

التحقق من قدرة متعلمي اللغة الانكليزية كلغة أجنبية على إتقان الجنس اللفظي

Investigating Iraqi EFL Learners' Command of Homonymy

Rafat Dhiyaa Rashaad

رأفت ضياء رشاد

Assistant Lecturer

مدرس مساعد

The General Directorate of

مديرية تربية محافظة نينوى

Education of Nineveh

rafat.dhiyaa@gmail.com

تاريخ القبول

تاريخ الاستلام

2022/1/11

2021/12/21

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجنس اللفظي - إتقان - إدراك - إنتاج

Keywords: Homonymy- Command- Recognition- Production

المخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى التحقيق في قدرة متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية العراقيين ، على المستوى الجامعي على إتقان الجنس اللفظي في اللغة الإنكليزية. حيث تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التحقيق في قدرة المتعلمين في التعرف على الفهم الإملائي الصحيح واستخدام ألفاظ متجانسة متنوعة باستخدام كلمة مناسبة حيث تكون متداخلة صوتيا وهجائيا. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، يحاول تقييم قدرة المتعلمين وأدائهم على مستوى الإنتاج.

من أجل تحقيق أهداف البحث ، تم إجراء اختبار تشخيصي من قبل الباحث وتم توزيعه على 100 طالب من طلاب السنة الرابعة لقسم اللغة الإنجليزية في كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية في جامعة الموصل. يتم اختيار الطلاب بشكل عشوائي من العام الدراسي 2019-2020. و قد خضع الاختبار لأعضاء هيئة المحلفين من أجل تحديد صلاحيته. كان معامل الدقة للاختبار 0,81. تشير النتائج إلى أن كلا من أسئلة الإدراك والإنتاج لها اختلافات إحصائية : يوضح الاختبار أن المتعلمين حققوا مستوى في الإدراك أفضل من مستوى الإنتاج .

Abstract

This study attempts to investigate the Iraqi EFL learners', at the university level, ability to command homonymy in English. The study aims to investigate the learners' ability to recognize the correct spelling comprehension and usage of diverse homonyms by using suitable lexeme that is phonologically and orthographically overlapped. In addition, it tries to assess the learners' ability and performance at the production level.

In order to achieve the aims of the research, a diagnostic test has been conducted and it is distributed on **100** students from the 4th year students in the English department of the College of Education for Humanities at the University of Mosul. The students are chosen randomly from the academic year **2019-2020**. The test is exposed to jury members in order to determine its validity. The reliability coefficient of the test was **0.81**. The results indicate that both the recognition and the production questions have statistical differences: the test demonstrates that the learners have achieved better at the recognition level than that of the production one.

1. Sense Relations

According to Kreidler (1998:86), sense relation is "an approach to the description of lexical relations attempting to classify lexemes according to shared and differentiating features. Its task is to account for the meaning relations between different expressions in a language".

Yule (2010 : 116-117) states that lexical items have relationships among each other as well as being containers of meaning. Consequently, the sense of every lexeme is not described according to its component properties, but in terms of its relationship with another lexeme.

Individual meanings of lexical items might have a variety of relationships with other meanings of a lexeme (Jeffries,2006: 168). Sense relations are the interrelations of word senses as a whole. Depending on the relationships among lexemes, there are a range of different sense relations in which a lexeme's meaning might go into. These various sense relationships have more in common than their convention names suggest.

Lexical relations then can be defined as the semantic relationships that appear in sets of lexemes from which an option has to be made by a speaker or writer. The choice constitutes the relations of meaning depending on the intended meaning and other factors (Greenbaum, 1996:424). According to Kreidler (1998: 86), sense relation is "an approach to the description of lexical relations which attempt to classify lexical items according to different or common features".

