The Intercultural Conversation: Theoretical Perspectives and Proposal for an Ideal and Pragmatical Model

Andrés Montaner Bueno*, Ana Montaner Bueno

Department of Language and Literature Didactics, University of Murcia, Spain

Corresponding Author: *Andrés Montaner Bueno, Department of Language and Literature Didactics, University of Murcia, Spain, Email: andres.montaner@um.es*

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to make a pragmatic model conversation between people of different cultures from the point of view of the Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics. To complete our purposes, we use a specific methodology in which the connection between language and social anthropology is expressed: ethnomethodology. To achieve that, we have previously pointed a series of theoretical considerations related to how affect different cultural influences in the generation of distinct discourses.In the same way, we think about the functions that cultural mediator, endowed with intercultural competence, performs in order to make communicative competence successful.

Keywords: *Linguistics; cultural communication; communication strategies; intercultural dialogue.*

INTRODUCTION

The main objective of this research work is the construction of an ideal model of Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics in conversational acts. 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 character organized (or structured) in turns of word" (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 1960s and early 1970s that scholars from Sociology, such as Goffman or Garfinkel; of Anthropology, such as Gumperz and Hymes or of Philosophy, such as Austin, Searle and Grice, showed the interest in studying the daily conversations of people to better understand the functioning of social and cultural life, as well as to understand how creations of meaning and their interpretations work.

Therefore, in the last decades the analysis of the conversation has been developed from a socio-cultural ethnomethodological perspective. In this line, following Hutchby and Drew (1995: 183-184), the pragmatic analysis of the conversation aims to "reveal how the technical aspects of verbal exchange are constituted in socially structured and organized resources through which the participants carry out and coordinate daily activities talking in interaction". But it is that, in addition to studying the development of different strategies and conversational skills that must be used to make communication effective, we also contemplate the analysis of them from an intercultural perspective, because we believe it is necessary to enunciate the pragmatic bases linguistics so that a conversation between speakers of different cultures can develop cordially.

In addition, 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 plays a key role in future conversations. And it is that as Coperías points out (1998: 31).

"The imparting of a cultural contextual knowledge that accompanies the linguistic will make the latter be used

effectively and not lead to misunderstandings and communication breaks in the communication exchanges between two people belonging to different cultures."

Thus, this text is formed by linking pragmatic strategies, conversation and interculturality, taking into account also 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, in the present work it is our objective to describe and base the ideal functioning, following the guidelines that other researchers have pointed out, of the dialogical acts in which participants from different cultures are involved, in order that these are successful.

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

Furthermore, in relation to this ideal model of oral conversation among intercultural actors, we also intend 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." Adequacy and flexibility in a conversation imply having the ability to solve intercultural problems resulting from 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 review and foundation of theoretical notions of Pragmatics and the delineation of a conversational model of Intercultural Linguistic Pragmatics. To do this, we have divided our research into two distinct sections. Thus, first, we made a tour of the main issues related to conversational communication exchanges. In accordance with 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 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

Secondly, a linguistic pragmatic model of ideal intercultural conversation is described based on the contributions made by other researchers in this regard. This idealization does not refer, in any case, to the fact that all the problems related to the development of intercultural conversational acts are resolved, but rather to encourage reflection on how these could be solved or alleviated in order to make communication 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.

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 or lower units and higher or dialogal units. The former are formed by statements and interventions and the latter 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.). As for the dialogical units, we find ourselves first with the concept of exchange. The same can be defined as the successive appearance of two interventions by different speakers. On the other hand, 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 Tusón (1997: 12), "we can see that definitions refer to the most typical relationships of the human species: those of coexistence, treatment and friendship."

In this line, the 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 together when and how to finish the activity.

