

An M.A. thesis in English linguistics.

Entitled:

Reasons behind Communication failure in English conversations

Submitted by:

Nourhan Magdy Muhammad Farid Elguindy.

To department of English,

Faculty of Education,

Ain Shams university.

Supervised by:

Dr. Faisal Abdullah.

**Assistant professor of English linguistic
English linguistics.**

**English department
Faculty of Education.
Ain Shams university.**

Dr. Amal Tayea.

Lecturer in

**English department.
Faculty of Education.
Ain Shams university.**

Reasons behind Communication failure in English conversations

Abstract:

The research sheds light on scenarios in which people are misunderstood due to pragmatic considerations or motives. A basic analysis of misunderstanding situations reveals that the inability of participants to express themselves clearly and accurately is the primary cause of this important phenomenon, which is likely to occur in all communicative situations regardless of who, when, or where a conversation takes place. In such cases, many parts of language appear to be at play. The goal of this research is to look at different types of talks that include a wide range of misunderstandings induced by different reasons.

ملخص البحث: يلقي البحث الضوء على المواقف التي يُساء فيها فهم الناس بسبب اعتبارات أو دوافع برجماتية. يكشف التحليل المبدئي لمواقف سوء الفهم أن عدم قدرة المشاركين على التعبير عن أنفسهم بوضوح ودقة هو السبب الرئيسي لهذه الظاهرة المهمة ، والتي من المحتمل أن تحدث في جميع المواقف التواصلية بغض النظر عن متى وأين تجري المحادثة. في مثل هذه الحالات ، يبدو أن العديد من أجزاء اللغة تلعب دورًا. الهدف من هذا البحث هو النظر في أنواع متنوعة من المحادثات التي تشمل مجموعة واسعة من سوء الفهم الناجم عن أسباب مختلفة.

Key words:

Pragmatics, Communication failure, misunderstandings, conversations.

The research:

The objective of the study is to examine certain English-language talks. where multiple types of miscommunications with numerous causes can be found. These situations were collected from many films, television shows, plays, books, stories, talk shows, and actual interactions.

Communication can be improved, and various forms of miscommunication can be avoided by being aware of the barriers that individuals encounter in their talks, as a result of linguistic or pragmatic issues. This would undoubtedly result in a more effective method of having successful interactions.

Conversation almost always occurs in a social context since language is first and foremost a tool for communication. Because of this, understanding and acknowledging the connections between a language and its users is necessary for efficient communication (Fasold & Connor-Linton 2014).

The transmission or transfer of data or a message from the sender to the recipient along a selected path while navigating obstacles is referred to as the communication process. Since the sender initiates communication and receives it back as feedback, it is cyclical. There is top, bottom, and side effects at every level of the organisation. Relationships in which different aspects both influence and are affected by one another must be ongoing and dynamic. It speaks about a set of procedures followed in effective communication (Richard Nordquist, 2020).

Effective communication and persuasive communication have been used interchangeably over time, but this is inaccurate because the two concepts refer to different communication goals. The goal of persuasive communication is to persuade the recipient's actions, opinions, values, or preferences. On the other hand, effective communication involves sending information in a clear and understandable way so that the recipient can correctly decode it. The "7 C's of communication" were discussed by Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center of the University of Wisconsin in their book

Effective Public Relations (1962), and were developed by Tyagi, S., and Rathi, N., and The list has evolved into a standard in public relations research with or without minor revisions.

completeness: Comprehensive communications provide the recipient with all the information he needs to understand and act on the message.

Conciseness: The aim of clarity is to limit your speech to a single idea. This is more dependent on the content of your communication than it is on how long it is.

Consideration: Effective communication takes into account the receiver's background and points of view.

Concreteness: A clear, observable, and remembered message is one that is concrete. It is supported by data and facts to give it more credence. It enables your audience to comprehend the overall picture more clearly.

Courtesy: Courtesy and consideration are added to messages that are successful. Creating a message that is genuinely nice and impartial, or respecting the receiver's culture, values, and beliefs, is what civility includes.

