Introduction

The Rise of Intercultural Pragmatics

Istvan Kecskes

1 What Is Intercultural Pragmatics?

Intercultural pragmatics is a relatively new field of inquiry that is concerned with the way in which the language system is put to use in social encounters between human beings who have different first languages but communicate in a common language, and, usually, represent different cultures (see Kecskes 2004, 2013). The main focus of research in this field is on intercultural interactions. In these encounters, the communicative process is synergistic, in the sense that existing pragmatic norms and emerging co-constructed features are present to a varying degree. The innovative feature of the field is that it provides an alternative way of thinking about interaction by shifting the attention of researchers from first language (L1) communication to intercultural communication. In Gricean pragmatics everything is about native speakers (mainly native speakers of English) of a language who are members of the same, although diverse and relatively definable, speech community, who have preferred ways of saying things and preferred ways of organizing thoughts, who share core common ground, conventions, norms, and distributed collective salience. This gives them a relatively firm basis for understanding each other. However, when the language is used by not only native speakers but also by second language (L2) or Lx speakers, and lingua franca speakers, access to communalities, common ground, and collective salience may be limited and cannot be taken for granted, and as a result, interlocutors need to co-construct them synchronically, at least temporarily. Consequently, the questions are to what extent interlocutors will stick to the original rules of the game, and how much will they rely on those communalities, conventions, standards and norms that the target language offers them? How will the main tenets of pragmatic theorizing change? Will the basic notions such as implicatures, presuppositions, context, common ground remain unchanged, or will modifications be needed? Intercultural

pragmatics research seeks answers to these questions. Some of them will be addressed directly or indirectly in the chapters of the *Cambridge Handbook of Intercultural Pragmatics* (CHIP) from different perspectives.

2   Intercultural Pragmatics and Other Pragmatic Subfields

The rise of intercultural pragmatics as a new field of inquiry was essential with globalization that has created an era in which multilingualism rather than monolingualism is the norm. Scholars have always been interested in how non-native speakers use a new language. However, existing paradigms such as interlanguage pragmatics, cross-cultural pragmatics, and L2 pragmatics have not always been able to answer the rapidly growing number of questions raised by intercultural interactions. The main reason is that their primary concern is not actual interaction. They investigate and highlight aspects of language behavior in which speakers from various cultures have differences and similarities. According to Kasper and Schmidt (1996), the cross-cultural pragmatics approach is comparative, focusing on cross-cultural similarity and difference in linguistic realization and sociopragmatic judgment in contexts. The other popular research paradigm dealing with L2, interlanguage pragmatics, is interested in the acquisition and use of pragmatic norms in L2: how L2 learners produce and comprehend speech acts, and how their L2 pragmatic competence develops over time (e.g. Kasper and Blum-Kulka 1993; Kasper 1998).

Intercultural pragmatics is not about creating a new paradigm for understanding and investigating L2 pragmatic competence as separate from L1 pragmatic competence. It has always been underlined in intercultural pragmatics that people have only one pragmatic competence that is flexible enough to accommodate the use of any number of languages. Language users do not switch from one pragmatic competence to another when they switch languages. They use the same pragmatic competence with adjustments and modifications as required by the language that is actually used. This is why intercultural pragmatics research has never tried to break up the Gricean paradigm; rather, it has attempted to apply it to explain intercultural interactions while making the necessary adjustments and changes on the way. Gricean pragmatics is about human communication in general, so the categories such as cooperation, intention, implicatures, presuppositions, common ground, etc. do not need to be changed for other categories when we analyze intercultural interactions. The real issue is how they have to be modified to explain not only L1 but also L2 and Lx communication.

The socio-cognitive approach that serves as the theoretical frame for intercultural pragmatics (see Chapter 4) is both about L1 communication and intercultural communication. It is an alternative view on pragmatics in general and on intercultural pragmatics in particular (see Horn and Kecskes 2013). The field of intercultural pragmatics has been shaped by

the contribution of scholars from all over the world for more than a decade (e.g. Kecskes 2004, 2013; Mey 2004; Moeschler 2004; Haugh 2008; House 2008; Spencer-Oatey and Wang 2017). Research has tried to fill in the gap between L1 pragmatics and L2 pragmatics and focus on intercultural interactions and also examine how L1-based pragmatic theories could explain what happens in intercultural interactions.

