



**Pragmatic Problems Faced by Iraqi EFL
University Students in Grammatical
Constructions and Lexico-grammatical
Patterns**

By

**Asst. Inst. Arwa Adnan Abdul-Rahman. *Al- Imam Al-
Adham College University /Department of Islamic Studies in
English Language***

**Asst. Prof. Manal Omer Mousa (Ph.D.) *Tikrit
University / College of Education for Women/ Department of
English Language***

The current study aims not only to examine the students' level of performance and some pragmatic difficulties in the use of grammatical constructions namely modal, imperative and gerund as well as lexico-grammatical patterns with its related domains as routine formula, lexical bundles and collocations to express some speech acts. But also, to recognize the difficult domains which teachers' face in applying grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns with speech acts contextually in the class. Seven hypotheses have been framed in this study. In order to verify these hypotheses and achieve the intended aims, a diagnostic test has been constructed and administrated to the selected sample of one hundred EFL 3rd year students in Education for Women College at Al-Iraqia University during the academic year 2021-2022. Besides to a close - ended questionnaire that has been constructed and applied for twenty university teachers who work at Al-Iraqia University and Al-Imam Al-Adham College University. The use of the grammatical constructions namely modal, imperative and gerund as well as lexico-grammatical patterns with its related domains as routine formula, lexical bundles and collocations represent a difficult area for EFL learners. Although the students use the same linguistic form that are used by the native speakers as examined in the data but the failure has been with the linguistic items within such forms. Such inappropriate use of the linguistic items, made them fail to match the acts produced by the native speakers.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Problem and the Significance of the Study

There are a sum of problematic areas in the English language surrounding the usage of the gerundial, modals and imperative constructions.as well as the use of different types of lexico-grammatical patterns – e.g. routine formulae, proverbs, idioms, complex prepositions, collocations and lexical bundles – related to pragmatic aspects of language use to Iraqi learners at the university level in both speech and writing. The researcher tries to reveal the deficiency of linguistic and pragmatic knowledge which is attributed to partial lack of syntax, semantic and misinterpreting the intended meaning. Therefore, the researcher has found that the students as well as university's teachers face difficulties in applying and understanding grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns to express various speech acts contextually.

1.2. Aims of the Study

It aims to:

- 1- Find out the student's level of performance in using grammatical constructions within speech acts communicatively.
- 2- Find out the student's level of performance in using lexico-grammatical patterns within speech acts communicatively.
- 3- Find out the differences between the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns within speech acts in students' performance.
- 4- Find out the differences between the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns within speech acts in students' performance according to recognition and production tests.
- 5- Identify difficulties which learners face in using grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns with speech acts contextually.
- 6- Identify difficulties which universities' teachers face in applying grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns with certain speech acts contextually.

1.3. Hypotheses

It hypothesizes that:

- 1- There are significant differences in use the meaning of grammatical constructions in correct manner pragmatically.
- 2- There are significant differences in use the meaning of lexico-grammatical patterns in correct manner pragmatically.
- 3- There are significant differences in distinguish between the meanings of grammatical constructions and

lexico-grammatical patterns pragmatically.

- 4- There are significant differences in distinguish between the speech acts with grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns contextually on recognition and production levels.
- 5- There are significant problems in applying various grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns to express different speech acts contextually in students' performance.
- 6- There are no significant problems in applying various grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns to express the different speech acts in teachers' performance.

1.4. Value of the Study

It is hoped that this study will be of academic value for the learners and teachers of English. Since it is expected to draw learners' attention as well as teachers' to the difficulties they face when expressing such grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns with speech acts in order to understand them, and to know how and when select a particular construction or pattern in accordance with the communicative needs as well as to draw their attention to the significant role of the functions of language.

1.5 Limits of the Study

This study is limited to:

- 1- Third year students in the College of Education for Women at Al Iraqia University for the academic year 2021-2022.
- 2- Grammatical constructions (gerund, modals and imperative) that are used contextually.
- 3- lexico-grammatical patterns (lexical bundles, routine formulae, idioms and collocations)
- 4- Questionnaire is submitted to teachers at Al-Imam Al-Al-Adham College University and Al Iraqia University for the academic year 2021-2022.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent times, some applied linguists have maintained a style that does not neglect any side neither form nor meaning. That what was emphasized by pioneering pedagogical grammarians such as Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999) who state that grammar involves three dimensions: form (morpho-syntax), meaning (semantics), and use (pragmatics). Furthermore, communication is a complicated process hence the ordinary knowledge of forms of a language is insufficient for the speakers. This knowledge should be in cooperation of meaning. The interaction between speakers makes the meaning further clear. The hearer provides him with feedback as to whether or not he understands what the speaker has said. This in turn assures the speaker's ability to revise his speech (Pizziconi, 2006).

