



وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي
جامعة تكريت
كلية الآداب

مجلة آداب الفراهيدي

مجلة علمية محكمة تصدر عن كلية الآداب
جامعة تكريت



العدد : السابع والعشرون
أيلول ٢٠١٦

ISSN : 2074 - 9554 : الترقيم الدولي

مجلة آداب الفراهيدي

ت	عنوان البحث	اسم الباحث	الصفحة	
			من	إلى
	القرآن الكريم والتربية الإسلامية			
١٥	أثر استعمال استراتيجيات عظم السمكة في اكتساب المفاهيم البلاغية واستبقائها لدى طلاب الصف الخامس الأدبي	م.م. حسن علي عبد جواد	٣٤٥	٣٨٢
١٦	تقويم مهارات معلمات رياض الأطفال في صلاح الدين	م.د. عامر محدي صالح م.م. إحسان نظير م.م. محمود خليل حمد	٣٨٣	٤٠٣
١٧	The Contemporary Relationship Between Sentence Meaning and Compositionality	M.M. Samara M. Ahmed	12	1
١٨	OCULESICS AS PART OF BODY LANGUAGE IN THE GLORIOUS QUR'AN WITH REFERENCE TO TRANSLATION	M.M. Mahmood Ibrahim Hamdan	31	13
١٩	Pragmatic Failure of Homonyms in EFL Iraqi Learners	M.M. Marwan Mizhir Sahab M.M. Ali Ershad Rushdi	48	32
٢٠	Assessing the Performance of Secondary School Students' in Learning Reading Comprehension Communicatively	Asst. Lecturer Khalid Nayef Salem Asst. Lecturer Samar Hikmat Omar	69	49



Pragmatic Failure of Homonyms in EFL Iraqi Learners

M.M. Marwan Mizhir Sahab
College of Arts/ Tikrit University
M.M. Ali Ershad Rushdi
University of Tikrit Faculty of Education

Abstract

Pragmatic failure is, as Jenny Thomas defines it, the inability to understand and comprehend what is meant by the virtue of what is said. Pragmatic failure is of two types: pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic failure. The first of those failures, namely pragma-linguistic failure, is the one which means the pragmatic failure that can be solved by the explanation of grammar. The second type, socio-pragmatic failure, is that failure which happens by the difference of the norms and the conventions of the mother tongue and that of the second/target language which thereby is very difficult to explain. However, students of English as a foreign language may misuse the linguistic term 'homonyms', where homonymy means the kind of words that may have the same spelling words and pronunciation, but are different in meaning which in this case requires the knowledge of the context and this would be very difficult to the students to understand. The present study seeks to identify the errors (or failure) of EFL Iraqi students in using homonymy, and to find the solution or strengthen the students' pragmatic competence.

To fulfill the aims of the study, two tests (pretest and posttest) have been conducted and distributed on 50 students at third year at the College of Education (for humanity) for the academic year 2014-2015. The reliability of the test is achieved by the use of formula of Cranach's Alpha to the scores. It is found to be 0.86 which means a high positive reliability. The results show that there are statistical differences between the two tests: the pretest and the posttest show that the testees have achieved better performance in posttest (57%) than in the pretest (43%). This due to their lack of the pragmatic competence. They were unaware of the words they face in the test. But, after the explanation and the clarification of the meaning and the context in which these words are used, their performance gets better.

1- Pragmatics and Pragmatic Failure

Pragmatics is usually defined as the study of language in use, Levinson (1983: 1) and Mey (2001:3). For Levinson (1983: 9), pragmatics means 'the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language'. Others have defined this field of linguistics as the study of the meaning as intended by the speaker and inferred by the hearer. It means for some other pragmatists a kind of equation, namely: truth conditions – meaning = pragmatics, Gazdar (1979: 12). Or, it is the study of the contextual meaning (Yule, 1996:1) (cf Horn and Ward (2004).