In this regard, Riemer (2010:136) recognizes that understanding the sense of a term entails more than merely knowing its description. A good speaker understands how a word relates to other words in addition to its definitional meaning. Clearly, lexical relations are those that decide one lexical item is chosen over another in the formulation of any speech. He goes on to say that describing and accounting for these relationships is one of the main tasks of lexical semantics (ibid:136). These relations observe the relationships between senses of the lexical items, in terms of similarity (synonymy), differences (antonymy), a

part- whole relation (meronymy), class inclusion (hyponymy) and so on. This study concentrates on the lexical relation of homonymy.

To sum up, words can reveal features about how we perceive the world, they cannot be treated as containers only or as fulfilling "roles", but they can also be treated as relationships. Lexical relations are divided into many types as: **Synonymy, Antonymy, Hyponymy, Monosemy, Polysemy, Homonymy, Meronymy, Metonymy** ,etc.

1.1 Synonymy

According to Crystal (2003: 450), synonymy is "a sense relation between lexical items which have the same meanings, such items are termed as synonyms". As for Larson (1998: 78), synonyms are lexical items that they are similar in their meanings. According to Parker and Riley (2005: 35), if two words have the same meaning, they are said to be synonyms, i.e. if the values of the words are similar in relation to their semantic features. For instance, the lexical items "big" and "large" have the same semantic features. So, they are treated as synonyms. (Bell, 1993: 92; and Crystal, 2003: 450) all agree that all languages do not have exact or absolute synonyms. In other words, the previous examples "big" and "large" in phrases like: (my big brother) and (my large brother) are absolutely not similar in meaning.

1.2 Antonymy (Oppositeness)

Antonymy is defined by Crystal (2003: 27) as "a term that is used in semantics as part of the study of oppositeness of meaning". Lobner (2002: 88) states that when two words indicate two contradictory boundaries, they are said to be antonyms. As for Parker and Riley (2005: 37) when the meanings of two words differ only in a single semantic feature, they are said to be antonyms. For instance, (hot and cold) and (dead and alive). The meanings of the previous pairs of words have an opposite in the semantic features of these lexical items. Thus, (dead) is said to have [- living] while (alive) is [+ living]. Finch (2000: 151) states that there are three types of antonymy, namely, gradable, complementary and relational. Gradable antonymy is a term where there is a gradable degree of opposition between lexical items. For instance, (hot and cold), (tall and short), etc. there are degrees of

temperature, height, and width. Consequently, to say that the water is not hot this does not mean that it is cold and vice versa. Complementary or (non-gradable) antonyms are different from gradable ones in that the opposition is absolute between lexical items. For example, (male and female), (open, shut) and (single and married).

The meanings of the previous examples indicate that if the man is not single, this means that he is absolutely married and vice versa. Thus, words do not have a degree in between. Relational antonyms mean one member of the pair which refers to the converse relation referred to by the other member. For instance, (husband and wife), (father and son) and (over and under). So, if there is not a husband, there will not be a wife.

1.3 Hyponymy

Finch (2005: 158) defines hyponymy as "a hierarchical sense relation that exists between two terms in which the sense of one is included in the other". According to Bell (1993: 92), the words rose, tulip and orchid all include the sense of flower. Therefore, the meaning of one lexical item is included in the other, for instance, a tiger is included in animal. As for (Larson, 1998: 71; and Crystal, 2003: 222) hyponymy is "a relationship between specific and general lexical items". Larson states that lexical items have generic and specific relations. For example, he provides the example of "sheep" in words like "ram", "ewe" and "lamb". Here, "sheep" is a generic lexical item since it includes the meanings of "ram", "ewe" and "lamb" in which they are more specific.

1.4 Meronymy

Lyons (1977: 311-314), Halliday (1985: 312), Saeed (1997: 70) and Murphy (2003: 218) define meronymy as "a structural sense/semantic relation holding between lexical items denoting parts (meronyms) and that denoting their corresponding wholes (holonyms)". For example, (finger) is a meronym of (hand), another example (eye) is a meronym of (face). Therefore, meronymy is said to be a part-whole relationship between the word senses.