Regarding how to start a conversation, as pointed out by Tusón (1997: 39-43), the possibilities are varied but, above all, there must be the willingness of people to carry out such a communicative exchange. In this sense, the first strategy to initiate 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 the same 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 must 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 can 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!, Happy the eyes!, Happy to see 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. . They also 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 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 pointed out by Tusón (1997: 44), they have to agree on: "a) maintain or change the subject, b) maintain or change the tone, c) maintain or change its 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 respect, both parties must know how to conclude the conversation in a non-abrupt way but that it 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 I'm in a hurry now, 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 affairs, 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 adequately 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:

- **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 ones would be marked by the organization of the space that affects communication (the park bench, the sofa in the house, the football stadium bench ...). 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 football 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 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.

- **The psychosocial characteristics of the participants:** The sex, age, social class, ethnic identity, status or knowledge background of each of the participants, will play a key 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.

- **The purposes pursued in the conversation:** These can be social (relate to a friend) or institutional (talk to a doctor about the health status of another person) and can have an individual or collective character.

- **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.

- **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.

- **The instruments that are 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.

- **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 it has to 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 shared by the speakers that have to do with concepts such as courtesy, implicature, presupposition, etc., which allow the participants to carry out processes of interpretation of the others' intentions according to what they say and how they say it.

- **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:

- The change of speaker is recurrent or, at least, occurs. That is, one of the characteristics of the conversation is that it is dialogical.

- In general, does not speak more than one person at a time.

- Overlaps (two-or more-participants speaking at the same time) are common but brief.

- The most common transitions between the words shift and the next are those that occur without intervals or overlaps, or those that occur with a short interval.

- The order of the word shifts is not fixed.

- The duration of the speaking shifts is not fixed, although there tends to be a certain balance.

- The duration of a conversation is not stipulated previously.

- What speakers say has not been previously specified.

- The distribution of the word shifts has not been previously determined.

- The number of speakers may vary.

- The speech can be continuous or discontinuous.

- There are techniques for the distribution of shifts.

- There are mechanisms to repair errors or transgressions in the taking of the word.

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 is that in the construction of conversational meanings both the emitter and the receiver intervene, but it is the latter who interprets the statements of the speaker and the first who tries to modify if the inference has not been optimal. For all this, we must bear in mind that the conversation is a dialogical act and that it is built in convergence rather than what was previously said, 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 the same 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 on 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. "It is necessary to 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:

- 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:

  - **Specifying the content or meaning of a verbal statement:** The tone, the intensity or the longest duration of some sounds will specify the type of statement that is dealt with: agree, assent, disagreement, anger, etc. Likewise, the type of voice or the facial gestures with which a statement is uttered will communicate the state of mind of the issuer.

  - **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.

  - **Reinforcing the content or meaning of a verbal statement:** It would be the case when a high tone is used when warning a child that something is not done.

  - **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 its statement.

  - **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.

  - **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.

- **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 for someone to go verbally (Would you mind leaving?) And nonverbal (making a gesture with your eyes and eyebrows towards the exit door).

- **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.

- **They correct verbal deficiencies:** The nonverbal 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.

- **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 signs or gestures to other interlocutors with whom he is face to face.

According to this, we will analyze some nonverbal 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 non-verbal elements that are very important for the full 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) oral and written verbal behavior aspects, 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.

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

> "Having a knowledge of the location, of the perception of others, of linguistic and non-linguistic aspects, of the necessary conditions for their social organization, of the characteristics attributed to the individuals involved 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 transmits unfailingly the cultural and social vision of each intervener, that its enunciation has a certain pragmatic code associated, that its acceptance and importance depends on the social position of each person

and that 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 by means of 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 it is that as Schiffrin 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 each culture.

In this sense, following Van Dijk (1980: 97 et seq.), We will define discourse as an interactive communicative event that takes place 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 that make up this 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, 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 no room for maneuver between both participants that allows, through linguistic uses, or to turn these 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 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, that 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 speech 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 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 will have its linguistic-pragmatic repercussions since it is going to have or not the possibility of addressing 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 it 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 concerns an aspect that has to do with the feedback of the speech. Thus, the use of expressions of the type mm, aha, clear-cut 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 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. Also, 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 public discourse that values more and sees better the way of communicating 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),

> "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 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 empathic nature. Thus, 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 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. In Table 1 we explain, then, what our ideal model of intercultural conversation would be like, considering the dichotomous division of them in close or distant models carried out by Raga (2012: 7).