To Richards and Schmidt (2002), ability to produce and understand utterances which are appropriate to the context in which they occur is the definition of communicative competence which includes: Grammatical competence, Pragmatic competence, Discourse competence and Strategic competence. Hence, pragmatic competence is broadly used in the second and foreign language acquisition and teaching fields to be regarded as one of the abilities included in the theory of communicative competence (Rueda, 2006).

The analysis of the role of utterances in relation to the behaviour of speaker and hearer in interpersonal communication is the essence of the speech act theory (Crystal, 2008). Since, speech act theory with all its models emphasized the notion that the illocutionary aspect or the intended meaning is to be clearly distinguished from its grammatical, or locutionary aspect and from the effect which it exerts on the hearer, or perlocutionary aspect.

2.1 Modals as Grammatical Constructions

These modal verbs according to Jacobs and Roderick (1995) have changed into specific sort with distinctive features and purposes (Al-Hessa, 2014). Syntactically unlike lexical verbs, the modals are similar to all auxiliaries in their availability with four so called 'NICE' criteria: negation (the availability of inflectional negative forms 'not'), inversion (of subject and auxiliary), code (post-verbal ellipsis dependent for its interpretation upon previous context), and emphasis (emphatic polarity involving the use of contrastive stress), as will be illustrated in the following examples:

- 1- He will not study.
*He likes not study. (Negation)
- 2- Will he study?
*Likes he study? (Inversion)
- 3- She will study, and so will he.
*She likes to study, and so does he. (Code)
- 4- They think he won't study,
*They think he doesn't like but he will study, but he likes. (Emphasis)

Grammatically, modals are classified into two main types with the same concept but various terms: central or principle or core modal verbs and marginal or semi- modals (Quirk et al., 1985; Quirk et al., 1972).

2.2. Imperative as Grammatical Construction

According to Leech, Denchar and Hoogenraa (1982) an imperative sentence is a sentence which has both a non-finite predicator as well as no subject. It is derived from a declarative sentence by the omission of the subject and of the operator, as indicated in the following example:

5- You will write thousand lines = write thousand lines.

Biber et al. (1999) argue that imperative is formally characterized by: the lack of the subject, the use of the base form of the verb and the absence of modals, tense and aspect markers. Although in some languages it can show 1st and 3rd person agreement markers (Kroeger, 2005)

Syntactic description of imperative construction includes not only arbitrary features but also features that are functionally motivated (Kroeger, 2005). The imperative sentence is characterized mainly by three features (Takahashi, 2004):

- 1- Hypotheticality.
- 2- Non-past.
- 3- Second person.

2.3 Gerund as Non-Finite Grammatical Construction

Gerund, as our concern here, is the present-participle form of verbs, it is formed by adding the '-ing suffix ' to the base form of the verb (Lester, 2008). It is recognized as a grammatical construction that functions as verbal noun (Trask, 1993). This form has the typical features of non-finite constructions (not marked for time, person and gender) (Brown & Miller, 2013).

Since it functions as a verbal noun, it has all the grammatical features and functions of the nouns (Biber et al., 1999; Lester, 2008): as the subject of the sentence, extra posed subject, subject predicative of the main clause's subject, direct object, object of prepositions, adverbial function...). Simultaneously, it has all the grammatical features of the verb by having its own subject or object, and expressing the present and perfect tense plus the active /passive voice. (Zandvoort & Van Ek, 1975 as cited in Munshid, 2017). There are two varieties of gerund, simple gerund and gerund phrase.

2.4 Lexico - Grammatical Patterns

Lexico-grammar as the abstract level of coding according to Halliday refers to the interdependence of vocabulary (lexis) and syntax (grammar) systems to become a signal system to convey certain meaning (Halliday, 1992). In other words, he considers it as a combination of lexis and grammar to be seen as complementary perspectives.