Mey (2001: 263) explains the importance of the cross-cultural pragmatic differences from culture to another. It happens that two interlocutors from two different cultures can communicate but it will have some differences and, sure, some difficulties. One of them may use a word in an inappropriate context which he thinks that it is appropriate in the norms and systems of his mother tongue language, and this is one reason the difference of the cultures. In cross-cultural pragmatics, the most important thing is the context and the pragmatic appropriateness of it that an expression is used with and in. Because these contexts of use are different from culture to culture, this will cause a problem of understanding accordingly from language to language. For example, what appears to be an apology in Arabic norms and language cannot count in the norms in English. This will rather be translated into elaborating and thanking. Yule (1996: 87) defines cross-cultural pragmatics as the study of differences that is based on the cultural schemata. It is a broad area of investigation. It looks at the ways in which meaning is constructed by the speakers from different cultures. This will need a complete reassessment of virtually everything.

So, pragmatic failure is the inability of understanding the meaning that goes on in these definitions above. It is the inability to understand the meaning implied as is said by the speaker. That is, the meaning of what is implied in what is said is difficult to understand by the interlocutors and especially by the learners of second language (Thomas, 1983: 1). Leech (1983: 231) explains the state of pragmatic failure as the case which is adhered to the cross-cultural communication that is compared between the two languages in the matter of teaching. Therefore, languages are compared cross-culturally and linguistically especially in their use and the norms and culture. For example "the Japanese are more modest than the British" and "the British are more tactful than the Americans". Leech calls them pragma-linguistic strategies. Such strategies are those of indirectness-indirect speech acts- and the norms found in that are observed in the performance of these strategies in different speech communities. He calls the probability of the wrong transference of the norms and convention from one community to another is the form of pragmatic failure. Thomas (1983: 1) prefers to call it a pragmatic failure rather than an error, because an error can merely be solved by the virtue of grammar. But, the failure refers to the inability to give a clear understanding of the pragmatic force and no one can determine this pragmatic force of the utterance as well as improving the pragmatic competence of the learners of the language. She also divides her

study of pragmatic failure into two types. They are pragma-linguistic and socio-linguistic failure. The former refers to the pragmatic uses that are connected to the grammar of the language and is easy to recover. She says that pragma-linguistic failure is easy to overcome because it is that question of a highly conventionalized usage that can be taught as part of grammar. The latter refers to the sociocultural differences which are formed in the community of the learner and that found in the language he is learning. This kind however is difficult to solve. It is that difficult because it is the part of the systems and beliefs as well as the norms and conventions that are all set in the mind of the learner who tries to reach to them. So, socio-pragmatic is rather difficult to account for. Thomas tries to set some ways so as to make students acquire and enhance their pragmatic competences in their minds because it is thought that improving learners' pragmatic competence would result in avoiding pragmatic failure (ibid).

Pragmatic failure occurs between native and non-native English language, for example. Primarily, British and non-British may find it difficult because of the difference in the norm systems and pragmatic values connected to these norm systems. So, it is a matter of cross-cultural differences (ibid). These pragmatic values existed in the mind of the speaker of any language form the pragmatic competence of him.

2. Homonymy

Homonymy, Lyons (1977a: 22) and Lyons (1977b: 550) defines it, is the word that has two different meanings. It is one reason of the linguistic vagueness or what is called lexical ambiguity. Lyons stresses that 'here are two kinds of lexical ambiguity, one of which depends on homonymy and the other on polysemy'. He stresses that the forms of the homonyms are those lexemes whose all forms have the same form. He also claims that homonyms have a grammatical identity of function, in other words grammatical function. The expression found 1 and found 2 satisfy both of the conditions: each of them has the same set of forms, and there is a grammatical function not only in the state at which the two words are verbs but also they have the same grammatical function. He adds that homonymy has more than this form. It is divided into homography and homophony. They are partial forms of homonymy (ibid).

Crystal (2008: 231) defines the term homonymy as the semantic term that is used in lexical items which gives the indication that the words are similar in the form but different in the meaning, as in bear (= animal, carry) or ear (of body, of corn). Crystal adds that there is a possibility of what he

calls the partial homonymy where the identity is within the medium as: homophony and homography. Ambiguity can occur by the use of these homonyms. When the homonyms are not understood fully in certain contexts, there will be what is called the homonymic clash and this will result in this ambiguity.