3 Factors Affecting Research Agenda in Intercultural Pragmatics

Intercultural pragmatics embodies a "multilingual, intercultural, socio-cognitive, and discourse-segment (rather than just utterance) perspective" on interactions (Kecskes 2013:1). There are some unique features of intercultural communication that may differentiate it, to some extent, from L1 communication. The investigation of these features may lead to the revision of some basic concepts in pragmatics, such as cooperation, common ground, implicature, context-sensitivity, salience, and others. Here is a short list of some of these features:

- Limited role of target language cultural norms, conventions, frames, and beliefs. More importance may be given to co-constructed and emergent elements in intercultural encounters. It is not that interlocutors in intercultural interactions do not need norms, conventions, beliefs, etc. for smooth communication. They do, but since they do not share those as they usually do in L1 they need to co-construct them temporarily.
- Limited role of core common ground of target language, and more reliance on emergent common ground in the course of communication. Emergent common ground dominates the relationship between interlocutors and their language use. Core common ground is what makes L1 communication cooperation-like. Interactants share core common grounds and relatively common cultural frames that help their encounters. In intercultural interactions participants cannot assume that they share core common ground that is based on their target language knowledge because their proficiency level varies.
- Cooperation gains a new sense in intercultural communication. Interlocutors cooperate not just because this is what human beings are expected to do in communication (as Gricean pragmatics claims), but because they generally do that consciously and eagerly to create understanding, common ground, community and to avoid communicative problems.
- Egocentrism, i.e. subconscious, automatic reliance on prior experience of individuals is just as part of human rationality as cooperation. The two are not antagonistic factors in the communication process. In fact, both cooperation and egocentrism are present in any interaction in

a varying degree. Cooperation is tied to relevance, while egocentrism is connected with salience.

- Growing role of individual factors. Social frames do not affect interlocutors top-down as it happens in L1 communication. Intercultural interlocutors will need to build up most of those frames bottom-up in the interaction. So intersubjectivity is less a matter of common sense than of intensive common ground building.
- Context-sensitivity works differently in intercultural communication than in L1 communication because actual situational context may be understood differently by interactants as they have limited prior experience in the target language and culture. In intercultural pragmatics we talk about the two sides of context: prior context and actual situation context. Prior context refers to the individuals' prior experience with linguistic signs, cultural frames, and situations. Meaning is the result of the interplay of these two sides of context.
- The balance between the use of formulaic language and ad hoc generated language is different in intercultural communication from L1 communication. Interlocutors generate more ad hoc language and there is less reliance on prefabricated target language. However, this does not mean that the idiom principle does not work in intercultural communication. It does because interlocutors create their own formulas and/or metaphors in the course of interaction. Although those units may not exist in the target language, they still function as temporary formulas. They are interpreted the same way, just like L1 formulas, and thus they support smooth communication (see Kecskes 2013, 2019).
- There is a strong emphasis on certain communicative strategies such as explicit negotiation of meaning, backchanneling, and development and use of trouble anticipating and avoidance strategies.

4 How Does the *Cambridge Handbook of Intercultural Pragmatics* Differ from Other Similar Publications?

Given the nature and novelty of intercultural pragmatics this handbook has some unique features. First, it is very inclusive because the chapters focus not only on intercultural pragmatics proper but also on theories and applications that are closely related to the field and help readers better understand the foundation of the paradigm and its relationship to other branches of pragmatics. Second, the chapters do not follow a particular pattern. They have the same structure but how the contents are presented is at the authors' discretion. Although there are references to other chapters in the handbook, building contents on each other's work was not a particular goal of the contributors. The common core in the chapters is the intercultural perspective and focus on actual language use and

interaction. Third, the chapters relate to intercultural pragmatics in a variety of ways. Some of them give an overview of particular research issues, others discuss the relationship of another field to intercultural pragmatics, and a few chapters direct the readers' attention to some innovative approaches and methodology related to intercultural pragmatics. CHIP emphasizes that intercultural pragmatics is not a homogenous field. It is a typical interdisciplinary paradigm that brings together views from several fields of language-oriented inquiry. Fourth, the handbook also reflects the "turbulent times" of language-oriented research. Gone are the days when monolingual, L1-based research ruled the fields. With globalization, the spread of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), and the development of technology, new subfields have emerged. If we just look at the field of pragmatics and the list of new journals, we see the results of this rapid development: *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *Corpus Pragmatics*, *Internet Pragmatics*, *Applied Pragmatics*, *Contrastive Pragmatics*, *International Review of Pragmatics*, *Pragmatics*, *East Asian Pragmatics*, and *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. If we add the *Journal of Pragmatics and Historical Pragmatics* the list will be full, reflecting the incredible variety of approaches in the field of pragmatics.