Then, lexico-grammatical patterns are well defined as frequent sequences of lexical and grammatical components that work for a particular function (Clear, 1993; Grzybek, 2007 as cited in Schmid, 2014)

According to Schmid (2014) there are three main groups of lexico-grammatical patterns' forms. According to the following dimensions such as degree of transparency (meaning is expressed through the whole word combination rather than through the sum of its individual components), syntactic regularity/ irregularity (differentiate between position-free and position-dependent word combinations) and pragmatic constrain.

Group 1: More fixed lexico-grammatical patterns.

Group 2: Medium fixed patterns.

Group 3: More variable pattern.

2.5 The Relationship between Grammar and Pragmatics

Related to the current study the notion of interaction between grammar and pragmatics is recognized as an interacting of two distinct components (grammar as grammatical competence plus pragmatic as pragmatic competence) of the theory of language in language use's contexts. So, the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns are ones, where in our daily speech implies different meanings within the context. They are parts from many constructions have pragmatically- oriented uses; speech acts or the communicative functions of language (Pearson, 2006).

2.5.1 The pragmatic Functions of Modals' constructions

modals express a wide range of meanings for expressing speakers' attitudes as well as the strength of those attitudes. For example, when a speaker feels something is necessary, advisable, permissible, possible, or probable, etc.

In addition, modals especially central ones have more than one meaning or function such as: 'offering, permission, thanking, requesting, etc.', as in the following examples: (Azar, 2003; Swan, 1980).

6- Can you take out the garbage? (request)

7- Can I send the letter for you? (offer)

2.5.2 The Pragmatic Function of Imperative Construction

English imperative is recognized as a verb used to express a different communicative acts; Directives and non-directives, (Leech, 2006, pp. 50-51; Cruse, 2006, pp. 84-85). Directives are such acts as Command, invitation, request, insult, prohibsion, offer, promise, etc. and non- directive acts as, expressing wish, expressing irony, reject,..etc.

8- Sleep well. Wish (Wilson & Sperber, 1988)

9- Have another cookie. Offer (Lester, 2008)

10- Do let's hurry up or we'll be late. invitation (Al-Marrani & Suraih, 2018)

11- Take plenty of exercises if you want to stay slim. Advice (Searle, 1969)

2.5.3 The Pragmatic Function of Gerund

Gerund as any grammatical construction can show various communicative uses that recognized in our daily life.

12- Going out? (weak direct request) (De Pablos-Ortega, 2020)

13- Have you thought about travelling? Advice (Delancer (2002)

14- No walking on the grass !Command (Stockwell, 2016, pp. 293 - 294)

15- I propose starting at once. (I suggest...)(Sayer, 200

2.5.4 The pragmatic function of lexico-grammatical patterns

Gläser (1986 as cited in Schmid, 2014) proposes some lexico-grammatical patterns related to specific communicative acts.

16- How do you do? (More polite) greeting

17- Happy New Year. Congratulation (Gläser, 1986 as cited in Schmid, 2014)

18- No offence meant. Apology (Aydin, 2013)

19- What a pity? Regret

20- Far from it. Rejection

3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 The test

3.1.1 Population and Sample of the test

The sample of the test in this study has been selected randomly. It consists of one hundred students out of the total population one hundred thirty six from the third year in of Education College for Women at Al-Iraqia University during the academic year 2021 - 2022.

3.1.2. Construction of the Test

The test is considered as an educational instrument which is used to rank students according to their scores. Mousavi (1999) denotes that the test is any method used to measure a factor or to assess an ability. The test totally includes fifty utterances; twenty five items for the recognition part and twenty five items for the production part. Each item will be given two marks to be the total mark of the test hundred marks. See appendix (A)"test".

3.1.3. Validity of the Test

To McNamara (2000), the validation in language testing is a mirror image of how well an instrument measures what is aimed to measure, It has been exposed to a jury of experts in the field of teaching English as an EFL to ensure its face validity as well as the test has to present the domain of knowledge and skills that is related to for ensuring its content validity.

3.1.4. Pilot Study of the Test

According to Schwarz and Sudman (1995), It is an effective way of ensuring that the participants are responsive to the programme, practically the intervention material.

Related to the current study, the pilot study is carried out in 2021-2022 academic year. A sample of thirty EFL college students at Al-Iraqia University are picked randomly from the population of this study.

It is found that all the instructions are clear and familiar to the students and that the average time that required for working out all the test items is two hours is sufficient.