Homophony is one kind of homonymy (cf Lyons (1977a/b); and Crystal (2008: 231). It is the case at which the words have the same pronunciation but rather different in meaning, like threw/through and rode/rowed. Homography, on the other hand, Crystal (2008: 230) defines, is a term used in semantic analysis. It refers to the state at which the words are similar in the spelling, but with the difference in meaning.

3. Context

Context means the psychological sets of assumptions that the speaker of a language has in his mind or the environment that come along with the utterances of the language spoken by the speakers or written by the writers of a language, which are responsible for making understanding possible either linguistically or physically. It is an understanding facilitating thing. Sperber & Wilson (1986/95: 15) define context as the set of psychological construct or the subset of the hearer's assumptions which he uses to make clues about the knowledge of the world. Carston (2002: 376) defines context as that subset of mentally represented assumptions which interacts with newly impinging information to give rise to 'contextual effects'. In ostensive communication, this set is not pre-given but is selected by the hearer on the basis of the utterance and his bid for an interpretation consistent with the communicative principle of relevance.

Mey (2001: 15) explains the term context stressing that it is dynamic rather than a static concept. That is, it is to be seen and understood as a constantly changing environment generally. It is the tool that the interlocutors rely on to make their current exchange intelligible. Hence, the communication process between them goes on correctly. Context according to the view of language is user-oriented rather than grammatical. The linguistic elements are treated in isolation of their use. They are treated as their basic syntactic structures. Whilst the user-oriented view in this regard, sees these linguistic elements in their use within the context of interaction. For Mey, context is an action, not merely a reference (ibid: 41). And, context is widely used in pragmatics. It is the extra-linguistic context which varies from user to user according to their knowledge of the language.



Context, however, is of two main kinds: co-text (linguistic context) and physical context or context of situation.

Malinowski (1923: 296) is the first who identifies the context of situation. He says that the concept of context of situation results in differences. The differences in linguistic perspectives which are opened up before the philologist who studies dead, inscribed languages, and before the ethnographer who has to deal with a primitive living tongue, existing only in actual utterance. The study of an object alive is more enlightening than that of its dead remains.

Yule (1996: 21) sets it clearly as he gives the kinds of contexts. He mentions two kinds of it: co-text and physical context. The former refers to the linguistic materials that accompany the intended expression. The co-text restricts the range of possible interpretations that can come across within the process of understanding the intended expression. It is part of the environment in which an expression is used. Whilst the co-text is adhered only to the linguistic surroundings within the expression, the latter, which is the physical context which means the non-linguistic physical surroundings that a word is happened to occur in. Yule (2010: 129) puts it as for the use of homonymy which is rather ambiguous as to be resolved by the context. The use of the homonym bank (the financial institution) and bank (the riverside). Here, the context plays the major role in the pragmatic interpretation of these words. If anyone comes to the interpretation of the word bank (the financial institution) when it comes in the co-text (I cashed my money in the bank) one will already know the meaning of it from the co-text. It is then the financial institution. If someone else is happened to hear an utterance that describes a place where the speaker is there at the moment like (come here chum! Let's have our launch beside the bank) and there he finds it in the riverside according the physical environment, then the word bank means the riverside and the meaning is construed by the physical context. So, resolving homonymy requires the knowledge of the context.

4. Two Types of Pragmatic Failure

As previously defined, it is the misunderstanding of the intended message of the speaker. Thomas (1983: 100) sets it clear about pragmatic failure as the following:

Grammar

Beliefs about the grammar

Knowledge of the grammar

Gram
matical
errors
(caused
by covert
and overt
grammati
cal
errors,
slips...
..etc.)

Pragmatic
Failure (caused
by mistaken
beliefs about
pragmatic force
of utterance)

Pragmatic Failure

Language in Use

Sociopragmatic
Failure (caused
by different
beliefs about
rights,
'mentionables'.
etc.)

Beliefs about the world

Social error (caused by ignorance
the world)

Knowledge of the world
World

Figure (1): Communication Breakdown

The above figure gives a clear-cut distinction among the other failures that may happen in the process of communication.