Clearness: The more straightforward it is for the recipient to interpret your communication in light of your original meaning, the clearer it is.

Correctness: When language and syntax are used correctly, your message will be more convincing and effective.

Pragmatics of communications:

Most of the time, communication is employed to perform a specific task or function. Philosophers who have tried to explain language from a pragmatic standpoint have identified and studied this aspect of language. It is possible to think of communication as a group of deeds or a collection of things with predetermined purposes. In addition to being beneficial, intentional, and designed to make some effect on the surroundings of listeners and speakers, communication is more than just a one-time event.

According to John Austin's definition from 1962, communication is a collection of speech acts or communicative acts used methodically to accomplish predetermined objectives. Austin highlighted the significance of the effects of language on communication, or perlocutionary force. Since then, studies of communication have focused on the effects that utterances have on audiences. That influence has an impact on both the utterance's production and reception; both actions contribute to the communication act's overall objective. The study of how individuals use language to convey information and carry out activities is called speech act theory, which is a subfield of pragmatics.

The speech act theory was developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle after being introduced by J.L. Austin in his work "How to Do Things with Words." The amount that utterances are said to perform locutionary, illocutionary, and/or perlocutionary duties is taken into account.

“The practice of literary criticism has been influenced by speech act theory since 1970. It offers a systematic framework for identifying the unstated assumptions, implications, and effects of speech acts that knowledgeable readers and critics have always considered, subtly though unsystematically, when applied to the analysis of direct discourse by a character within a literary work. To reframe the theory of literature—and particularly prose narratives—on a more radical basis, speech act theory has also been employed as a paradigm. What the author of a fictional work—or else the author's imagined narrator—recounts is considered to be a "pretended" set of statements, which the author intended, and the competent reader understood, to be free from a speaker's usual commitment to the truth of what he or she asserts. However, within the framework of the fictional world that the story thus creates, the fictional characters' utterances—whether they be claims, pledges, or marriage vows—are held to be accountable to customary illocutionary commitments.” (Abrams and Galt Harpham 2005).

Context:

The anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski developed the phrase "context of circumstance" in his 1923 addition to C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards' *The Meaning of Meaning*. This phrase later achieved fame inside J.R. Firth's phonetic hypothesis (alluded to hereinafter within the 8th edition 1946). Malinowski emphasises the significance of comprehending language in light of the circumstances and the larger cultural context in which it was used. The Trobriand islanders' primitive language, in which words' meanings are decided by their surroundings, is referenced by Malinowski's idea of the Phatic Communion. For instance, the meaning of the words "wood," "paddle," and "place" have to be determined by free interpretation.

Any circumstance is considered a context. For an idea or way of thinking to be communicated, a condition must be present. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of context in the communication process since without it, discourse is meaningless. There are many different situations, or contexts, in which communication occurs. The multiplicity of settings makes communication increasingly challenging. If you are unaware of the situation, it can be difficult to interpret a statement's meaning. Knowing the context will make it simpler to relate to prior knowledge. (Fillmore 1977, p. 119).

Pragmatics:

According to Crystal (1985), pragmatics is the study of language from the viewpoint of its users, concentrating on their decisions, the limitations that affect how they use language in social interactions, and the effects that their decisions have on other people who are also involved in the communication process. The study of the connections between language and situation that are grammaticalized or stored in a language's structure is known as pragmatics, according

to Levinson (1983: 9). Linguistics has also been described as the study of meaning as it is intended by the speaker and deduced by the listener. In Yule's opinion, it is the study of contextual meaning. A branch of linguistics called pragmatics examines how language and the contexts in which it is used interact. The primary emphasis of both twentieth-century linguistics and language philosophy has been on studying language in relation to its usage in context. As this description suggests, pragmatics is a distinct and coherent field of study that focuses solely on the study of language in isolation from its usage in context. Deixis, presupposition, speech acts, implicatures, politeness, information structure, and other topics frequently covered under the rubric of pragmatics result from a variety of challenges and dead ends encountered in the analysis of language taken out of context; as a result, they make up a motley collection that includes deixis, presupposition, speech acts, implicatures, politeness, and so forth. (James Slotta 2018). The term "pragmatics" as it is used now was coined by the philosopher Charles Morris (1938), who was concerned in defining the broad framework of the study of signs, or semiotics. Morris outlined three subfields of semiotics study: pragmatics, semantics, and syntactic (or syntax), which investigate "the formal relation of signs to one another" as well as "the relations of signals to the things to which they are applicable" (1938: 6).