1.5 Member-collection

According to Saeed (1997:71), member-collection is a relationship between the lexical item of a unit and the usual lexeme for a collection of the units. For instance, **employee** is a member of (committee); **book** is a member of (library); and **ship**-(fleet).

1.6 Portion mass

According to Winston et al.,(1987), the portion mass relationship indicates that the part is similar to all other parts and to the whole such as, slice part of pie. Each portion of the pie is a "pie" and it is similar to the other slices of the pie and to the whole pie. In the present research, the focal point is homonymy.

2. Homonymy

Liddell, et al (1982: 480) state that the word "homonym" is traced back to the Greek form consisting of the prefix "homo-", meaning "same", and suffix "ónymos", meaning "name". Homonyms are therefore lexical items having the same pronunciation but distinct meanings. Homonymy is "the case where different unrelated meanings are shared under same surface form of words"(Fellbaum, 2000: 52).

2.1 Definitions of Homonymy

Homonymy is a type of lexical relation and it is always classified under paradigmatic relations. Homonymy is defined differently. However, they all agree that there are differences of meaning of the same orthography or the same pronunciation.

Jackson (1988: 4) states that homonymy is " the case in which words are spelt and pronounced the same, but have clearly different meanings". Moore (2000: 9) defines homonymy as "different words with the same form". As for Pustejovsky (1995: 29) homonymy is" the case where a lexical item carries two distinct and unrelated meanings". According to Finch (2005: 157), homonymy is "a lexical relation that exists between words which have the same form but unrelated senses". Gramley (1992:13) also defines homonymy as "different words with the same pronunciation (homophones, e.g. meat-meet), or the same spelling (homographs, e.g. lead - lead) but distinct meaning". According to Cruse (2006:80), homonymy is "a lexical relation that describes cases where unrelated meanings are conveyed by similar linguistic items such as "bank 1" and "bank 2" (n.) which have the same spelling and pronunciation but different, unrelated meanings.

To sum up, homonymy is one or two lexical items that have the same pronunciation or the same orthography, but their senses are unrelated and they are sorted in dictionaries separately through different lexical entries for the lexeme, for instance, meet, meat; sea, see; you, ewe, etc.

Some authors state (homophones and homographs) when talking about homonymy. According to Palta (2007: 3), the homophone words "are spelled differently but pronounced the same way". For instance, week-weak, meat-meet ,etc. On the other hand, homograph "is one of two or more words spelled alike

but different in origin or meaning or pronunciation". That is to say, these lexical items are similar in spelling, but they differ in the pronunciation and meaning (ibid: 13).

Francu (2003: 13) states that "homophones are two or more words which are identical in the phonic medium and different in written medium and meaning". As for Parent (2009: 22), "the words that have the same written form but differ in their pronunciation are called homographs". For instance, the word "bank" (financial institution), and (side of the river).

2.2 Types of Homonymy

According to Lobner (2002: 43), homonyms are divided into four types:

- 1- Two lexical items having the same spelling and the same grammatical category. For example, the word "bank" (n.) (financial institution), and "bank" (side of the river).
- 2- Two lexical items having the same spelling and different grammatical category. For example, the word "present" (n.) (a gift), and "present" (v.) (to give or to show something).
- 3- Two lexical items having the same grammatical category with different spelling. For example, the word "rain" (n.) (the water that falls from the sky), and "reign" (n.) (the period of time that a king or queen rules a country).
- 4- Two lexical items having different spelling with different grammatical category. For example, the word "meat" (n.) (the flesh of animals), and "meet" (v.) (to come together with someone).