5 Overview

The book begins with four chapters on the theoretical foundation of intercultural pragmatics. They summarize what scholars engaged in research in the field presently or in the future are expected to know to get a firm grip of the main tenets of the paradigm. The first two chapters explain post-Gricean pragmatics (Kasia M. Jaszczolt) and the Relevance Theory (Jacques Moeschler), as related to intercultural pragmatics, highlighting those features of the two approaches that are especially relevant to intercultural pragmatics. Chapter 3 on cognitive psychology by Rachel Giora seemingly does not have much to do with intercultural pragmatics. However, the information in the chapter is necessary for anyone in the field because it explains defaultness in L1. In intercultural interactions the literal meanings of lexical units serve as default meanings, as core common ground for interlocutors with different L1 backgrounds when they communicate in English. To understand how default interpretation works in intercultural interactions, first we need to get to know how defaultness works in L1. Giora's chapter helps us with that. My chapter on the socio-cognitive approach (SCA) describes the theoretical frame for intercultural pragmatics, partly relying on some ideas presented in the previous chapters. SCA brings together the individual with the social and emphasizes that egocentrism of individuals[1] is as important as cooperation in interaction. In L1, social frames affect individuals top-down, while in intercultural communication individuals are expected to build up those

---

[1] See explanation of egocentrism in Chapter 4.

social frames bottom-up, developing emergent common ground. The process is explained in Chapter 4.

Part II includes chapters that address key issues in intercultural pragmatics research. Some of the chapters directly focus on intercultural interactions, while others deal with questions that are relevant to the discipline, but the author's perspective is not necessarily intercultural, such as the chapter on the role of context by Anita Fetzer or Elke Diedrichsen's chapter and Brian Nolan's chapter on common ground. The rest of the chapters discuss issues that represent major challenges for intercultural pragmatics research, such as idiomaticity (Marie-Luise Pitzl), metaphors (Marianna Bolognesi), humor (Kerry Mullan and Christine Béal), vague language (Grace Zhang), and emotions (Laura Alba). Part II ends with a chapter on research methods in intercultural pragmatics by Monika Kirner-Ludwig. This chapter is especially important for anybody who is interested in the field. The author gives a very detailed and well-presented summary of what can be considered research in intercultural pragmatics. In the introduction to the chapter Kirner-Ludwig says the following: "this chapter on research methods essentially represents a hub amongst the here-assembled contributions: it intertwines with or at least closes contingent spaces between topics and issues discussed across the five strands this handbook is divided into."

Part III contains chapters on the interface of intercultural pragmatics and related disciplines. Each author has made an attempt to make a reasonable connection between their field and intercultural pragmatics. These chapters will help further research in the paradigm to a great extent because reading them will generate several research questions. Out of the disciplines represented in this chapter, semiotics seems to be the furthest from intercultural pragmatics. Marcel Danesi discusses what semiotics can offer to intercultural pragmatics. The chapter focuses on the notion of semiotic code, which provides a specific theoretical framework for describing the negotiation of meaning in intercultural communication. The rest of the chapters in this part have overlapping areas of research with intercultural pragmatics. Discussing the similarities and differences between sociopragmatics and intercultural pragmatics, Michael Haugh and Wei-Lin Melody Chang highlight that sociopragmatics has tended to rely, for the most part, on data from intracultural settings (i.e. where users share the same L1), while intercultural pragmatics focuses more on data from intercultural interactions. Barbara Seidlhofer and Henry Widdowson contributed with a chapter that has an ELF perspective on intercultural pragmatics. Their writing is especially interesting because ELF is one type of intercultural communication that intercultural pragmatics focuses on and which has recently emerged as an independent field of inquiry. Helen Spencer-Oatey's chapter on politeness and rapport management demonstrates the unique feature of intercultural politeness through concrete performance examples. Ulla Connor summarized the common features

of intercultural rhetoric and intercultural pragmatics and the influence of the former on several other disciplines such as second language teaching and English for specific purposes. Jesus Romero-Trillo's chapter deals with corpus-based research in intercultural pragmatics, which has become very popular in recent years.