Pragmatic failure, Thomas (1983: 98) asserts, is not quite obvious in the surface structure of the language. It is rather hidden in the deep structure of it and that can only be revealed by explaining and discussing to the

learners by the teachers what pragmatic forces they are using. Here, Thomas imposes that teachers of the language should enhance the learners' metapragmatics- the ability to analyze and understand language use perceivably and consciously.

Already mentioned types of pragmatic failure are pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure. They are tackled respectively in the following:

4.1 Pragmalinguistic Failure: it that type which takes place when the pragmatic force mapped in the linguistic utterance or the structure which is systematically different from that normally assigned to it by the native speakers. It probably occurs when there is a teaching error or when there is 'pragmalinguistic transference'-the inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies from one language to another, or the transferring from the mother tongue to the target language of utterances which are semantically/syntactically equivalent, but which, because of different 'interpretive bias', tend to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language. Many pragmatic failure researchers have noted that there is a bias form which almost often existed in interpreting the grammatical ambiguity. That is so, because most people thing of the meaning of the ambiguous meaning as having only one meaning. And the best example of the inappropriate transfer from the first language to the second language is that of the use of speech acts. When the hearer understands the speaker's utterance as a direct speech act whereas in fact the speaker intends the indirect one. Some other pragmalinguistic failure might be resulted from the teaching-introduced materials; some of these failures are resulted from the inappropriate use of the model, or the lack of the use of modality in the discourse classrooms (Thomas, 1983:102). Pragmalinguistic failure is also dependent on the cross-cultural use of language. For example, speakers of Russian language tend to say of course to show enthusiastic affirmation instead (yes). In English, on the other hand, the use of 'of course' depends largely on the certain context. In English, 'of course' can be used as in:

- A. Are you coming to my party?
- B. Of course. [Gloss: yes, indeed/it goes without a saying/ I wouldn't miss it for the world!]

Usually, 'of course' implies that the speaker has asked about something which is already known and self-evident so that the Russian KONESNO which means in English 'of course', transferred from Russian to English in an answer to a genuine question can sound, at best crucial, and at least insulting:

- A. Is it a good restaurant?
B. Of course. [Gloss: (for Russian: yes, (indeed) it is. For English (H): What a stupid question!]
- (3) A. Is it open on Sunday? [Gloss: (for Russian): yes, (indeed) it is. For English (H): Only an idiotic foreigner would ask!]

So, the differences in culture and the norms and the way of using two different languages result in forming pragmatic failure (ibid).

4.2 Sociopragmatic Failure: this type of a pragmatic failure is rather difficult to account for. To gain successful pragmatic meaning and communication, there are two basic judgements: the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic judgements. The former refers to the basically grammatical or the pragmalinguistic assessment of the pragmatic force of the linguistic token or utterance. The latter concerns the size of imposition, cost and benefit, social distance, and relative rights and obligations.

The second kind of judgments which concerns the social rights and the obligations is the one which forms the social competence of the speaker. They help make the linguistic utterances because it makes the speaker aware of when, what and how to speak the language in certain contexts. Examples of the sociopragmatic

There are certain kinds of the sociopragmatic failure. They are:

- The size of the imposition: it concerns the free and non-free goods which provide a useful framework within which to discuss one cause of sociopragmatic failure. 'Free goods' are those which, in a given situation, anyone can use without any permission, for example, asking for a salt in the restaurant. 'Free goods' varies according to the degree of intimate relationship and the situation as to say that in one's own family, the food, drink, books and other things are all free goods. In Russia, asking for a cigarette in England using the strategy of Russian language would either result in wrong use of politeness or misjudge the size of imposition.
- Tabus: this is related to the use the language by following the tabu and the religion of two different cultures and religion. A serious formation of a sociopragmatic failure is the wrong use of tabus- sex and religion. It happens when the learner is making reference in the second language to something which is tabu.
- Cross-culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance: in this case, the sociopragmatic failure is resulted by the learner's use of the native speaker's relative power and social distance. For example, in the

learner's own culture, the teacher may have a rather higher status than they do in other country, leading the learner to behave not typically as he is expected to normally behave.