Pragmatic competence:

According to Saville-Troike (2003), pragmatic competence is "what a speaker must know to interpret and convey meaning in communication," whereas sociolinguistic competence is the understanding of "the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as the status of the participants, purposes of the interaction, and norms or convent," according to Canale and Swain (1980; 1983). Because they deal with the culture, context, issue, and social relationship, pragmatics and

sociolinguistics are intimately related to language functions, the subject of this study. On another hand, Pragmatic failure, defined by Jenny Tohmas as "the incapacity to understand what is intended by what is spoken," frequently results in misunderstanding or confusion in cross-cultural communication. On the other hand, one of the most significant comments regarding pragmatic failure is: "Most of our misunderstandings of other people are not owing to any incapacity to hear them, to parse their sentences, or to understand their words... The fact that we frequently are unable to discern a speaker's aim is a significantly more significant source of communication problem. in (Miller 1974).

Theoretical framework:

Regarding the theoretical framework that will be used in the current study, it is crucial to address the most relevant conceptual frameworks issues, such as implicatures, the cooperative principle, and speech acts, while analysing pragmatic failure. The concept behind implied meanings and speech acts is that people don't always say exactly what they mean when they speak. There will be two main categories for analysing elements. First class mostly evaluates linguistic abilities and clarity, and it covers theories that may be used to any situation.

The speech act concept was first introduced by J.L. Austin in his book *How to Do Things with words*, developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle. It takes into account the degree to which utterances are said to engage in perlocutionary, illocutionary, and/or illocutionary activities. The most blatant instance of "illocutionary act," which fails as a result of a misunderstanding of the intended meaning Therefore, speech act will serve as the primary theory for our research.

Many particularly perplexing words have come to be seen as serving to indicate (rather than to report) the circumstances under which the

statement is made, the caveats to which it is subject, how it is to be taken, and the like, rather than to indicate (rather than to report) some particularly odd additional feature in the reality reported, rather than to indicate (rather than to report) some particularly odd additional feature in the statement's apparent descriptiveness. When you ignore these alternatives in a way that was once common, you are committing the "descriptive" error (1962 Austin, p. 3).

Assertive, commissive, directive, declaratory, and expressive illocutionary points are the only illocutionary points that speakers can make on propositions in an utterance, according to Searle. When they represent how things are in the world, commiserate about doing something, try to convince listeners to do something, declare something as being done simply by saying it is done, and express their feelings about things and facts in the world, speakers make their points in an assertive, directive, declaratory, directive, and expressive manner, respectively. (Kubo and Vanderkeven 2002).

An utterance must at the very least fit the following three criteria, according to Austin in Levinson (1995, p. 229).

A. standard technique and a standard outcome are required. The circumstances and those engaged must be proper, as stated in the approach.

B. The procedure must be followed exactly and completely.

C. In many situations, the person must have the necessary intentions, feelings, and thoughts as outlined in the method, and if further action is needed, everyone involved must comply.

By transforming these traits into four felicity Conditions, Searle (1975:65–68) makes a significant contribution (FCs). Felicity conditions are a series of requirements that must be satisfied before a specific act can be carried out. If a speech is pragmatically well-formed, it is considered felicitous in linguistics and linguistic theory.

