responses, expanding, therefore, the repertoire of possible interpretations and behaviors available in cultural interactions.

In this way, intercultural competence combines the existence of several cultural representations: one on the own culture (cultural self-perception), another on other cultures (vision of the other) and a third resulting from the intercultural experiences that the person has experienced.

According to this, we believe that the most appropriate place for the development of intercultural competence would be the foreign language classes, in which historically this aspect has not always been worked on. Thus, going back in time, and following Aarup (1994: 43 et seq.), We must point out that traditional language teaching separated the study of language and culture, limiting itself to presenting political systems, institutions, customs, traditions and folklore of the country in question. In addition, cultural elements were often presented as static, with fixed patterns that had to be known and learned, without deepening the meaning of cultural signs or considering the needs of students with the aim of providing resources to avoid situations of misunderstandings and conflicts in the conversation.

However, as Oliveras points out (2000: 32 et seq.), Since the eighties and up to the present day, studies on the teaching of foreign culture have been changing and have gone from emphasizing the simple transmission of knowledge to give greater importance to cultural education as an integral part of language communication learning, preparing students for intercultural communication. In this way, the accent falls on the cultural aspect of language teaching, and the starting point is to focus more on the student's relationship with the culture

they are learning, in order to be able to relate to the people that make up the language.

But in order to implement this pedagogical method, the first thing that has been done is to study the most common problems of people who live in a culture for a long period. In this way, Schumann (1975: 215 and ss.) Came to the conclusion that they are, above all three:

- a. linguistic shock, with frustrating feelings due to the lack of competence in the foreign language,
- b. pragmatic-cultural shock, due to the fact that the usual communicative strategies of their own language do not work to solve problems and
- c. cultural stress, caused by issues of identity due to a change of social status in the foreign culture with respect to the native one.

Once the main difficulties are determined, Taft (1981: 53-88), among others, has proposed that the pedagogical strategies to save them should be implemented holistically, that is, looking for general objectives through their combination. In this regard, they should move towards:

- a. Increase the role of personality and identity of students. In this sense, it is sought that the person who has learned the foreign language continues to be herself in an intercultural contact.
- b. Develop intercultural empathy. It is considered necessary to increase the cognitive ability of the learner of a foreign language and culture to understand a different point of view and know how to situate it in one's own culture. This ability includes interpreting not only verbal responses, but also nonverbal ones.
- c. Prepare students of the foreign language to be intercultural actors, with the function of acting as mediators of two cultures in contact.

Well, established the problems and goals to achieve, the didactic ways that are currently applied in the teaching of foreign languages to move from one to another have been commanded by authors such as Ouellet, Kane and Barro and focus, on the one hand, in the acquisition of linguistic skills of the foreign language and, on the other, in the familiarization of students with pedagogical methods that focus on the active observation of cultural habits that develop in the target civilization.

In this regard, as Leiva (2013: 109) points out, "it is culture that gives meaning to one's personal reality, since it permeates all social events, which are historically constructed and shared by the members of a community". And it is that each person perceives and lives the reality from the mental schemes that mark their own culture, within which is one of the most decisive elements for the development of the communication of the person: the pragmatic-linguistic code.

Assuming this fact, so that there is understanding in a conversation between two people of different cultures, it is necessary that each of the participants be open and receptive to the knowledge of the values, norms, habits, customs, etc. that prevail in the pragmatic code of the interlocutor. That is, it is about each member of the conversational act acquiring sufficient training to understand the cultural positions of the other in aspects that may be conflicting. And this is one of the aspects that deepens the intercultural linguistic competence.

According to this, we must bear in mind that to train people with intercultural linguistic competence, it is necessary that the foreign language classes deepen in the development of the communicative approach. And it is that, according to Areizaga (2000: 195), "from the communicative approach it is understood that the target culture constitutes the context in which communication makes sense, and for this reason, it is expected that it be the predominant methodology to the time to teach the classes." From our point of view, nothing better than the use of this path since, since the meaning is built on the interaction between linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the world, the student will acquire both skills from the pragmatic code of the learned culture.