3.1.5. Reliability of the Test

Bachman and Palmer (1996) consider the reliability as the consistency of measures over the measurement context including forms, rates and other characteristics. Accordingly, the split-half method, Alpha Cronbach equation have been used

3.1.6. Items Analysis of the Test

Linden and Glas (2010) state that item analysis process includes collecting, summarizing and applying the obtained results from the students' performances. It involves determining the difficulty level and the discrimination power.

Table (1): The Items Analysis of the Test

No. of items	The sum of the scores of the upper group	The sum of the scores of the lower group	Discrimination power	Difficulty level
1	18	6	0.40	0.40
2	14	4	0.33	0.30
3	24	10	0.67	0.57
4	20	6	0.47	0.43
5	16	8	0.27	0.40
6	18	6	0.40	0.40

7	22	8	0.47	0.50
8	14	2	0.40	0.27
9	26	8	0.60	0.57
10	20	6	0.47	0.43
11	18	4	0.47	0.37
12	20	8	0.40	0.47
13	18	6	0.40	0.40
14	24	4	0.67	0.47
15	18	6	0.40	0.40
16	18	8	0.33	0.43
17	22	6	0.53	0.47
18	20	6	0.47	0.43
19	20	10	0.33	0.50
20	18	4	0.47	0.37
21	14	6	0.27	0.33
22	18	4	0.47	0.37
23	16	8	0.27	0.40
24	18	6	0.40	0.40
25	16	6	0.33	0.37
26	20	4	0.53	0.40
27	18	6	0.40	0.40
28	16	2	0.47	0.30
29	20	0	0.67	0.33
30	16	4	0.40	0.33
31	18	6	0.40	0.40
32	16	4	0.40	0.33
33	18	8	0.33	0.43
34	22	6	0.53	0.47
35	20	4	0.53	0.40
36	18	6	0.40	0.40
37	22	6	0.53	0.47
38	20	4	0.53	0.40
39	26	10	0.53	0.60

40	20	6	0.47	0.43
41	18	6	0.40	0.40
42	16	4	0.40	0.33
43	18	4	0.47	0.37
44	24	4	0.67	0.47
45	20	6	0.47	0.43
46	20	4	0.53	0.40
47	18	6	0.40	0.40
48	16	2	0.47	0.30
49	18	4	0.47	0.37
50	16	6	0.33	0.37

3.2 The Questionnaire:

3.2.1. Population and Sample of the Questionnaire

According to the second tool 'questionnaire', the population is about thirty one teachers from Al-Imam Al-Adham College University and Al Iraqia University. The sample is chosen randomly practically twenty teachers during the academic year 2021 - 2022.

3.2.2. Construction of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire in the current study has structured questions that are characterized as definite, concrete and predetermined form. It is from closed-ended type or what is called 'scaled questions'. That means the respondents answer to a fixed set of alternatives that are graded on a continuum (Roopa & Rani, 2017). This continuum, according to 'the frequency of use of Likert scale response', is arranged orderly as: " Every time, Almost every, Occasionally, Almost never and Never " to generate sufficient variance among the intended participants (Vagias, 2008).

3.2.3. Validity of the Questionnaire

To McNamara (2000), the validation is to make sure of the objectivity of analysis. The degree to which a questionnaire measures what it was intended to measure. It has been exposed to a jury of experts in the field of teaching English as an EFL to ensure its face validity as well as the test has to present the domain of knowledge and skills that is related to for ensuring its content validity.

3.2.4. Pilot Study of the Questionnaire

The pilot study is a phase of trying-out before finalize a new tool to minimize the statistical errors in the final solution. (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Related to the current study, the pilot study is carried out in 2021- 2022 academic year with a sample of ten college teachers at the English department of Al- Iraqia University and Al-Imam Al-Adham University College are chosen. The application of the pilot study of the questionnaire shows that there's no serious ambiguity regarding the instructions as well as the instrument.

3.2.5. Reliability of the Questionnaire

Bachman and Palmer (1996) consider the reliability as the consistency of measures over the measurement context (Aithal & Aithal, 2020, p. 6). The statistical method that is employed to compute the internal consistency of the individual's performance on the scale from one item to another of the questionnaire is Alpha Cronbach.

3.2.6. Items Analysis

Conducting the item analysis is to extract the discriminatory power of the items and to keep the distinct items in the scale and to exclude the unmarked items in order to make a worthy assessment on the quality of the items (Oliva, 1988).