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 regard, 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 for a particular observation of each intercultural conversation.

One aspect to highlight within the rules that govern the change of shift 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 vivacity, interest and affective involvement in the conversation, since they are the same to emphasize cordiality and empathy in conversational acts.

Another one of the rules to consider in the establishment of an intercultural conversational act, would be the opening of the same conversational frame 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 this culture relates to each other. 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 knowing 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 reaffirmations 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 answer to a compliment is gratitude, and in others there is even a tendency to express disagreement before 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 character, 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.

According to this, the most obvious conflict can 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 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 to want to talk about the business. For this reason, 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 on 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 regard, 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 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 creating 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 verbal ritual 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 it. Silence, as indicated by Braithwaite (1990: 321-327), 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 by Hernández (1999: 146),

> "Languages evolve thanks not to their expressiveness, but rather to their lack of expressiveness, or deficit expressiveness, which continually 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 and the ability of speakers to discriminate what function they fulfill according to the conversational context in which they are located, will make a conversational exchange require a smaller number of verbal expressions. On the other hand, as we have indicated previously, the functional value of silences in an intercultural conversation depends on the evaluation of these participants in it. Thus, it is possible to discover quite important divergences in the different pragmatic-cultural domains regarding the emergence 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 temporarily 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 it is the person of a lower social position who speaks and tries to convince the interviewer of his 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 between the interlocutors who will remain silent waiting for the other to take the initiative. This circumstance could end in the termination of the same because of two 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 (1945) who, showed that both the paraverbal elements, the proxemic, and the kinesthetic They 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 kinésica.

As far as the proxemics are concerned, 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 a closer proximity so that a conversational act takes 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 noted Poyatos (1994), 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 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, inescapably, 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 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 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 something 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 misunderstanding and conflicts in the conversation.

However, as Oliveras (2000: 32 et seq.) Points out, since the eighties and up to now, 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 the communicative learning of the language, 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 who 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

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 questions 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:

- **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.

- **Develop intercultural empathy:** It is considered necessary to increase the cognitive capacity of the apprentice of a foreign language and culture to understand a different point of view and know how to situate it in the own culture. This ability includes interpreting not only verbal responses, but also non-verbal ones.

- 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 one 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 in which the intercultural linguistic competence deepens the most.

According to this, it must be taken into account that in order to train people with intercultural linguistic competence, it is necessary that the foreign language classes deepen 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 the communication makes sense, and for this reason, it is expected that it is 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 in 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 should 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. This competition, as Gago (2010: 236) points out, "will guarantee the empowerment of the person to play an active

social role in the context of the company 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 of another culture, explaining it 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 the culture of origin and foreign culture to each other, 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 deal with 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 of communicative success in a possible intercultural encounter with them. For this, an author such as Trujillo (2005: 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 like Casmir (1993: 410 et seq.) 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 fulfill 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 adapt to 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 communication 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 can be produced 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, it is necessary that the participants in the conversation dominate 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 nuance) to the content or meaning of a verbal statement, can be used 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.

Second, another key to successful intercultural conversation is that each participant 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.

Regarding this issue of social distance between participants, they should 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 speakers is weighted and another in which their position within the social structure to which they are measured is measured 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.).

Thirdly, and as the axiomatic factor that would serve to structure the entire intercultural conversational act, we would have the development of intercultural competence in each one of the participants, which would allow them to make use of Interlinguistic Pragmatics from a reflective perspective. And criticism with 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

[1] Aarup, A. (1994): "Defining Intercultural Competence. A Discussion of its Essential Components and Prerequisites", L. Sercu (ed.), *Intercultural Competence*, *Volumen I*, Aalborg: Ed. Aalborg University Press, pp. 41-52.