Also, to get students to achieve this type of intercultural communicative competence, we believe that the first step should be the acquisition of greater competence in the foreign language, since it is essential to begin to interpret the cultural features of that area. In this line, and as Harder (1980) points out, if the student lacks this linguistic competence, he will be unaware of the most important cultural asset of every human group: his own language. Once they have acquired linguistic competence in the language with a level at least acceptable, the teacher must propose to their students activities in which they are personally involved and in

which they have to observe, describe, analyze, interpret and reflect on the foreign culture, in order to combine their own affective experiences with the effective knowledge of it.

In this way, if the student reaches these objectives, he will have a good part of the way traveled for the achievement of intercultural communicative competence. Such competence, as Gago (2010: 236) points out, "will guarantee the empowerment of the person to play an active social role in the context of the society of others". And it is that the objective of intercultural communicative competence is not only to provide the person who possesses the necessary knowledge to understand and explain the culture of the country from outside, but also instructs it so that it can become involved internally playing social actions with the native members of that community

In this sense, intercultural linguistic competence can be segmented, following Byram, Zárate and Neuner (1997: 50-54), in:

- a. knowledge of how social groups and social identities work, both their own and those of others ,
- b. skills to compare, interpret and relate (for example, a document or event from another culture, explaining and relating it to documents or events of one's own culture),
- c. discovering and interacting skills developed in the acquisition of new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices, and in the management of knowledge, attitudes and skills of interaction in real time,
- d. critical cultural awareness, defined as the ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit and implicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products of their own cultures and countries as well as of others and
- e. attitudes of curiosity and openness towards other cultures, as well as a desire to relativize one's values, beliefs and behaviors, assuming that they are not the only ones possible by observing an external perspective to them.

For its part, in the field of education, the Council of Europe established in its Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2002: 142-143) a series of skills and abilities, related to intercultural linguistic competence, that the student of a foreign language should acquire. They are the following:

- a. Ability to relate to each other the culture of origin and foreign culture,
- b. Development of cultural sensitivity and the ability to identify and use a variety of strategies to establish contact with people from other cultures,
- c. Ability to fulfill the role of intermediary between one's own culture and foreign culture and to effectively address cultural misunderstandings and conflictive situations; and
- d. The ability to overcome stereotyped relationships.

In this way, through the acquisition of intercultural linguistic competence, what is pursued, as noted by Salaberri (2007: 72-73), is that the learner of a foreign language will focus on the study of the use they make of the language. language, the native speakers of the same in their social and cultural contexts, with the aim of practicing this use for themselves and thus lay the foundations for communicative success in a possible intercultural encounter with them. For this, an author such as Trujillo (2003: 36) has proposed the concept of rich socialization, which refers to the presence of students in different contexts of socialization where they can develop interculturality in contact with other individuals and other communities.

In line with what has been said, we should not forget, as Černý (1998: 473 points out), that "concepts and stereotypes about other cultures are provided from childhood within education. Through the mother tongue, we are given certain doses of disgust or even hatred towards other different population groups. " For this reason, we believe that the best way to eliminate possible prejudices and stereotypes that students of the foreign language have about the culture and its members is to implement a critical anthropological vision that breaks down one culture and compares it with others. in order to prove that there are more similarities than differences.

On the other hand, through the development of intercultural communicative competence, an author such as Casmir (1993: 410 and ss.) Has proposed the construction of a third culture to overcome communication barriers between speakers of different cultures. Thus, in the event that there is a conversation between two people who have no knowledge of the pragmatic code

of the other, the proposal is to create a subculture of their own through which their communicative exchange is governed. In this way, it will be the communicative exchanges and the personal experience of the two speakers that will adapt to their measure the third culture, which must meet the requirement of having an equidistant distance with respect to the other two that are put into play.

In this way, the third culture aims to reconfigure the cultural differences of each of the participants so that they are accommodated in a situation in which there is no clash or intercultural confrontation. Thus, the construction of the same facilitates and promotes the acquisition and development of new ways of thinking and acting that, in turn, enrich the interaction by providing communicative bases. Therefore, it is necessary, as indicated by Vivas (2008: 10), that each participant learn something of the language and culture of the other, relativizing the value of their own culture and thus attenuating the attitude of strangeness that they can produce in them. An unknown pragmatic code.