3.2.6.1 Discrimination Power (DP)

Discriminatory power it is useful for making sure that the items of this scale are sufficient to express the intended characteristic to be measured (Linden & Glas, 2010). After calculating the mean and standard deviation for the lower and upper groups, the T-test formula for two independent samples is applied to test the significance of the differences between the two groups for indicating the discriminatory strength of the item.

Table (2): The Discrimination Power of the Questionnaire's Items

No. of items	Upper group		Lower group		Calculated T- value	Significant level 0.5
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation		
1	4.284	0.924	3.321	1.181	5.776	Significant
2	3.642	1.143	3.024	1.150	3.424	Significant
3	4.469	0.775	3.518	1.184	6.042	Significant
4	4.469	0.708	3.890	1.026	4.723	Significant
5	4.692	0.679	3.790	1.075	5.966	Significant
6	4.407	0.905	3.470	1.046	4.377	Significant
7	4.333	0.395	3.385	1.132	5.976	Significant
8	4.049	1.105	3.232	1.175	4.544	Significant
9	4.395	0.875	3.395	1.080	6.472	Significant
10	4.465	0.759	3.306	1.044	8.003	Significant
11	4.246	0.968	3.395	1.211	4.493	Significant
12	4.321	0.848	3.234	1.196	6.665	Significant
13	4.246	0.873	3.049	1.082	7.764	Significant
14	4.284	0.911	3.246	1.199	6.191	Significant
15	4.049	0.960	3.061	1.004	6.391	Significant
16	3.814	0.963	3.024	1.038	4.905	Significant
17	4.802	0.485	3.709	1.045	7.905	Significant
18	4.555	0.698	3.765	0.939	6.105	Significant
19	4.666	0.670	3.777	1.060	7.735	Significant
20	3.876	1.066	2.531	1.073	8.009	Significant
21	4.296	0.732	2.691	1.032	6.671	Significant
22	4.246	1.006	3.358	1.186	5.124	Significant
23	3.321	1.151	2.753	1.211	2.267	Significant
24	4.094	0.930	2.864	1.092	7.743	Significant
25	4.703	0.660	3.567	1.283	7.080	Significant

26	4.461	0.852	3.234	1.442	6.631	Significant
27	4.419	0.920	3.629	1.155	4.813	Significant
28	4.716	0.617	2.691	1.230	6.297	Significant
29	4.419	0.946	3.604	1.068	5.136	Significant
30	3.901	1.067	3.456	1.094	2.497	Significant

3.2.6.2. Internal Consistency (Person Correlation Coefficient)

The relationship of the item score to the overall score of the scale is a statistical tool that is used to infer the truthfulness. So, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient formula is utilized and its results indicate that all items have high correlation coefficient value with the total degree, so all the items are accepted. As shown in Table (3).

Table (3): Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values between Item Score and Overall Scores of the Questionnaire

Items	Items correlation coefficient of total score	Items	Items correlation coefficient of total score
1	0.629	16	0.552
2	0.591	17	0.577
3	0.631	18	0.611
4	0.571	19	0.441
5	0.657	20	0.622
6	0.398	21	0.788
7	0.534	22	0.632
8	0.584	23	0.574
9	0.667	24	0.626
10	0.509	25	0.545
11	0.642	26	0.499
12	0.649	27	0.581
13	0.631	28	0.623
14	0.498	29	0.636
15	0.525	30	0.655

4. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.2. Data Analysis for the First Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the first hypothesis namely: **There is no significant difference in use the meaning of grammatical constructions in correct manner pragmatically**, the T-test formula of one independent sample has been used. The mean of the scores of this sample is (23.3200) less than the theoretical mean (25) with a standard deviation of (6.17077) degrees. Comparing with the tabulated t-value which is (1.98), the calculated t-value (2.723) is higher than the tabulated t-value with a degree of freedom (99) at a level of significance (0.05). That means, there is a significant difference between students' performance in use the meaning of grammatical constructions in correct manner pragmatically.