- Sociopragmatic failure and value judgements: the most difficult task that the teacher inevitably faces is when he teaches the use of the language with the politeness, especially when these principles of pragmatics conflict with each other. The value in this respect is not to hold matters of Truth and Justice. Cross-culturally two things may occur which appear to involve a fundamental conflict of values but in fact stem from sociopragmatic mismatches, in different cultures different pragmatic 'ground rules' may be invoked and relative values such as 'politeness', 'perspicuous' may be ranked in a different order by different cultures.

These are the main concepts of the pragmatic failure; whether in the pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic failure. Muir and Xu (2011:258) state that the pragmatic failure takes place when there are two different socio-cultures and when there are some lack of linguistic proficiency. They mention some issues that are thought of to be the reasons that cause the pragmatic failure. They are:

- Pragmatic transfer: it causes to the pragmatic failure in that it contains some huge differences, because of the socio-cultural differences. Pragmatic transfer is the transference of the norms and the cultural conventions of the mother language to the target or the second language.
- The lack of linguistic proficiency: the lack of the linguistic proficiency is one other reason behind the pragmatic failure. Learners who have low linguistic proficiency are prone to do some pragmatic failures because of the lack of the needed information in the language they are learning.

It is, presumably, thought that the pragmatic failure may also happen because of the lack pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence- the ability to use the language in certain contexts- is very important to the process of learning and using the language.

5. Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence can be defined as the ability to successfully communicate and appropriately use the language in social context. Fraser (2010: 1) defines pragmatic competence as the ability of the communication of the intended messages with all the nuances in any socio-cultural context and to interpret this message to the interlocutor the same way as it is

intended. It is a must that learners of the second language should have this kind of competence. It happens that many learners may have a very good grammatical flow of sentences, but not fully understood in their second language and hence they are prone to fail in their communication because they lack the pragmatic competence.

Thomas (1983: 92), on the other hand, defines pragmatic competence as the ability to use the language effectively in order to achieve a certain purpose and to understand the language in its context. It is rather different from the linguistic competence which means the abstract knowledge of the grammar of language and the decontextualized knowledge of intonation, phonology, syntax, semantics, and etc. Pragmatic competence is also different from the communicative competence in that the communicative competence is the kind of mixer between language use and the linguistic knowledge of the language itself.

6- Research Design and Method of the Study

6.1 Population and Sample of the Study

The population is Iraqi EFL College students at University of Tikrit , and the total number of third year students population enrolled in this University is (123). The sample is randomly selected from the College of Education (for humanity) 50 third year students for the academic year 2014-2015 , they are exposed to two tests . The first before explanation homonymy (pretest), and the second after explanation homonymy (posttest).

6.2 Instrument

The instrument used in this study involves: a test of visualizing the meaning of homonymy and put it in complete sentence. The test is given to a group of students before explanation what is homonymy (pretest), and the same test is given after explanation homonymy (posttest). The test has been constructed from the data gathered from the available resources.

6.3 Description of the Tests:

The last procedure carried out by the researcher is the application of test .The test is constructed of 15 pair sentences consisting homonymy .The testees are asked to identify the meaning of the homonymy and put it in complete sentence before explanation the concept of homonymy (Pretest) .The same test is given again to the same group of the students after giving the students a lecture of two hours to explain the concept of the homonymy (Posttest). The testees are also asked to identify the meaning of the homonymy and put it in complete sentence. The answers are formulated by



the testees themselves. The scoring is objective. The two tests have been tried out on a sample of fifty students at third year.

The statistical correlation between the scores of two tests as well as an external criterion are established to find an efficient criterion, since these tests are measuring language usage in an educational context.