Self-contradictory, inconsequential, unimportant, or otherwise inappropriate statements are referred to as infelicitous utterances. The criteria that must be met for a speech act to succeed are referred to as felicity conditions in both speech act theory and pragmatics (the study of how to do things with words). Searle classifies FCs into four groups: 1. Propositional Condition: In connection to propositional content, the illocutionary forces define the scenarios that are acceptable. Or, to put it another way, it's the imagined condition of the speaker or listener. 2. Preparatory Conditions: These relate to the knowledge and intentions of both the speaker and the listener. They make clear what the speaker is hinting at while doing the act. When a speaker engages in an illocutionary act, they signal that the act's prerequisites have been satisfied. 3. Sincerity Condition: They make clear the speaker's intentions, beliefs, and desires at the time the act is carried out. However, one can sincerely proclaim or pledge, but one cannot honestly greet. 4. Fundamental precondition: One of the requirements for the existence of an utterance is that it be intended to cause the hearer to engage in the desired behaviour.

We must include the idea of taking turns into our research in order to analyse a dialogue and determine when a failure happened. An adjacency pair is a two-speaker conversational unit where each speaker takes one turn. The turns are connected functionally so that the first one requires a particular kind (or set of types) of the second one. The idea of adjacency pairs and the phrase itself were developed by sociologists Emanuel A. Schegloff and Harvey Sacks in 1973. ("Opening Up Closings" in "Semiotica"). The field of pragmatics, which examines how language is used in social contexts, is one of the subfields of linguistics, the study of language.

A branch of sociology and linguistics that studies how language and society interact is known as sociolinguistics. Dialogue analysis is a part of all these disciplines. In conversation analysis, an adjacency pair is a two-part exchange in which the second utterance is

functionally dependent on the first, such as in usual greetings, invitations, and requests. It is also known as the following idea. It takes a different person to deliver each pair. In *Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy*, the authors described the traits of the pair components and the contexts in which they occur. One of the most significant contributions to CA [conversation analysis] is the notion of the adjacency pair. An adjacency pair consists of two turns delivered by different speakers that are placed next to one another and in which the second utterance is connected to the first. Example adjacency pairs include question-and-answer, complaint-and-denial, offer-and-accept, request-and-grant, compliment-and-rejection, challenge-and-rejection, and instruct-and-receipt. Adjacency pairs have three things in common: they each consist of two utterances, are continuous, with the first coming just after the second, and have different speakers in each utterance. (Scott Thornbury and Diana Slade 2006).

The idea of ethnography of communication, which Del Hymes established in the late 1960s, is an active aspect of the way of life of humans. Hymes was inspired by Noam Chomsky's 1965 essay "Theory of Linguistic Competence and Performance." According to Hymes, the ethnography of discourse analysis should consider the following characteristics in order to fully understand a speech situation:

S-scene and setting: According to Hymes, "the scene defines the atmosphere of the situation whereas the setting alludes to the time and place.

P-Participants: This refers to all parties associated with the speech, including the audience and the speaker.

E-Ends: The speech's objectives and purposes, as well as any results.

A-Act Order: the sequence in which things happened throughout the speech.

K-key: overall voice or delivery style of the speaker.

Instruments: the speech's format and delivery style.

N-Norms: What is socially acceptable during the event.

G-Genre: the nature of the delivered speech.

The factors that contribute to clear speaking should also be taken into account as a way to analyse the reasons of misunderstandings. The cooperation concept in conversation analysis presupposes, that participants will make an effort to be clear, relevant, truthful, and instructive. Philosopher H. Paul Grice argued in his 1975 article "Logic and Conversation" that "talk exchanges" were more than just a "succession of disconnected utterances," and that they would not be rational if they were. The collaboration principle, according to Grice (1975, 45), is the guiding principle of conversation: "Make the conversational contribution that is requested by the accepted purpose or direction of the discussion you are participating in at the moment."