2.3 Homonymy VS Polysemy

Regardless of the fact that polysemy and homonymy are sorted as distinct phenomena, the boundary between them may be fuzzy. Yule (2010: 120) and Wadsworth (2008: 187-188) indicate two criteria to distinguish between these two phenomena. The first criterion is the historical origin of the word, or the etymology of the word. The meaning of the word "bank" as (financial institution) has a French origin, while the other sense which is (slope of the river) is borrowed from Scandinavian origin (ibid: 187). The second criterion is the different synonyms and antonyms of the word. For example, the word "plain" has two senses: (1) 'clear, easy' and (2) 'undecorated' ; these two

senses have a synonym of being "simple" and an antonym of being "complex" and both the two senses can be said to be "devoid of complex". The previous criteria appear to be workable although not always infallible. The most widely used criteria among linguists to distinguish polysemy and homonymy are the etymological information and relatedness/ unrelatedness of meanings. This criterion is unfortunately criticized by Finch (2000: 165) as there are some problematic lexemes like "pupil" which are originally polysemic , but have so unrelated senses that people label them as homonyms.

The difference between homonymy and polysemy is better shown in dictionaries: polysemous use of a lexeme is listed under one entry , whereas homonymous words have separate entries. For instance, the word "bark" has three distinct entries with three different meanings (sound of dog, cover of tree, and kind of a boat). If found, polysemous use is presented in terms of aspects of meaning and reflect syntactic information where necessary.

Speaker intuition about lexical relations is also made use of as a factor in differentiating polysemy and homonymy. Depending on this factor, two lexemes are polysemous if they are viewed by the native speakers as related, homonymous words if they are not related . The problem of this criterion is the subjective judgment and the relatedness is a matter of degree. Some speakers would see some words related while others would not (Lyons, 1977: 552). Moreover, speakers intuitions may not have any bearing on the way in which speakers comprehend and use words. This is possibly because speaker intuitions about lexical relations are arrived at by thinking about language, i.e. not directly reflected as they are stored in mind, metalinguistic.

According to (Fromkin et al. 2003:180), words such as: 'neck', 'guard', 'music', and 'bachelor' are considered as polysemous because each one of them is seen as a single lexeme with many discernible senses in standard English dictionaries, however they have one entry, while homonymous words usually have separate entries in standard English dictionaries and often distinguished from each one by giving them numbers (1, 2).

3-Data Collection and Analysis

This section is devoted to presenting a clear description of the work and the procedures followed to fulfill the aims of the research and confirm its hypotheses. In order to achieve the objectives of this research, the researcher designed a test to examine the students' command of homonymy in English.

3.1 The Sample of the study

The population of the research covers all the undergraduate Iraqi EFL learners at the fourth year in the English Department, College of Education for Humanities at the University of Mosul. The overall number of the population is **209** students. The sample of this research is chosen randomly. One hundred students are chosen randomly from the 4th year students in the English department of the College of Education for Humanities at the University of Mosul. The samples of the research are from the academic year 2019-2020.

3.2 Test Construction

In order to measure the students' command of homonyms, the researcher designed a test taking into consideration that fourth year students of the College of Education have studied lexical relations in linguistics. The researcher drew up two questions to be answered by students of the 4th year. The test was composed of (30) homonymous words , it is worthy to mention that all the (30) items were chosen from the Oxford Wordpower Dictionary (2003) and New Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1995)

3.2.1 Validity of the Test

According to Chastain (1988:393), validity has to provide an authentic measure of a precise skill that is intended to be measured. Validity is "the degree to which a test measures what is supposed to measure , or can be used successfully for the purpose for which it is intended" (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 575). To ensure the validity of the test used in the present study , two kinds of validity are used : face and content validity.

3.2.1.1 Face Validity

Face validity is "the extent to which a test meets the expectations of those involved in its use", viz test makers, administrators, teachers and candidates (McNamara, 2000: 138). Accordingly, in order to apply face validity of the present research, the researcher submitted a form of the test to jury members who were specialists in linguistics, teaching EFL and methodology to give their approval of the test items. They agreed that the test items were suitable for the purpose of the research adding some modifications which were taken into consideration.