Table (4): T-Test Value of the Student's Performance in the Grammatical Construction

No. of subject	Mean	S.D.	Theoretic mean	t-Value		D. F.	Level of Significance
				Co mp ute	Ta bul		
100	23.3200	6.17077	25	2.723	1.98	99	0.05

4.2. Data Analysis for the Second Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the second hypothesis specifically: There is no significant difference in use the meaning of lexico-grammatical patterns in correct manner pragmatically, the T-test formula of one independent sample has been used. As illustrated in the Table (9), the mean of the scores of this sample is (19.2000) less than the theoretical mean (25) with a standard deviation of (5.51215) degrees. Comparing with the tabulated t-value which is (1.98), the calculated t-value (10.522) is higher than the tabulated t-value with a degree of freedom (99) at a level of significance (0.05). This means that there is a significant difference between students' performance in use the meaning of lexico-grammatical patterns in correct manner pragmatically.

Table (5): T-Test Value of the Student's Performance in the Lexico-Grammatical Patterns Pragmatically

No. of subject	Mean	S.D.	Theoretic mean	t-Value		D. F.	Level of Significance
				Co mp ute	Tab ulat ed		
100	19.2000	5.51215	25	10.522	1.98	99	0.05

4.3. Data Analysis for the Third Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the third hypothesis specifically: There is no significant difference in distinguish between the meanings of grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns pragmatically, the T-test formula of one independent sample has been used. According to the following results in Table (6), the mean of the scores of grammatical constructions is (17.33) and standard deviation is (6.244). While the mean scores of Lexico-grammatical is (13.45) and the Standard Deviation is (3.838). The calculated t-value (5.162) is higher than the tabulated t-value (1.98) with a degree of freedom (99) at a level of significance (0.05). And from this it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between students' performance at the grammatical construction field and that at the lexico-grammatical patterns field and for the benefit of the grammatical construction field. Therefore, the performance of the students in the grammatical construction field is better than the students' performance in the lexico-grammatical patterns field.

Table (6): T-Test Value of the Student's Performance in the Grammatical Construction and Lexico-Grammatical Patterns within Speech Acts

No. of subject	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
Grammatical constructions	100	17.33	6.244	Calculated	Tabulated	99	0.05
				5.162	1.98		
Lexico-grammatical	100	13.45	3.838				

4.4. Data Analysis for the Fourth Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the fourth hypothesis namely: There is no significant differences in distinguish between the speech acts with grammatical constructions contextually on recognition and production levels, the paired samples T-test statistics have been used.

In this section there are two pairs to be analyzed statistically. The first pair is to compare the students' performance in grammatical constructions at the recognition test and the students' performance in grammatical constructions at the production test. The second pair is to compare the students' performance in the domains of grammatical constructions (modal, imperative and gerund) at the recognition test and at the production test.

The obtained results show that students' mean scores at the production level is found to be (33.8000) and that at the recognition level is (32.2000). The t-test formula for two paired samples is used to show that the calculated t-value is (2.195) and the tabulated t-value is (2.145) at the degree of freedom (14) and level of significance (0.05) It can be inferred that there is a significant difference between students' performance at the recognition level and that at the production level and for the benefit of the recognition level. So, the subjects' performance in grammatical construction at the recognition test had a significant effect on their performance mean score. Consider table (7)

Table (7): Students' Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, and T-Value of the Students' Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels

Paired Samples Statistics								
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t-value	Tabulated	D F
Pair 1	Recognition grammatical construction	32.2000	15	7.19325	1.85729	2.195	2.145	14
	Production grammatical construction	33.8000	15	7.27226	1.87769			
There is a significant differences for the recognition level								
Pair 2	Recognition Lexico-grammatical patterns	33.1000	10	11.88323	3.75781	0.208	2.262	9
	Production Lexico-grammatical patterns	34.5000	10	15.47220	4.89274			
There is no significant differences between recognition and production levels								
Pair 3	Recognition Types grammatical	32.2000	15	7.19325	1.85729	2.195	2.145	14
	Production Types grammatical	33.8000	15	7.27226	1.87769			
There is a significant differences for the recognition level								
Pair 4	Recognition Types Lexico-grammatical	33.1000	10	11.88323	3.75781	0.208	2.262	9
	Production Types Lexico-grammatical	34.5000	10	15.47220	4.89274			
There is no significant differences between recognition and production levels								

4.5. Data Analysis for the Fifth Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the fifth hypothesis namely: There is no significant difference in distinguish between the speech acts with lexico-grammatical patterns contextually on recognition and production levels, the paired samples T-test statistics have been used. The first pair is to compare the students' performance in Lexico-grammatical patterns at the recognition test and the students' performance in Lexico-grammatical patterns at the production test. The second pair is to compare the students'

performance in Lexico-grammatical domains at the recognition test and the students' performance in Lexico-grammatical domains at the production test.