CONCLUSIONS

Once this research in which we have tried to formulate and develop an ideal model of intercultural conversational act, we have reached a series of conclusions on which other researchers may agree or disagree. They refer to the pragmatic strategies that should be included in the ideal model of intercultural conversation. They are the following:

In the first place, the participants in an ideal intercultural conversation should respect in a flexible and empathetic way the maximum communicative principles of cooperation, courtesy and relevance. For this, it is especially important that both participants fulfill their role as transmitters and recipients in the most collaborative and active way possible, as this allows them to bridge existing pragmatic-linguistic differences, thus avoiding any type of conflict or misunderstanding that may arise.

In relation to the principle of cooperation, speakers must observe the four maxims of which it is composed (quantity, quality, relation and manner). To do this, they must consider that both the culture to which each participant belongs, as well as the situational context in which they find themselves, will condition the amount of information that is necessary to

provide the other, the nature and reliability of the tests. that they prove that the information is true, how focused is the intervention of the speakers with respect to the subject of which they are speaking and also the linguistic form - simple or complex- in which a statement is formulated.

Referring to the principle of courtesy, the participants in the conversation should try, as far as possible, to learn and master the pragmatic strategies in which courtesy is expressed in the code of their interlocutors. In this sense, we must consider that many of the problems that occur in the conversation come because the speakers make pragmatic errors due to the different degree of application of the courtesy in each culture. In our opinion, the best way to avoid them or solve them will be given by the development of intercultural linguistic competence, which will be reflected in the use by users of cross-cultural interlinguistic strategies appropriate to each conversational context.

Regarding the principle of relevance, native speakers must take into account the level of linguistic competence of the speakers who are speaking in a foreign language. The ability to interpret more or less complicated statements and to decode and interpret those in which there are more implicit references will depend on their greater or lesser competence. For this reason, the solution is given because the issuer tries to encrypt as little as possible their statements and, at the same time, that the speaker of the foreign language spends as much time as possible interacting with native members.

Secondly, it is necessary that the participants in the conversation master the verbal and non-verbal aspects of the person with whom they are interacting. It would be a mistake to think that it is enough to master the linguistic code of the other, when it is very common for the intentions of a discourse to be expressed through the use of the non-linguistic code.

We must consider in this regard, that the nonverbal aspects fulfill a plurifunctional task in the conversations and can have very varied missions, such as: adding information (or nuanced) to the content or meaning of a verbal statement, can serve to communicate something to another person as occasional substitutes for verbal language, they can be used to regulate the communicative interaction, they can be used to correct existing verbal deficiencies and grant the

possibility to the same person to hold two conversations simultaneously.

Third, another key to successful intercultural conversation is that each of the participants considers their social position with respect to each other. Once this is done, the speaker of greater social power should try to minimize the social distance that could separate him from the other, trying to make the latter feel as comfortable as possible. For its part, the dominated social position should accept the invitation to approach the other person, always safeguarding the image of his interlocutor and his own.

Around this issue of social distance between participants, they must consider the place where they are in relation to each other, regardless of the culture to which they belong. According to this, the social distance between the two will be measured around two axes: one in which the degree of knowledge among the speakers is weighted and another in which their position is measured within the social structure to which belong. The interrelation between these two factors will depend to a large extent on the use of pragmatic or other strategies, although always considering that the conversation is a dynamic act in which other elements intervene (contexts, personal attitudes, spatial disposition of people, etc.).

Fourth, and as the axiomatic factor that would serve as the backbone of the entire intercultural conversational act, we would have the development of intercultural competence in each of the participants, which in turn would allow them to make use of Interlinguistic Pragmatics from a reflective perspective. and criticism of the pragmatic-cultural codes of the people who participate in the conversation (including their own). From our point of view, the best way to acquire this intercultural linguistic competence is in the foreign language classes. From them, the learning must be implemented not only of the language in question, but also of the issues related to pragmatic-cultural aspects that will have application in future conversations between the learners and the native people.