3.2.1.2 Content Validity

According to Hughes (1989: 23), " the test would have content validity only if it included a proper sample of the relevant structures". Content validity then takes place when the test gives adequate coverage of the subject being studied, i.e. how far the test reflects the content of the syllabus and whether it really measures what is supposed to measure or it can successfully be used for the purpose aimed at (Al-Juboury, 2000: 22).

3.3 The Pilot Study

Cohen et al., (2004: 324) indicate that "Conducting a pilot test is necessary to refine the test reliability and presentation of the items, to judge item discrimination power, item difficulty, and to address validity and reliability". In the present research, the test was performed on **50** students from the population of the College of Education for Humanities , other than the original sample. The pilot study was performed so as to help the researcher to check the clarity of the items in the given test.

3.4 Item analysis

According to Oliva (1988: 15), the procedure for testing item analysis refers to "checking responses constructed by all students for each item included in the test". The outcomes of the item analysis are used to give details about the items' difficulty in addition to the items' ability to discriminate between the best and the weakest students. The test papers of the pilot study are scored and after that the students' overall scores are ranked from the highest to the lowest so as to put the

highest scores into the upper group and to put the lowest scores into the lower group. Item analysis is made in order to get the items difficulty "P" and items discrimination "D".

3.4.1 Items Difficulty "P"

According to Cohen et al., (2007: 337), the construction of the test must tackle item analysis, item discrimination and item difficulty. Item difficulty "P" is a measure of the proportion of the testees who answered the item correctly. As for Brown (2004: 58), both the very easy items and the very difficult items are impracticable to divide the testees' high-ability and low-ability and he indicates that the range of the item difficulty is between **0.15** and **0.85**. Nonetheless, the best rate of "P" is from **0.222** to **0.574** (see table 1).

3.4.2 Items Discrimination "D"

According to Brown (2004: 68), Item discrimination "D" is "a statistic that indicates the degree to which an item separates the students who performed in a good way from those who did poorly on the test as a whole". The higher the item discrimination coefficient, the more effective is the item. Item discrimination is calculated by dividing the testees into two groups based on high and low scores on the test, then subtracting the proportion of correct answers in the upper group (Whiston, 2009: 84). All the test items are acceptable since the items discrimination of the items ranges from **0.333** to **0.777** after applying the item discrimination formula (see table 1).

Table (1)

The Discrimination Index of the Recognition and Production Test

NO.	Level of difficulty	Power discrimination	NO.	Level of difficulty	Power discrimination
1	0.222	0.444	17	0.547	0.333
2	0.370	0.666	18	0.481	0.666
3	0.296	0.518	19	0.407	0.370
4	0.518	0.518	20	0.222	0.444
5	0.481	0.740	21	0.518	0.518
6	0.462	0.777	22	0.425	0.333
7	0.425	0.333	23	0.370	0.666
8	0.259	0.518	24	0.481	0.740
9	0.518	0.592	25	0.296	0.518
10	0.481	0.666	26	0.462	0.777
11	0.259	0.444	27	0.370	0.666
13	0.407	0.370	28	0.481	0.740
14	0.462	0.629	29	0.518	0.592
15	0.388	0.481	30	0.296	0.518
16	0.259	0.518			

3.4.3 Reliability of the Test

Ary et al., (2010: 649) indicate that reliability is the extent to which scores are free of random errors. In the present study, Alpha-Cronbach is used as a tool to calculate the reliability of the test. One of the characteristics given by Lado (1961: 330) is to re-score the test after ten days after the first scoring. Reliability coefficient was obtained by comparing the scores of the first rating (i.e., the rater's first rating) to the scores of the second rating (i.e., rater's second rating). The researcher has found that the correlation coefficient of the test is **(0.81)** by applying the Alpha-Cronbach formula.

3.5 The Scoring Scheme of the Test

The scoring scheme of a test illustrates the scheme adopted in scoring the test items. The test consists of two questions. The first question comprises 15 items. On the other hand, the second question also consists of 15 items. Thus, it will be scored out of 30 marks, (1)

score is given for each correct item and (0) score for each wrong item.