6.4 Correlation Coefficient of Reliability

6.4.1 Reliability

Reliability is one of the necessary characteristics of any good test. It refers to stability of measurement which makes validity possible and indicates the amount of confidence that can be placed in results of the test (Oller, 1979:4). Reliability indicates to the consistency of the test results. Lado (1961:33) points out that the same sample must have the stable scores in order to show the reliability of the test. There are several methods for estimating reliability, one of which is Cronbach's Alpha (Eble, 1972:41). For this purpose ten Iraqi 3rd year college students from Department of English/ College of Education for Humanity / University of Tikrit are chosen randomly and tested in the items of the test. The learners' papers are corrected and the formula of Cronbach's Alpha is applied to the scores. It is found to be 0.84 which means a high positive reliability. Table (1) below shows the reliability of the test.

Table (1)
Test Reliability

No.	Part (1)	Part (2)	Total
1	17	20	37
2	17	17	34
3	16	15	31
4	16	14	30
5	15	14	29
6	14	13	27
7	13	12	25
8	13	9	22
9	12	10	22
10	9	7	16

The formula of Cronbach's Alpha is as follows:

$$\alpha = \frac{k}{k-1} \left[1 - \frac{\sum s_i^2}{s^2} \right]$$

K= The

number of test items

K-1= The number of test items -1

($\sum s_i^2$)= The variance of the marks of each item

s^2 = The total variance of the total of test items (ibid).

6.4.2 Test Difficulty Level

The difficulty level of the test items indicates the proportion of the testees who pass the test. The total scores of the ten learners have been ranked from the highest to the lowest one, then they are divided into two groups. The total scores of the learners who answer the test items correctly at both the upper and the lower groups are divided by the total number of the learners of the both groups. Brown (1983:37) confirms that the acceptable level of difficulty ranges from 20% - 80%. The level of difficulty of the two parts is 0.71, 0.73 respectively and thus it is considered acceptable.

6.4.3 Pilot and Final Administration of the Instruments:

A pilot administration of the instrument has been done with a sample of 50 third year students. The procedure has been followed to the same sample after one week in order to answer both tests which require from the students to give the suitable meaning of homonymy. All the answers have been collected by the researcher to calculate the number of correct responses, percentage of correct answer. Being certain that the instrument is valid and reliable, two tests have been administered at different days to the selected sample. The researcher has explain the aims behind these instrument for the testees. Then the testees' answer (both tests) are collected by the researcher and then scored and tabulated in order to find out the final results.

6.4.4 Scoring Scheme:

A definite scoring scheme is adopted to fulfill the reliability of the test under analysis. The test which includes fifteen items is scored out of 50 and the scores are distributed in such a way as to give two scores for each correct item. Zero score is given for both incorrect and ignored items assuming that the later are considered incorrect.

7- Results and Discussions

7-1 Pretest and Posttest of Homonymy

The analysis of two tests namely the pretest and posttest show that the testees have achieved better performance in the posttest (58%) than in the pretest (42%).

7-1-1 Students' Performance of Homonymy Pretest

This test intends to investigate whether the students can or can not identify the meaning of homonyms and put them in complete sentence before explanation of the concept of homonymy (pretest). The test consists of fifteen pair sentences . The researchers collect and calculate the no. of items , no. of correct answer , and no. of incorrect answers . The results of the students responses in this aspect are indicated in the following table :

Table (1)
The numbers of Correct , Incorrect Answers and percentages of the Learner's Performance in Pretest

No. of items	No. of Correct answer	No. of incorrect answer
1	17	33
2	21	29
3	15	35
4	26	24
5	19	31
6	16	34
7	23	27
8	25	25
9	14	36
10	28	22
11	20	30
12	24	26
13	22	28
14	27	23
15	24	26
	321	429
	43%	57%

The results reflected by table (1) visualize that the total number of the correct answers is (321) with percentage (43%) , while the total number of incorrect answers is (429) with percentage (57%) . This points out that students before explanation the concept of homonymy have extremely power performance in identifying the meaning of homonymy and put it in complete sentence. This may be attributed either of two reasons. First, the absence of cues (context) to facilitate the understanding homonymy and put it in

complete sentence. Second, they rarely use these homonyms in their daily speech.