In any case and to finish, we believe that more studies should be done in order to perfect this model of ideal intercultural conversation on a practical basis. And we must not forget that it is in the real interaction where this theoretical model is going to make sense. In this regard, it would be interesting if other countries other than

English-speaking people did research on Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics in conversational acts between people from different backgrounds, in order that the data could be richer and palliated, to a certain extent, the cultural ethnocentrism that makes all the investigations revolve around the contrast between the Anglo-American language, culture and Pragmatics and those of other civilizations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aarup, A. (1995). Defining Intercultural Competence. A Discussion of its Essential Components and Prerequisites. En L. Sercu (ed.) *Intercultural Competence*, Volumen I. Aalborg: Ed. Aalborg University Press, pp. 41-52.
- [2] Anscombe, J. C. y Ducrot, O. (1983). *La argumentación en la lengua*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- [3] Ardila, J. A. G. (2002-2003). El aprendizaje transcultural en el currículum de lenguas extranjeras, *Encuentro Revista de Investigación e innovación en la clase de idiomas*, N° 13-14, pp. 12-22.
- [4] Areizaga, E. (2000). El componente cultural en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras, *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, N° 9, pp. 194-202.
- [5] Austin, J. L. (1962). *Cómo hacer cosas con palabras*. Barcelona: Editorial Paidós.
- [6] Auwera, J. van der (1979). Pragmatic Presupposition: Shared Beliefs in a Theory of Irrefutable Meaning. En C. K. Oh y D. A. Dinneen (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 11: Presupposition*. New York, San Francisco, London: Ed. Academic Press, pp.249-264.
- [7] Basso, K. H. (1971). 'To Give up on Words'. Silence in Western Apache Culture, *Southwest Journal of Anthropology*, N° 26, pp. 213-230.
- [8] Bertuccelli, M. (1993). *¿Qué es la Pragmática?* Barcelona: Editorial Paidós.
- [9] Blum-Kulka, S. (1996). Introducción a la Pragmática del interlenguaje. En J. Cenoz y J. F. Valencia (eds.), *La competencia pragmática: elementos lingüísticos y psicosociales*. Bilbao: Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco, pp. 155-175.
- [10] Bourdieu, P. (1982). *¿Qué significa hablar? Economía de los intercambios verbales*. Madrid: Editorial Akal.
- [11] Braithwaite, C. A. (1990). Communicative Silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis. En D. Carbaugh (ed.), *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*. New Jersey: Ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 321-327.
- [12] Briz, A. (2000). Las unidades de la conversación. En A. Briz y Grupo Val.Es.Co., *¿Cómo se comenta un texto coloquial?* Barcelona: Editorial Ariel Practicum, pp. 51-80.
- [13] Brown, P. y Levinson S. (1987) *Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena*. Cambridge: Ed. Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Byram, M., Zárata, G y Neuner, G. (1997). *Sociocultural Competence in Language Learning and Teaching*. Strasbourg: Ed. Council of Europe.
- [15] Carrasco, A. (1999). Revisión y evaluación del modelo de cortesía de Brown & Levinson, *Revista Pragmalingüística*, N° 7, pp. 1-44.
- [16] Carston, R. (2004). Relevance Theory and the Saying / Implicating Distinction. En L. R. Horn y G. Ward, *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Ed. Blackwell, pp. 633-656.
- [17] Casmir, F. L. (1993). Third-Culture Building: A Paradigm Shift for International and Intercultural Communication. En S. A. Deetz, *Communication Yearbook/16*. London, Ed. Sage, pp. 407-428.
- [18] Castro, A. (1966). *La realidad histórica de España*. Ciudad de México: Editorial Porrúa.
- [19] Černý, J. (1998). *Historia de la lingüística*. Cáceres: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Extremadura.
- [20] Cestero, A. M. (2006). La comunicación no verbal y el estudio de su incidencia en fenómenos discursivos como la ironía, *Revista ELUA*, N° 20, pp. 57-77.
- [21] Cicourel, A. V. (1992). The interpretation of communicative contexts: examples from medical encounters. En A. Duranti y C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context. Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Ed. Cambridge University Press, pp. 291-310.
- [22] Consejo de Europa (2002). *Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas: aprendizaje, enseñanza, evaluación*. Madrid: Ed. Instituto Cervantes, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte y Anaya.
- [23] Coperías, M. J. (1998). Aproximación cultural a la Pragmática. En I. Vázquez e I. Guillén (eds.), *Perspectivas pragmáticas en Lingüística Aplicada*. Zaragoza: Anubar Ediciones, pp. 27-31.
- [24] Coseriu, E. (1967). *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*. Barcelona: Editorial Gredos.
- [25] Cots, J. M. et al. (1990). Conversa(r). *Caplletra: Revista de Filología*, N° 7, pp. 51-72.
- [26] Ducrot, O. (1986). *El decir y lo dicho. Polifonía de la enunciación*. Barcelona: Editorial Paidós.
- [27] Escandell, M. V. (1996). *Introducción a la Pragmática*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.