Table (2) illustrates the scoring scheme of the test:

Table(2)
Distribution of the Test's Scores

Question Form	Question Number	The Scores
Multiple choice items	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15	(0-1)
Blank filling	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15	

3.6 Statistical Methods

In order to fulfill the aims of this research, five statistical methods have been used. The first method is the Pearson formula which has been used to compute the reliability of the test. The second method is the Essay Item Difficulty level formula which has been used to compute **P** for the recognition and production test. The third method is the Objectives Item Discrimination Formula which has been used to compute the **D** for the items in the recognition and production test. The fourth and fifth statistical methods are the percentages formula and the T test formula. The percentage formula has been used to find the percentage of the right and wrong answers for all items in the test and also the T-test value has been used for the test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Analysis of the Results

In order to achieve the aims of the present research, the following outcomes are conducted when the data is statistically manipulated. Firstly, as far as the first recognition test is concerned, the analysis of the results is made in order to discover if the mean score of the sample of the research for the two questions have statistically significant differences. The mean score of the sample of the research is **(9.80)** with a standard deviation of **(2.06)**. On the other hand, at the production level, The mean score of the sample of the research is **(3.24)** with a standard deviation of **(2.33)**. The two questions are at **(0.05)** level of significance and under **(99)** degree of freedom. It has been found that the T-test value of the test is **(20.65)**. Secondly, these results show that there are statistically significant differences since the level of significance **(0.000)** is lesser than **(0.05)**. Table (3) summarizes the subjects' results concerning the recognition as well as the production test:

Table (3)

The test results for the recognition and production test

NO.	T-test value				d.f	(t)	Significance
	Recognition		Production				
	Mean	Std.v	Mean	Std.v			
100	9.80	2.06	3.24	2.33	99	20.65	0.000

4.2 The Test Items

The recognition test aims to investigate the ability of the learners to recognize the correct spelling comprehension and usage of diverse homonyms by using suitable lexeme that is phonologically and orthographically overlapped. The first question comprises **(15)** items and the learners are asked to fill in the blanks with the right and suitable word. The statistical analysis yields the results shown in the following table:

Table (5)

Analysis of the items in the recognition question:

Items No.	Overall answers	Correct answers	Incorrect answers	Percentage of correct answers	Percentage of incorrect answers
1	100	70	30	70%	30%
2	100	92	8	92%	8%
3	100	21	79	21%	79%
4	100	97	3	97%	3%
5	100	91	9	91%	9%
6	100	90	10	90%	10%
7	100	36	64	36%	64%
8	100	88	12	88%	12%
9	100	96	4	96%	4%
10	100	84	16	84%	16%
11	100	76	24	76%	24%
12	100	65	35	65%	35%
13	100	10	90	10%	90%
14	100	25	75	25%	75%
15	100	78	22	78%	22%
Total	1500	979	521	65.26%	34.73%

The second question also consists of (15) items and the learners are asked to write down an appropriate homonym (homophone or homograph) similar to the example given in the question. The following table summarizes the results yield at:

Table (6)

Analysis of the items in the production question

Items No.	Overall answers	Correct answers	Incorrect answers	Percentage of correct answers	Percentage of incorrect answers
1	100	19	81	19%	81%
2	100	51	49	51%	49%
3	100	8	92	8%	92%
4	100	38	62	38%	62%
5	100	28	72	28%	72%
6	100	22	78	22%	78%
7	100	5	95	5%	95%
8	100	21	79	21%	79%
9	100	18	81	19%	81%
10	100	12	88	12%	88%
11	100	16	84	16%	84%
12	100	18	82	18%	82%
13	100	5	95	5%	95%
14	100	16	84	16%	84%
15	100	46	54	46%	54%
Total	1500	324	1176	21.6%	78.4%

4.3 Findings

The analysis of the recognition as well as the production test shows that the learners have achieved better recognition level at the test than that of the production. This supports the stipulation of Corder (1973: 202) that "there is a general belief amongst teachers that a learner's receptive ability normally exceeds his productive abilities, and that recognition of an item is easier than its retrieval in production".