In Part IV contributions focus on different types of communications from an intercultural perspective. In recent years technology infiltrated and conquered communication. The first three chapters demonstrate the results of this process. Charles Foreceville's chapter on visual and multi-modal communication discusses how interaction works when the process relies on semiotic resources other than just spoken language. Sigrid Norris and Jarret Geenen demonstrate how intercultural teamwork takes place via videoconferencing technology. Carmen Maiz-Arevalo's chapter focuses on the intercultural aspects of computer-mediated communication. Business communication and healthcare communication have received special attention in recent years. Liu Ping's chapter highlights how ELF works in business interactions. Maria Grazia Rossi and Fabricio Macagno provide an overview of healthcare-oriented studies to describe differences and commonalities between pragmatic strategies used in interactions of different types and levels of "interculturality." In her chapter María Luisa Carrió Pastor focus on academic writing, particularly on Spanish and Chinese writers, in order to identify intercultural traits that display cultural and linguistic characteristics which differentiate the way academic English is used by non-native speakers. Fabienne Baider's contribution analyzes the interculturality of conspiracy theory in far-right populist discourses in the frame of the Dynamic Model of Meaning.

Language learning is at the center of attention in the chapters of Part V. In the 1990s and beginning of the 2000s, interlanguage pragmatics served as the basis for language learning. Gradually, this role has been taken over by intercultural pragmatics. In the opening chapter Elly Ifantidou examines pragmatics competence from different perspectives. In his chapter Troy McConachy analyzes the role of pragmatic awareness in intercultural language learning. Study abroad has always been an important angle of L2 pragmatics research because it provides direct access to the sociocultural background of the target language. In their chapter Martin Howard and Rachel Shiverly discuss the relationship of interculturality and study abroad experience. Intercultural mediation is a recent topic of interest in language teaching. In his contribution Anthony Liddicoat proposed the idea that language learners do not simply need to develop communicative abilities in a language but also need to be able to mediate between languages and cultures. The handbook ends with an exciting new development in education and language research: the multilingual classroom. A team of scholars from Sweden, Marie Källkvist, Erica Sandlund, Pia Sundqvist, and Henrik Gyllstad, give an overview of multilingual classroom research and translanguaging pedagogy.

CHIP addresses many issues in the field of intercultural pragmatics but not all. But that has not been the goal anyway. What we wanted to do is to show where the field is now and in what directions it is going. A number of different views have been presented, but there is still room for new ideas and new approaches within the paradigm. I would say that the field has grown into its "adolescence" with many more promising years to come.

References

Haugh, M. (2008). Intention in pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, **5**, 99–110.

Horn, L. and Istvan, K. (2013). Pragmatics, discourse and cognition. In Stephen R. Anderson, Jacques Moeschler, and Fabienne Reboul, eds., *The Language-Cognition Interface*. Geneva/Paris: Librairie Droz, pp. 353–375.

House, J. (2008). (Im)politeness in English as a Lingua Franca Discourse. In Miriam A. Locher and Jurg Strassler, eds., *Standards and Norms in the English Language*. Berlin/New York: Degruyter Mouton, pp. 351–366.

Kasper, G. (1998). Interlanguage pragmatics. In Heidi Byrnes, ed., *Learning and Teaching Foreign Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, pp. 183–208.

Kasper, G. and Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–17.

Kasper, G. and Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, **18**, 149–169.

Kecskes, I. (2004). Lexical merging, conceptual blending and cultural crossing. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, **1**, 1–21.

Kecskes, I. (2013). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kecskes, I. (2019). Impoverished pragmatics? The semantics-pragmatics interface from an intercultural perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, **16** (5), 489–517.

Mey, Jacob L. (2004). Between culture and pragmatics: Scylla and Charybdis? The precarious condition of intercultural pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, **1**, 27–48.