- [28] Escandell, M. V. (2005). *La comunicación*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- [29] Escavy, R. (2002). Las relaciones pragmalingüísticas y el marco intercultural. En M. Pérez y J. Coloma (eds.), *El español, lengua del mestizaje y la interculturalidad: actas del XIII Congreso Internacional de la Asociación para la Enseñanza del Español como Lengua Extranjera, ASELE, Murcia, 2-5 octubre de 2002*. Madrid: Centro Virtual Cervantes, pp. 17-39.
- [30] Escavy, R. (2011). *Pragmática y subjetividad lingüística*. Murcia: Editum.
- [31] Escavy, R. (2009). *Pragmática y textualidad*. Murcia: Editum.
- [32] Essama, B. (2008). Bases para una mediación intercultural e interlingüística: aspectos antropológicos y socioculturales. En A. Moreno, *El valor de la diversidad (meta) lingüística: Actas del VIII Congreso de Lingüística General*, pp. 33-47.
- [33] Fant, L. (1989). Cultural mismatch in conversation: Spanish and Scandinavian communicative behavior in negotiation setting, *Revista Hermès*, Nº 3, pp. 247-265.
- [34] Friedman, V. y Berthoin, A. (2005). Negotiating Reality: A Theory of Action Approach to Intercultural Competence, *Revista Management Learning*, Nº 36, pp. 69-86.
- [35] Fuentes, C. (2000). *Lingüística pragmática y análisis del discurso*. Madrid: Editorial Arco/Libros.
- [36] Gago, E. (2010). El desarrollo de la competencia intercultural en el aula de ELE, *Revista Analecta Malacitana (AnMal Electrónica)*, Nº 29, pp. 221-239.
- [37] Gallardo, B. (1997). El sobreentendido, *Revista Pragmalingüística*, Nº 3-4, pp.351-381.
- [38] Gallardo, B. (1991). Pragmática y análisis conversacional: hacia una Pragmática del receptor, *Revista Sintagma*, Nº 3, pp. 25-38.
- [39] Garnica, A. (1998). Lo que queremos decir cuando hablamos o el aspecto pragmático de la lingüística. En J. M. Oro y J. Varela, *Diálogo de culturas*. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, pp. 45-55.
- [40] Geertz, C. [1997(1973)]. *La interpretación de las culturas*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa.
- [41] Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Revista Psychiatry*, Nº 18, pp. 213-231.
- [42] Goffman, E. [1991 (1964)]. El olvido de la situación. En Y. Winkin, *Los momentos y sus hombres. Textos seleccionados y presentados*. Barcelona: Ed. Paidós, pp. 129-134.
- [43] Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. En P. Cole y J. L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts*, volumen 3. New York: Ed. Academic, pp. 41-58.
- [44] Guervós, J. D. S. (2005). Retórica, Pragmática y Lingüística de la Comunicación, *Revista de Investigación Lingüística*, Volumen III, pp. 177-208.
- [45] Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. London: Ed. Cambridge University Press.
- [46] Gutiérrez, S. (2002). *De Pragmática y Semántica*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- [47] Harder, P. (1980). Discourse as self-expression on the reduced personality of the Second Language Learner, *Revista Applied Linguistics*, Nº1, pp. 262-270.
- [48] Hernández, C. (1999). *Culturas y acción comunicativa. Introducción a la Pragmática intercultural*. Barcelona: Editorial Octaedro.
- [49] Hernández, C. (2003). Interculturalidad, Transculturalidad y valores de la acción comunicativa. En Grupo CRIT, *Claves para la comunicación intercultural*. Castellón: Editorial de la Universidad Jaume I, pp. 17-35.
- [50] Huchtby, I. y Drew, P. (1995). Conversation analysis. En J. Verschueren et al., *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam y Philadelphia: Ed. John Benjamins, pp. 182-189.
- [51] Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. En J. J. Gumperz y D. H. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Nueva York: Ed. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp. 35-71.
- [52] Jakobson, R. [1981(1963)]. *Ensayos de lingüística general*. Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral.
- [53] Kasper, G. (1989). Interactive procedures in interlanguage discourse. En W. Oleksy (ed.), *Contrastive Pragmatics*. Philadelphia: Ed. John Benjamins, pp. 189-229.
- [54] Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1986). *L'Implicite*. Paris: Ed. Colin.
- [55] Knapp, K. y Knapp-Potthoff. (1987). Instead of an introduction: Conceptual issues in analyzing intercultural communication. En K. Knapp, W. Enninger y A. Knapp-Potthoff (eds.), *Analyzing Intercultural Communication*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Ed. Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-13.
- [56] Kreuz, R. y Roberts, R. M. (1993). When collaboration fails: Consequences of pragmatics errors in conversation, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Nº19, pp. 239-252.
- [57] Lakoff, R. (1973). La lógica de la cortesía, o acuérdate de dar las gracias. En María Teresa Julio y Ricardo Muñoz (1998), *Textos clásicos*