As far as the recognition question is concerned, all the students have answered the items. The correct answers are (979) with the percentage of (65.26%), while the incorrect responses are (521) with the percentage of (34.73%). Whereas, at the production question, the correct answers are (324) with the percentage of (21.6%) while the incorrect ones are (1176) with the percentage of (78.4%).

5. Conclusions

The investigation of the Iraqi EFL learners' command of homonyms has yielded the following conclusions:

- 1- Students of English have problems in understanding and producing homonymy. However, they seem to be better in recognizing homonyms than of producing them.
- 2- Iraqi advanced learners are significantly better in recognition than production. This supports the commonly accepted assumption that the ability of the students' recognition is higher than that of production also the results of this research shows that there are individual differences in the ability of word recognition caused by the difference in orthographical processing abilities which are partly decided by differences in exposure .
- 3- Students of English cannot understand the context of the sentences and they find some problems to differentiate between two words relations in a correct way.
- 4- The students' infelicitous answers are probably due to their limited acquaintance of the other senses of the same lexical item (i.e., homonymous word).

References

- ❖ Al-Juboury, A.N. (2000). A Language Teacher's Guide to Assessment. University of Baghdad.
- ❖ Ary, D.; Jacobs, L.; Sorensen, C. and Razavieh, A. (2010). Introduction to Research in Education. (8th ed.). Belmont: Cengage Learning.
- ❖ Bell, K. (1993) . Translation and Translating. London: Longman.
- ❖ Brown, D. (2004). Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. San Francisco State University: Longman.
- ❖ Chastain, K. (1988). Developing Second-Language Skills: Theory and Practice. London. Harcourt Brace Jovanovic.
- ❖ Cohen, J., Partnca , C., Stephen G., Leona, S. (2004). Applied Multiple Regression/ Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (3rd ed.). University of Tennessee USA
- ❖ Cohen, L.; Manion , L. and Morrison , K. (2007). Research Methods in Education. (6th ed.). New York: Routledge Madison Avenue.
- ❖ Corder, Jim W.(1973) “Asking for a Writing and Listening to Learn them in Production and Recognition.” Encountering Student Texts. Lawson, Bruce, Susan Sterr Ryan and W. Ross Winterowd, eds. Urbana: NCTE,.
- ❖ Cruse, A. (2006). A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, Ltd.
- ❖ Crystal , D. (2003) . A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (5th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- ❖ Fellbaum, A. (2000). "autotroponymy". In, Yael Ravin and Claudia Leacock (eds.). Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches,
- ❖ Finch, G. (2000). Linguistic Terms and Concepts. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- ❖ _____. (2005). Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics (2nd ed.).
- ❖ Francu, V. (2003). Multilingual access to information using an intermediate language. Belgium, Antwerp city: University of Antwerp.