[2] Areizaga, E. (2000): El componente cultural en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras, *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 9, pp. 194-202.

[3] Basso, K. H. (1971): "'To give up on Words'. Silence in Western Apache Culture", *Southwest Journal of Anthropology*, 26, pp. 213-230.

[4] Bourdieu, P. (1982): *¿Qué significa hablar? Economía de los intercambios verbales*, Madrid: Editorial Akal.

[5] Braithwaite, C. A. (1990): "Communicative Silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis", D. Carbaugh (ed.), *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 321-327.

[6] Briz, A. (2000): "Las unidades de la conversación", A. Briz y Grupo Val.Es.Co. (eds.), *¿Cómo se comenta un texto coloquial?*, Barcelona: Editorial Ariel Practicum, pp. 51-80.

[7] Byram, M., Zárate, G y Neuner, G. (1997): *Sociocultural Competence in Language Learning and Teaching*, Strasbourg: Ed. Council of Europe.

[8] Casmir, F. L. (1993): "Third-Culture Building: A Paradigm Shift for International and Intercultural Communication", S. A. Deetz (ed.), *Communication Yearbook/16*, London: Sage, pp. 407-428.

[9] Castro, A. (1966): *La realidad histórica de España*, Ciudad de México: Editorial Porrúa.

[10] Černý, J. (1998): *Historia de la lingüística*, Cáceres: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Extremadura.

[11] Cestero, A. M. (2006): "La comunicación no verbal y el estudio de su incidencia en fenómenos discursivos como la ironía", *Revista ELUA*, 20, pp. 57-77.

[12] Cicourel, A. V. (1992): "The interpretation of communicative contexts: examples from medical encounters", A. Duranti y C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context. Language as an interactive phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 291-310.

[13] 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.

[14] Coperías, M. J. (1998): "Aproximación cultural a la Pragmática", I. Vázquez e I. Guillén (eds.), *Perspectivas pragmáticas en Lingüística Aplicada*, Zaragoza: Anubar Ediciones, pp. 27-31.

[15] Cots, J. M. et al. (1990): "Conversa(r)", *Caplletra: Revista de Filología*, 7, pp. 51-72.

[16] Escandell, M. V. (2005): *La comunicación*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

[17] Fant, L. (1989): "Cultural mismatch in conversation: Spanish and Scandinavian communicative behavior in negotiation setting", *Revista Hermès*, 3, pp. 247-265.

[18] Friedman, V. & Berthoin, A. (2005): "Negotiating Reality: A Theory of Action Approach to Intercultural Competence", *Revista Management Learning*, 36, pp. 69-86.

[19] Gago, E. (2010): "El desarrollo de la *competencia intercultural* en el aula de ELE", *Revista Analecta Malacitana (AnMal Electrónica)*, 29, pp. 221-239.

[20] Gallardo, B. (1991). Pragmática y análisis conversacional: hacia una Pragmática del receptor, *Revista Sintagma*, Nº 3, pp. 25-38.

[21] Goffman, E. [1991 (1964)]: "El olvido de la situación", Y. Winkin, *Los momentos y sus hombres. Textos seleccionados y presentados*, Barcelona: Ed. Paidós, pp. 129-134.

[22] Harder, P. (1980): "Discourse as selfexpression on the reduced personality of the Second Language Learner", *Revista Applied Linguistics*, 1, pp. 262-270.

[23] Hernández, C. (1999): *Culturas y acción comunicativa. Introducción a la Pragmática intercultural*, Barcelona: Editorial Octaedro.

[24] Hernández, C. (2003): "Interculturalidad, Transculturalidad y valores de la acción comunicativa", Grupo CRIT, *Claves para la comunicación intercultural*, Castellón: Editorial de la Universidad Jaume I, pp. 17-35.