- de Pragmática*. Madrid: Editorial Arco/Libros, pp. 259-278.
- [58] Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London, New York: Ed. Longman.
- [59] Leiva, J. J. (2013). Relaciones interpersonales en contextos de Educación Intercultural: un estudio cualitativo, *Dedica. Revista de Educação e Humanidades*, Nº4, pp. 109-128.
- [60] Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmática*. Barcelona: Editorial Teide.
- [61] Lewandoswska-Tomaszczyk, B. (1989). Praising and complimenting. En W. Oleksy (ed.), *Contrastive Pragmatics*. Philadelphia: Ed. John Benjamins, pp. 73-100.
- [62] Liebe-Harkort, M. (1989). Interactive ethnolinguistics. En W. Oleksy (ed.), *Contrastive Pragmatics*. Philadelphia: Ed. John Benjamins, pp. 101-111.
- [63] Lorés, R. (1998). S = D + P + I ¿Un proceso sumativo?, *Revista Bibliid*, Nº 5-6, pp. 297-317.
- [64] Malinowski, B. (1923). The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. En C. K. Ogden y I. A. Richard, *The meaning of meaning: a study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism*. London: Ed. Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 296-336.
- [65] Maltz, D. N. y Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. En J. J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 195-216.
- [66] Márquez-Reiter, R. (1998). Sensitising Spanish Learners of English to Cultural Differences: The Case of Politeness. En M. Pütz (ed.), *The Cultural Context in Foreign Language Teaching*. Frankfurt: Ed. Peter Lang, pp. 143-155.
- [67] Martín, L. (1996). Lenguaje y género. Descripción y explicación de la diferencia, en *Revista Signos. Teoría y Práctica de la Educación*, Nº 16, pp. 6-17.
- [68] Merleau-Ponty. (1945): *Phénoménologie de la Perception*. Paris: Ed. Gallimard.
- [69] Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [70] Meyer, M. (1991). Developing Transcultural Competence: Case Studies of Advanced Foreign Language Learners. En D. Butjes y M. Byram (eds.), *Developing Languages and Cultures*. Clevedon: Ed. Multilingual Matters, pp. 136-158.
- [71] Morant, R. y Peñarroya, M. (1995). *Llenguatge i Cultura. Per a una ecologia lingüística*. Valencia: Ed. Universidad de Valencia.
- [72] Neubert, A. y Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as Text*. Ken, Ohio and London: Ed. Kent State University Press.
- [73] Oliveras, A. (2000). *Hacia la competencia intercultural en el aprendizaje de una lengua extranjera. Estudio del choque cultural y los malentendidos*. Barcelona: Editorial Edinumen.
- [74] Olza, I. (2005). Hablar es ‘también’ una cuestión de cultura. Introducción a la Pragmática contrastiva o intercultural, *Revista Hipertexto*, Nº1, pp. 81-101.
- [75] Palmer, G. (2000). *Lingüística cultural*. Madrid: Editorial Alianza.
- [76] Pons, S. (2004). *Conceptos y aplicaciones de la Teoría de la Relevancia*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- [77] Poyatos, F. (1994). *La comunicación no verbal: I Cultura, lenguaje y comunicación; II Paralenguaje, kinésica e interacción; III Nuevas perspectivas en novela y teatro y en su traducción*. Madrid: Editorial Itsmo.
- [78] Raga, F. (2012). Sobre los límites de la comunicación y la mediación intercultural. En M. E. Placencia y C. García, *Pragmática y comunicación intercultural en el mundo hispanohablante*. Nueva York / Amsterdam: Editorial Rodopi, pp. 3-24.
- [79] Real Academia Española (2013). *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*. Disponible en <http://lema.rae.es/drae/> (Última consulta: 12/09/2013).
- [80] Reyes, G. (1995). *El abecé de la Pragmática*. Madrid: Editorial Arco/Libros.
- [81] Reyes, G. (1990). *La Pragmática lingüística. El estudio del uso del lenguaje*. Barcelona: Editorial Montesinos.
- [82] Sacks, H., Schefloff, E. A. y Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking in conversation, *Revista Language*, Nº 50, volumen 4, pp. 696-735.
- [83] Salaberri, M. S. (2007). Competencia comunicativa intercultural. Intercultural communicative competence, *Revista Perspectiva CEP*, Nº 13, pp. 61-76.
- [84] Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York: Ed. Brace & World.
- [85] Searle, J. [1980 (1969)]. *Actos de habla*. Madrid: Editorial Cátedra.
- [86] Searle, J. (1995). Una taxonomía de los actos ilocucionarios. En L. Valdés Villanueva (ed.), *La búsqueda del significado*, Madrid: Ed. Tecnos, pp. 449-476.
- [87] Schiffrin, D. (2011). Definiciones de discurso, *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, Nº 13, pp. 1-33.
- [88] Schumann, J. H. (1975). Affective factors and the problem of age in Second Language Acquisition, *Revista Language Learning*, Volumen 25, Nº 1, pp. 209-235.