Grice's Maxims of Conversation: The Principles of Effective Communication is also included in the study. Paul Grice, a linguist, developed a collection of principles known as the "Grice maxims of conversation" to guide conversations and improve communication. There are four fundamental tenets that centre on the style, amount, quality, and relevancy of what people say. "1. Quantity. I expect you to provide me with exactly what I need when you're helping me fix a car; if I need four screws at one time, you should provide me with four, not two or six. 2. Quality I want real contributions from you, not made-up ones. If I need sugar for the cake you are helping me make, I don't expect you to provide me salt. 3. Relation. I want my partner's contribution to be suited to my immediate needs at each level of the transaction; if I'm mixing ingredients for a cake, I don't expect to be given a nice book or even an oven mitt (though this may be an acceptable contribution at a later stage). 4. Manner. The

speaker is expected to make a clear statement about his contribution and talk reasonably quickly. (Grice, 1975, p.45)

The other group consists of hypotheses, which are applicable to certain but not all situations. There are number of theories that contribute to misunderstandings in addition to the fundamental ones that are used in every situation examined in the research. There are two categories for these ideas: linguistic and social.

The social components of appropriate discourse were the main emphasis of the **politeness theory**. A misunderstanding could occur if one or more of these components are absent. One of the most complete and thoroughly investigated ideas in the area of pragmatic politeness is the politeness theory put forth by Brown and Levinson in 1978. It was widely applicable across most cultures and covered a wide range of topics. The hypothesis, however, is ostensibly Western-biased and leaves out components that are more pertinent to many Middle-Eastern cultures, and speech communities (Bharuthram, 2003; Nwoye, 1992; Shum, 2008). In their hypothesis, Brown & Levinson (1987) described the factors that affect people's choices on which tactic to use. They asserted that speakers from different societies and cultures employ comparable techniques in comparable circumstances because these tactics offer enticing benefits or payoffs. They believed that people's decisions about which strategy to use were most heavily influenced by the types of rewards that various strategies offered, as well as the pertinent social and cultural circumstances of the situation, such as the social distance (D), relative power (P), and importance of an act's imposition in a particular culture (R).

"According to Brown and Levinson (1978/1987), there are two types of politeness: positive and negative. Negative face is defined as the addressee's "will to have his freedom of action unconstrained and his attention unrestrained" (p. 129), whereas positive face is defined as

the addressee's "perennial desire that his wishes... should be conceived of as desirable" (p. 101)."

On another hand, the use of metaphors is one of the most obvious linguistic causes of the communication breakdown. The typical definition of conceptual metaphors, as per Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), is as follows: An explanation of one area of experience (often abstract) in terms of another is known as a conceptual metaphor (that is typically concrete). This phrase is both the process and the outcome of mental metaphors.

Misunderstandings frequently result from speakers using metaphors and listeners taking those metaphors literally. *Metaphors We Live By*, written by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, introduced the concept of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) (1980:197).

In anger management movie (2003).

Context:

Angry employer Frank's secretary, Dave, works for him. Dave avoids public displays of affection, such as kissing his girlfriend Linda, as a result of his bullying experience. His problems are made worse by Andrew, a narcissistic employee who is close friends with Linda and desires to restart their sexual relationship. Dave loses his temper, albeit in a mild way, after being treated disrespectfully by the flight attendant on a flight, prompting the sky marshal to taser him. He is detained after being accused of "assaulting" a flight attendant and is ordered to undergo anger management therapy under the supervision of Dr. Buddy Rydell, a renowned psychiatrist who was sitting next to him on the aircraft.

Air marshal (black-muscled man): Is there a problem here, sir?

Dave: I do not think so.

Air marshal: can you come to the back of the plane with me, so we can have a talk (showing him the marshal card).

Dave: talk about what? There is not a problem, the flight attendant keeps ignoring me when I ask her to...

Air marshal: calm down.

Dave: I am calm what is it with you people?

Air marshal: you people!

Dave: Oh no! wait a minute, I do not mean you people. I mean you people (pointing to the marshal and the flight attendant).

Air marshal: sir, I will not tolerate any racist behaviour on the plane this is a very difficult time for our country.

Dave: I know that; I am not a racist. I just want to watch the movie (nervously).

Air marshal: I am only going to say one more time sir, calm down.

Dave: I am calm (raising his voice).

.]the marshal uses the electric device against him[

Analysis:

According to the *Speech act* theory. The miscommunication of this situation implies in "illocutionary force," it's level 2 failure. It is the air marshal misunderstood Dave's purpose when he said (you people).