Moeschler, Jacques (2004). Intercultural pragmatics: A cognitive approach. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, **1**, 49–70.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2000) Rapport management: A framework for analysis. In H. Spencer-Oatey, ed., *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London: Continuum, pp. 11–46.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen, and Wang, Jiayi (2017). Intercultural pragmatics. In R. Sybesma, ed., *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*, Vol. II. Leiden: Brill, pp. 441–445.

1

Post-Gricean Pragmatics for Intercultural Communication

Kasia M. Jaszczolt

1.1 Philosophical Pragmatics at the Service of Intercultural Communication

Traditional methods of argumentation and conceptual analysis are sometimes shunned in pragmatics circles these days: they rely on introspection, seemingly make little recourse to empirical data, and as such may appear "unscientific." But this assessment cannot be further from the truth. Every discipline of scientific inquiry relies on constructing theories that describe and explain empirical facts, have predictive power, well-defined theoretical terms and concepts, and rely on answers to foundational questions. Philosophical pragmatics comprises all these tasks. While empirical investigations, such as experimental and corpus pragmatics, provide the necessary database of facts of conversation to test theories, philosophical pragmatics launches the theories that explain human conversational behavior in the context of human rationality and the relation human mind and actions bear to the world in which they are immersed.[1]

It is in this context that I address the relation between post-Gricean pragmatics and intercultural pragmatics – as the relation between theories of meaning in discourse that are firmly based in philosophical pragmatics on the one hand and, on the other, approaches that explain patterns in conversational behaviour, or pragmatic competence, in L2 learners. This chapter is devoted to various approaches within one dominant orientation in pragmatic theorizing, namely post-Gricean pragmatics, and as such addresses meaning in relation to intentions and inferences as its *explanantia* (i.e. tools used to answer questions and explain phenomena). The chapter provides a brief overview of the main developments in this tradition and places them in the context of the utility they have for

---

[1] The term "philosophical pragmatics" is used in a variety of ways in the literature. See Jaszczolt (2018) for a discussion.

understanding cross-cultural communication, and specifically, in the context of this book, the acquisition of pragmatic competence.

The structure of the chapter is as follows. In Section 1.2, I introduce the concept of pragmatic universals and move on to discuss how Grice's account of cooperative conversational behavior and the associated concept of meaning based on speaker intentions can be viewed as such pragmatic universal principles. Having pointed out some problems with Grice's original account as it is seen from the perspective of several decades, in Section 1.3 I proceed to post-Gricean approaches to linguistic communication, focusing not so much on the traditional debates concerning the number and scope of the necessary maxims or principles (covered briefly in Section 1.3.1) but rather on the semantics/pragmatics boundary and the related question of the truth-conditional content that opened up interesting contextualist pursuits (Section 1.3.2). In Section 1.4 I address different versions of contextualism and place it in the context of the debates between minimalists and contextualists. Section 1.5 concludes with closing comments on the utility of post-Gricean pragmatics for intercultural communication, stressing the significance of pragmatic universals.

1.2   Pragmatic Universals: Universal Expressibility and Universal Principles of Communicative Interaction

Linguistic interaction displays a formidable diversity of means that its speakers use to communicate information or display attitudes, feelings, and emotions. This variation exists within each natural language as well as across languages. When speakers from two different cultures communicate, both types of variation are involved. In order to understand the principles that govern this interaction, one must search for generalizations. Some of them pertain to universal characteristics of human rational communicative behavior; others are conventions that interlocutors bring to the situation of discourse from their own cultures, where culture is understood as anthropological culture, that is, social organization and practices specific to a group of people.[2] We will be interested here in the first kind of regularities captured by principles that are the domain of philosophical pragmatics.

A typical novice to language study begins by observing the differences between the ways speakers of different languages communicate. After all, it can appear intriguing to speakers of English that there are languages without grammatical tenses or, say, languages without words for sentential connectives such as conjunction, disjunction, or conditionality. Yukatek Maya, Mandarin Chinese, Paraguayan Guaraní, Burmese, Dyirbal, Kalaallisut

---

[2] See, e.g., Sperber (1996); for a discussion see Jaszczolt (2002: chapter 16).