Theoretical Foundation for the Pragmatic Study of Conversational Acts from a Didactic and Intercultural Perspective

- [89] Scollon, R. y Scollon, S. W. (1994). *Intercultural Communication*. Oxford & Cambridge: Ed. Blackwell.
- [90] Scollon, R. y Scollon, S. W. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood (New Jersey): Ed. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- [91] Sperber, D. y Wilson, D. (1986). *La relevancia*. Madrid: Editorial Visor. Lingüística y Conocimiento.
- [92] Strawson, P. F. (1950). On referring. *Revista Mind*, N°59, pp. 320-344.
- [93] Taft, R. (1981). The Role and Personality of the Mediator. En S. Bochner (ed.) *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*. Cambridge: Ed. Schenkman, pp. 53-88.
- [94] Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure, *Revista Applied Linguistics*, N° 4, pp. 91-112.
- [95] Trujillo, F. (2005). En torno a la interculturalidad: reflexiones sobre cultura y comunicación para la didáctica de la lengua, *Porta Linguarum, Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras*, N° 4, pp. 23-40.
- [96] Tusón, A. (1997). *Análisis de la conversación*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel Practicum.
- [97] Tusón, A. (2002). El análisis de la conversación: entre la estructura y el sentido, *Revista de Estudios de Sociolingüística. Linguas, sociedades e culturas*, N° 3, pp. 133-153.
- [98] Van Dijk. T. (1980). *Estructuras y funciones del discurso*. México D. F.: Editorial Siglo Veintiuno.
- [99] Vivas, J. (2008). Un acercamiento a la Pragmática Intercultural en la clase de ELE, *Revista Electrónica Elenet*, N° 4, pp. 1-12.
- [100] Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge: Ed. MIT Press.
- [101] Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin, New York: Editorial Mouton de Gruyter.
- [102] Yule, G. (1998). *El lenguaje*. Madrid: Editorial Akal.
- [103] Yus, F. (2003). *Cooperación y relevancia: dos aproximaciones pragmáticas a la interpretación*. Alicante: Ed. Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante.

Citation: Andrés Montaner Bueno, Ana Montaner Bueno. "Theoretical Foundation for the Pragmatic Study of Conversational Acts from a Didactic and Intercultural Perspective, 2(4), 2018, pp. 37-72.

Copyright: © 2018 Andrés Montaner Bueno. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.