- ❖ Fromkin, V.; Rodman, R. and Hyams, N. (2003). An Introduction to Language. (7th ed.). USA: Heinle, a part of Thomson Corporation.
- ❖ Gramley, S. and Patzold, K. (1992). A Survey of Modern English. London: Routledge.
- ❖ Greenbaum , S. (1996). The Oxford English Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ❖ Halliday, M. A. K. (1985) . Functional Grammar. Hong Kong: Hodder and Staughton.
- ❖ Hughes, A. (1989). Testing for Language Teachers. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Jackson, H. (1988). Words and Their Meaning. London & New York Longman Group Ltd.
- ❖ Jeffries, L. (2006) Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English. Palgrave Macmillan.
- ❖ Kreidler, C. W. (1998). Introducing English Semantics. London: Routledge Press Ltd.
- ❖ Lado, R. (1961). Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests. London. Longman group Ltd.
- ❖ Larson, M. L. (1998). Meaning Based-Translation . A guide to Cross Language Equivalence. University Press of America. Inc.
- ❖ Liddell, G. H. and Scott, R. (1982). A Greek-English Lexicon.(8th ed.). Perseus Digital Library.
- ❖ Lobner, S. (2002). Understanding Semantics. London: Arnold Education Press.
- ❖ Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. (Vol.1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ _____. (1977). Semantics. (Vol.2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. London: Macmillan.
- ❖ McNamara, Tim (2000). Language Testing. Oxford: OUP.
- ❖ Moore, A. (2000). Semantics-Meaning: Etymology and the Lexicon. In: ar-Moore 1995@ bigfoot.com.
- ❖ Murphy , L. (2003) . Semantic Relations and the Lexicon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- ❖ Oliva, P. (1988). Developing The Curriculum. (2nd ed.) New York: Scott, Foresmand.
- ❖ Palta, E. (2007). Word Sense Disambiguation. Bombay: Indian institute of technology.
- ❖ Parent, K. (2009). Polysemy A Second Language Pedagogical Concern. Victoria University of Wellington.
- ❖ Parker, F. and Riley, K. (2005). Linguistics For Non- linguists. New York: Pearson.
- ❖ Pustejovsky, J. (2001). The Generative Lexicon. (4th ed.). The MIT Press, London, England.
- ❖ Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, Richard (2002). Longman Dictionary of Language Testing and Applied Linguistics. (3rd ed.). London: Longman.
- ❖ Riemer , N. (2010). Introducing Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Saeed, J. I. (1997). Semantics. London Blackwell Published, Ltd.
- ❖ Wadsworth, T. (2008). Language its Structure and Use. (5th ed.). Edward Finegan: USA.
- ❖ Whiston, S. C. (2009). Principles & Applications of Assessment in Counseling. Belmont: Cengage Learning.
- ❖ Winston, M., Chaffin, R., and Hermann, D. J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Part-Whole Relations. Cognitive science, 11, 417-444.
- ❖ Yule, G. (2010). The Study of Language. (4th ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1

Dear participants

This study aims to investigate Iraqi EFL learners' command of homonymy in English at the university level. It would be highly appreciated if you could answer the following questions in as much detail as possible. Your answers will only be used for research purposes.

Background Information

Gender: -----

College: -----

Year at the college: -----

The Recognition Question:

Q1/ Choose the correct words among (A, B, C) to fill the blanks:

- 1- Can you ----- a letter in English?
A- rite B- write C- right
- 2- The ----- of blood made her excited.
A- sight B- cite C- site
- 3- The ----- is nursing the piglets.
A- sew B- sow C- so
- 4- Please, get me a shampoo ----- dry hair.
A- fore B- for C- four
- 5- He hung an old, wooden ----- on his wall as a decoration.
A- ore B- or C- oar
- 6- Barking dogs seldom -----.
A- bite B- bight C- byte
- 7- The oldest ----- of the Thespians was a rude stone.
A- idyll B- idle C- idol
- 8- Jane expects her second baby to be ----- in February.
A- born B- bourn C- borne
- 9- You must ----- the dough till it is ready to be baked.
A- need B- knead C- kneed
- 10- I took a ----- at the list.
A- peek B- peak C- pique
- 11- Can I ----- you a coffee?
A- by B- bye C- buy
- 12- The ----- of flowers came in at the window.
A- scent B- sent C- cent
- 13- How much does a dentist -----?
A- urn B- erne C- earn
- 14- I got my first ----- of glasses when I was eight.
A- pear B- pair C- pare
- 15- The family was too ----- to buy proper food.
A- poor B- pour C- pore

The Production Question:

Q 2/ Write a homonymous word for the following lexical items:

A- Week ----- weak

B- Meet ----- meat

1- See -----

2- Root -----

3- Waste -----

4- Ring -----

5- Mussel -----

6- Die -----

7- Loan -----

8- Some -----

9- Mail -----

10- Hart -----

11- Pause -----

12- Pain -----

13- Rain -----

14- Ewe -----

15- Seas -----