According to Searle's *felicity conditions*, this failure is because of the lack of the preparatory condition. As a result for the misinterpretation of the speaker's intention and the lack of the hearer's knowledge about the nature of the conversation from the beginning.

According to the *adjacency pairs* concept, this situation is asking / answering.

In the light of Hymes *SPEAKING model*, the failure

Settings: being on a plane contains several strangers with different cultures, personalities, and natures may cause some misunderstandings. In addition to the hard situation that the flight attendant talked about.

Participants: Dave and the air marshal are from two different races, which make it sensitive and caused a failure.

Ends: the goal of what is said is misinterpreted by the air marshal.

Act sequence: the flight attendant ignoring to Dave's request, made him get nervous. Which helped in causing failure.

Key: the way Dave's talked with, made the air marshal sensitive to what is said and took it as a racism.

Norms: it is socially unacceptable to make a racist behaviour, and this is exactly what drives the air marshal mad.

Genre: conversation.

According to *Grice's maxims*, it's obvious that the situation lacks the maxim of manner. It's because the speaker's message isn't clear to the listener.

This failure here can be classified as a "social miscommunication". In this situation, we can notice that this is a cumulative failure. First, Dave getting nervous because the flight attendant was impolite with him. "The socio-cultural perspective assumes that each community has its own set of social norms, which are more or less explicit regulations that specify a specific behaviour, state of affairs, or style of thinking in a given situation. When an action is in line with the norm, it receives a good rating (politeness), but when it is not, it receives a negative impression (impoliteness = rudeness). (Fraser 1990: 220)

Robin Lakoff (1973) was the first to propose a politeness theory based on maxims. In a nutshell, she suggests two pragmatic competence rules: one is to "be explicit," and the other is to "be nice". 'It is more important in a conversation to avoid offense than achieve clarity'(1973: 297).

According to Brown and Levinson, Positive impoliteness: the employment of methods that harm the addressee's positive face needs, such as ignoring, snubbing, or failing to acknowledge the existence of the other.

Negative impoliteness: the employment of tactics to harm the addressee's negative face needs, such as frightening them into believing that something bad would happen to them. Condescend or ridicule, all of these tactics are used to emphasise your relative power.

There is a positive impoliteness in this situation (ignoring). As a result of the flight attendant rudeness, Dave became agitated and spoke nervously with the air marshal by saying "what is it with you people?", which is considered a negative impoliteness.

On the other hand, another reason for this failure. Sociable variables may cause misunderstandings. These social variables can be summarise in age, religion, race and ethnic, gender, and social class. One of these social variables which is racism, caused this failure. Racism means that there are superior and inferior. The terms superior and inferior are used to describe the interaction between two persons and their identities, as well as the societal foundations of power and other elements. In this view, when it comes to contact, the more powerful interlocutor, that is, the speaker who has a better chance of carrying out their wishes even when they are opposed by others, can be seen as superior (Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert and Leap, 318).

Race is a social characteristic that denotes the social grouping of people who have comparable physical or social qualities and are seen as belonging to a distinct group by society. (Louisa Desilla 2019: 12).

“People are also judged based on their language and language use when it comes to race and ethnicity. To put it another way, language can be seen as the embodiment of race and ethnicity because it reflects the attitudes and ways of thinking of specific social groupings. Language is used as part of this examination to subjectively categorise persons into social groups based on their racial and ethnic features.” (Williams 1992:215).

In this situation we have two participants from two different races “black and white” people. The racism against black people is notable. Otherwise, Dave did not mean this kind of racism with his utterance “you people”. This is what is called racial trauma.

People of Color and Indigenous peoples are victims of racial trauma, which is a type of race-based stress (POCI). People of Color and Indigenous peoples' (POCI) experiences with racism, discrimination, and microaggressions harm their mental and physical health, according to a growing clinical and empirical literature (Alvarez, Liang, & Neville, 2016).