[25] Hymes, D. H. (1972): "Models of the interaction of language and social life", J. J. Gumperz y D. H. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Etnography of Communication*, Nueva York: Ed. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp. 35-71.

[26] Jakobson, R. [1981(1963)]: *Ensayos de lingüística general*, Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral.

[27] Kasper, G. (1989): "Interactive procedures in interlanguage discourse", W. Oleksy (ed.), *Contrastive Pragmatics*, Philadelphia: Ed. John Benjamins, pp. 189-229.

[28] Leiva, J. J. (2013): "Relaciones interpersonales en contextos de Educación Intercultural: un estudio cualitativo", *Dedica. Revista de Educação e Humanidades*, 4, pp. 109-128.

[29] Lewandoswska-Tomaszczyk, B. (1989): "Praising and complimenting", W. Oleksy (ed.), *Contrastive Pragmatics*, Philadelphia: Ed. John Benjamins, pp. 73-100.

[30] Maltz, D. N. & Borker, R. A. (1982): "A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication", J. J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 195-216.

[31] Martín Rojo, L. (1996): "Lenguaje y género. Descripción y explicación de la diferencia", en

Revista Signos. Teoría y Práctica de la Educación, 16, pp. 6-17.

[32] Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945):*Phénomenologie de la Perception*, Paris: Ed. Gallimard.

[33] Meyer, M. (1991): "Developing Transcultural Competence: Case Studies of Advanced Foreign Language Learners", D. Butjes y M. Byram (eds.), *Developing Languages and Cultures,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 136-158.

[34] Oliveras, A. (2000): *Hacia la competencia intercultural en el aprendizaje de una lengua extranjera. Estudio del choque cultural y los malentendidos*, Barcelona: Editorial Edinumen.

[35] 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.

[36] Raga, F. (2012): "Sobre los límites de la comunicación y la mediación intercultural". Se encuentra en E. Placencia y C. García (comp.), *Pragmática y comunicación intercultural en el mundo hispanohablante*, Nueva York / Amsterdam: Editorial Rodopi, pp. 3-24.

[37] Real Academia Española (RAE, 2013): *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*. Disponible en http://lema.rae.es/drae/(Última consulta: 12/09/2013).

[38] Reyes, G. (1995): *El abecé de la Pragmática*, Madrid: Editorial Arco/Libros.

[39] Sacks, H., Schefloff, E. A. y Jefferson, G. (1974): "A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking in conversation", *Revista Language*, 50(4), pp. 696-735.

[40] Salaberri, M. S. (2007): "Competencia comunicativa intercultural. Intercultural communicative competence", *Revista Perspectiva CEP*, 13, pp. 61-76.

[41] Schiffrin, D. (2011): "Definiciones de discurso", *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 13, pp. 1-33.

[42] Schumann, J. H. (1975): "Affective factors and the problem of age in Second Language Acquisition", *Revista Language Learning*, 25(1), pp. 209-235.

[43] Scollon, R. y Scollon, S. W. (1981): *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*, Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

[44] Scollon, R. y Scollon, S. W. (1994): *Intercultural Communication*, Oxford & Cambridge: Ed. Blackwell.

[45] Taft, R. (1981): "The Role and Personality of the Mediator", S. Bochener (ed.), *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures,* Cambridge: Ed. Schenkman, pp. 53-88.

[46] 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*, 4, pp. 23-40.

[47] Tusón, A. (1997): *Análisis de la conversación*, Barcelona: Editorial Ariel Practicum.

[48] Tusón, A. (2002): "El análisis de la conversación: entre la estructura y el sentido", *Revista de Estudios de Sociolingüística. Linguas, sociedades y culturas*, 3, pp. 133-153.

[49] Van Dijk. T. (1980): *Estructuras y funciones del discurso*, México: Siglo Veintiuno.

[50] Vivas, J. (2008): "Un acercamiento a la Pragmática Intercultural en la clase de ELE", *Revista Electrónica Elenet*, 4, pp. 1-12.