7-1-2 Students' Performance of Homonymy Posttest

The same test is given to the same group of students after explaining the concept of homonymy (posttest). It aims at investigating whether the students can or can not identify the meaning of homonyms and put them in complete sentence. . (See Appendix 2). The researchers collect and calculate the no. of items, no. of correct answer, and no. of incorrect answers. The results of the students' responses are showed in the following table:

Table (2)
The numbers of Correct, Incorrect Answers and percentages of the Learner's Performance in Posttest

No. of items	No. of Correct answer	No. of incorrect answer
1	29	21
2	31	19
3	27	23
4	23	27
5	34	16
6	26	24
7	30	20
8	32	18
9	27	23
10	25	25
11	37	13
12	33	17
13	24	26
14	29	21
15	26	24
	433	317
	58%	42%

The results reflected by table (2) indicates that the total number of the correct answers is (433) with percentage (58%), while the total number of incorrect answers is (317) with percentage (42%). This points out that the students' performance in posttest is better than their performance in pretest. This can be ascribed to the role of cues given in posttest that activates their memory.

8. Conclusion

The conclusions arrived at in this research are the following:

- 1- Students can not understand and give sentences of homonymy unless the get acquainted with meaning of the words .
- 2- Most of English as foreign language learners do not have that adequate pragmatic competence that helps them cope with the use of these homonyms
- 3- Pragmatic failure of pragmalinguistics kind is the only possible area to assess and analyzed because the other type – sociopragmatic failure is very difficult to be analyzed , because it is hard to explain and it needs books to uncover the norms differences in two different languages .
- 4- The students must have memorize and study the use of homonyms by fortifying and strengthening their pragmatic competence to improve their use of language.

Bibliography

- Brown, F.G. (1983): Principles of Education and Psychological Testing. New York: Wileg.
- Carston R. (2002): Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Crystal D. (2008): A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Eble, R. I. (1972): Essentials of Education Measurement. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Fraser B. (2010): Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Hedging. In: Kalterböck, Mihatseh, and Schneider. New Approaches to Hedging. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Gazdar G. (1979): Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Forms. New York Academic Press.
- Lado, R. (1961): Language Testing. The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Test. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Leech G (1983): Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman Ltd.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983): Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons J (1977a): Semantics Vol I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons J (1977b): Semantics Vol II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malinowski B. (1956): The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages, in C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards (eds), The

Meaning of Meaning New York: Harcourts, Brace, and Company.

- Mey J. (2001): Pragmatics: An Introduction 2nd (ed). London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Oller, J. and John W.(1979): Language Test at School. London: Longman.
- Sperber D. and Wilson D. (1995): Relevance: Communication and Cognition. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Thomas J. (1983): Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure. In: Applied Linguistics.
- Yule G. (1996): Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix (1)

The Pretest

Identify the meaning of the following homonyms and put them in complete sentences

1. Bank/bank
2. Port/port
3. Wind/wind
4. Present/present
5. Close/ close
6. Wound/wound
7. Live/live
8. Lying/lying
9. Watch/watch
10. Fuzz/fuzz
- 11.Bored/board
- 12.Wear/ware
- 13.Rode/road
- 14.Band/banned
- 15.Tows/toes

Appendix (2)

The Posttest

Identify the meaning of the following homonyms and put them in complete sentences

1. Bank (financial institution)/bank (beside the river)
2. Port (a small bay)/ port (a kind of alcoholic drink)
3. Wind (v. to roll)/ wind (the movement of the air)
4. Present (a gift)/ present (v. to introduce something)



**Pragmatic Failure of Homonyms
in EFL Iraqi Learners**

مجلة آداب الفراهيدي

Marwan Mizhir Sahab

Ali Ershad Rushdi

العدد (٢٧) أيلول ٢٠١٦م

5. Close (near)/ close (locked)
6. Wound (injury)/ wound (rolled)
7. Live (dwell: to live in a certain place)/ live (direct)
8. Lying (to lie on something)/ lying (saying what is not true)
9. Watch (v. to monitor)/ watch (a hand watch)
10. Fuzz (to hurry)/ fuzz to fly away)
11. Bored/board
12. Wear/ware
13. Rode/road
14. Band/banned
15. Tows/toes