In my point of view, the air marshal is affected by this racial trauma, the reason why he misunderstood the word “you people”, as it is a

racist behaviour and “people” here means black people. While Dave meant the air marshal and the flight attendant with this word.

In Emily in Paris series (2020).

Emily Cooper is a passionate young woman who accepts a job opportunity in Paris, but she confronts numerous obstacles, as a result of her sense of being an outsider who is unloved by anyone.

Context:

When they are at a work party, Emily and her friend Paul who is introducing a company manager to her.

Paul: Antoine of course owns “maison la vu”, and He has the best nose in France.

Emily: well, it’s... it’s very symmetrical.

(The rest of the group laughing at her and she feels embarrassed).

Antoine: Not totally my nose, a “nose” is what we call a perfumer. The one who composes the scent.

Emily: (embarrassment-inducing smile).

Analysis:

In this situation, regarding **speech act** Emily misinterpreted the meaning of nose illocutionary force failure, and this is (level 2). She has no idea what it means when Paul says about Antoine, the perfumer, that he has "the best nose in France". Although That is not even a French expression, this may happen because of her anxiety, due to the previous situations with them.

According to Searle’s **felicity conditions**, in this conversation, the failure is in the preparatory condition. As the intended meaning of the speaker is not clear.

According to **adjacency pairs** concept, it is statement/ sharing knowledge.

In the view of Hymes SPEAKING model, the failure is included in:

-scene/setting: being a part of a work party, led Emily to be serious and is not able to take the implied meaning of the word ‘nose’.

-participants: Emily’s colleagues are not friendly with her. Which makes her not confident while talking to them.

-ends: the goal of this conversation was introducing the manager of one of perfumes’ brands, but she did not get the right meaning.

-instrument: using the metaphorical word 'nose' is the main reason for the failure.

Regarding **Grice's maxims**, from the researcher's point of view, the failure can be assigned to the maxim of manner. As the word is not clear, but the failure can mainly occur because of the Particularised Conversational Implicature. Emily doesn't comprehend the intended meaning because she doesn't have enough information about this man, the "perfume's brand owner", according to Holtgraves, "Shared knowledge refers to information that all interlocutors have access to; whether or not the interactants are aware of each other's knowledge of this situation is irrelevant." (2002:125).

This failure considered a "linguistic-miscommunication". The speaker's (Paul) intended meaning was "he has the best taste in perfumes.", and what she understood is that he has the most symmetrical nose as a physical shape. He used a metaphorical word "nose", and she understood the literal meaning, and this is what discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) that A generative metaphor is a metaphor (or figurative analogy) in which one notion (or conceptual domain) is comprehended in terms of another. The source domain is the conceptual realm from which we derive the metaphorical phrases required to comprehend another conceptual domain in cognitive linguistics. The target domain is the conceptual domain that is interpreted in this way. As a result, the source domain of the journey is frequently utilized to explain the life's objective domain. In this situation, the conceptual metaphor "nose", is not crystal clear for Emily who takes only the literal meaning of the word.

Conclusion:

This paper discusses the communication issues that arise for those whose first language is English. The research clarifies that there are various causes for misunderstandings in casual interactions. This issue is primarily driven by two different linguistic and social sources. Due to miscommunications that result from lexical errors and others from social disparities between the conversation partners.

References:

- Adorno, T., & EFN, T. (2019). Abrams, MH, and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. A Glossary of Literary.
- Alvarez, A. N., Liang, C. T., & Neville, H. A. (Eds.). (2016). *The cost of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination* (pp. xv-356). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). Speech acts.
- Bharuthram, S. (2003). Politeness phenomena in the Hindu sector of the South African Indian. English speaking community. *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1523-1544.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311). Cambridge University Press.
- Canale M, Swain M (1980) Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to Second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1): 1–48.
- Canale, M (1983) From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In: Richards J, Schmidt R (eds) *Language and Communication*. Longman, London, pp 2–27.
- Comas-Díaz, L. (2016). Racial trauma recovery: A race-informed therapeutic approach to racial wounds. In A. N. Alvarez, C. T. H. Liang, & H. A. Neville (Eds.), **The cost of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination** (pp. 249–272). American Psychological Association.
- Crystal, D. 1985. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Erton, ø. 2007. Applied Pragmatics and Competence Relations in Language Learning and Teaching, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, Vol.3, No.1, April 2007.
- Cutlip, S. M., & Center, A. H. (1962). *Nuovo manuale di relazioni pubbliche*. Angeli.
- Fasold, R. W., & Connor-Linton, J. (Eds.). (2014). *An introduction to language and linguistics*. Cambridge university press.
- Fasold, R. W., & Connor-Linton, J. (Eds.). (2014). *An introduction to language and linguistics*. Cambridge university press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1977). The case for case reopened. In *Grammatical relations* (pp. 59-81). Brill.

- Fleming, L., & Slotta, J. (2018). The pragmatics of kin address: A sociolinguistic universal and its semantic affordances. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 22(4), 375-405.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(2), 219-236.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. 'Logic and conversation' in P. Cole and M. Morgan (eds.) 1975.
- Holtgraves, T. (2002). Language as Social Action: Social Psychology. *Language Use, Mahwah*.
- Hymes, D. 1974, Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.
- Kathy, P. (2015). Psychoanalysis: The defenses, anxiety and core issues. Educational Website Content Management.
- --Lakoff, R. (1973, April). The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 292-305). Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). The metaphorical structure of the human conceptual system. *Cognitive science*, 4(2), 195-208
- Lakoff, G. (2006). Conceptual metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings. Berlin*, 185-239.
- -Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2020). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. In *Shaping Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 475-504). Routledge.
- Lange, H. (2010). Adler, Hans, and Wulf Koepke, eds. A Companion to the Works of Johann Gottfried Herder. *The German Quarterly*, 83(2), 245-247.
- Levinson, S. C., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge university press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1995). Three levels of meaning. In *Grammar and meaning: Essays in honour of Sir John Lyons* (pp. 90-115). Cambridge University Press.
- Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert, Leap, R. J. A. W. (2009). *Introducing sociolinguistics*(2nded.). Edinburgh University Press.
- Miller, G. A. 1974. 'Psychology, language and levels of communication' in A. Silverstein (ed.). *Human Communication*. New York: John Wiley.
- Morris, C. W. (1938). Foundations of the Theory of Signs. In *International encyclopedia of unified science* (pp. 1-59). Chicago University Press.
- Nordquist, R. (2020). English as a foreign language (EFL). Retrieved from thoughtco.com/English-as-a-foreign-language-efl-1690597. Access in March 6th.
- Nwoye, O. G. (1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of pragmatics*, 18(4), 309-328.
- Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A. (1946). *The Meaning of Meaning*. 1923. Kegan, London, 19272.

- Pangestu, N. A., & Sunardi, F. D. (2016). An incomplete psychological novel: A psychoanalytical analysis of hazel Lancaster in John Green's *The Fault in Our Stars*. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(1), 20-28.
- Savillie-Troike, M. (2003). A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Culture as the Core: Perspective on Culture in Second Language Education*, 1.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In *Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). Brill.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings.
- Shum, A. O. N. (2008). Being positively polite—women making requests in Hong Kong workplaces. *LCOM Papers*, 2, 27-43.
- Terms, Thompson Wadsworth, 2005. Adler, Hans, and Wulf Koepke, eds. A Companion to the Works of Johann Gottfried Herder. Camden House, 2009.
- Adam, Ian. "Marginality and the Tradition: Earle Birney and Wilson Harris." *Journal. "NOT THE TRUTH BUT THE WAY": THE ETHICS OF IRONY IN WORLD LITERATURE*, 61, 199.
- Thornbury, S., & Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: From description to pedagogy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tipton, R., & Desilla, L. (Eds.). (2019). *The Routledge handbook of translation and pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Tyson, L. 2006, *Critical Theory Today*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
- Vanderveken, D., & Kubo, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Essays in speech act theory* (Vol. 77). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Williams, Glyn. *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.