The mean scores of the student's performance at the recognition level and that at the production level in the test are calculated and compared to find out whether there is any significant difference between them. Based on the results, students' mean scores at the recognition level are found to be (33.1000) and that at the production level is (34.5000). This means that that there is no significant difference between students' performance in Lexico-grammatical domains at the recognition level and that at the production level. So, the subjects' performance in Lexico-grammatical domains at both levels had no significant effect on their performance mean score. Consider the above table (7)

4.6. Data Analysis for the Sixth Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the fifth hypothesis namely: There are no significant problems in applying various grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns to express different speech acts contextually in students' performance, the weighted mean and weight percent of the test items have been used to have an indication of student's ability to differentiate between speech acts and as the result the problems in using such grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns within speech act.

In relation to pragmatic problems in using grammatical constructions, some problems are discovered in using modals, imperative or gerund within speech acts such as suggestion, permission, request, offer, invitation, command, etc. at both recognition and production levels. But their performance at the recognition level are better than that at the production level.

Table (8): The weighted mean and weight percent of the test items at The Recognition Level.

Level of test	Categories	Domains	Test Item Number	S.A	W.P %	W.M
Recognition	Grammatical construction	Modal	7	suggestion	36%	0.36
			10	permission	27%	0.27
			15	Request	26%	0.26
			17	offer	31%	0.31
			19	Invitation	41%	0.41
		Imperative	2	Command	28%	0.28
			3	Offer	24%	0.24
			11	Wishes	42%	0.42
			16	Permission	33%	0.33
			23	Warning	31%	0.31
		Gerund	1	Request	41%	0.41
			4	Suggestion	30%	0.30
			6	Command	23%	0.23
			20	Apology	32%	0.32
	22		Advice	39%	0.39	
	25		Disagreement	62%	0.62	
	Lexico-grammatical patterns	Routine formulae	5	Complain	49%	0.49
			8	Apology	69%	0.69
			13	Regret	66%	0.66
			18	Greeting	58%	0.58
21			Rejection	38%	0.38	
Lexical bundles		14	Warning	63%	0.63	
		9	Thanking	53%	0.53	
		24	Suggestion	40%	0.40	
Collocation and Idiom		12	Irony	41%	0.41	

Then, in reference to students' problems in using lexico-grammatical patterns, some problems are revealed in using routine formula, lexical bundles, idioms or collocations within speech acts such as suggestion, permission, request, offer, invitation, command, etc. at both recognition and production levels but their performance at the recognition level are equal to that at the production level.

Table (9): The weighted mean and weight percent of the test items at The Production Level.

Level	Categories	Domains	Test Item Number	S.A.	W.P %	W.M	
Production	Grammatical construction	Modal	2	Command	48%	0.48	
			3	Invitation	39%	0.39	
			8	Advice	45%	0.45	
			10	Wishes	66%	0.66	
			21	Obligation	59%	0.59	
		Imperative	7	Command	56%	0.56	
			12	Offer	53%	0.53	
			17	Threat	69%	0.69	
			19	Invitation	41%	0.41	
			20	Rejection	61%	0.61	
			Gerund	4	Thanking	46%	0.46
				9	Request	62%	0.62
				11	Avoiding	58%	0.58
				16	Advice	51%	0.51
				24	Complain	64%	0.64
		Routine formulae	1	Complain	48%	0.48	
			13	Greeting	41%	0.41	
			15	encourage	37%	0.37	
			18	Congratulation	36%	0.36	
			23	Apology	31%	0.31	
			Lexical bundles	5	Warning	38%	0.38
				6	suggestion	33%	0.33
				14	Thanking	41%	0.41
		25		Inquiry about hearer's mind	38%	0.38	

		Collocation and idioms	22	Wish	52%	0.52
--	--	------------------------	----	------	-----	------

4.7. Data Analysis for the Seventh Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the sixth hypothesis namely: There are no significant problems in applying various grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns to express the different speech acts in teachers' performance, the close-ended questionnaire has been utilized. For accomplishing the sixth aim, the closed-ended questionnaire is applied for (20) teachers. Then, the weighted mean and the weighted percent for each item in the questionnaire are calculated to find EFL university teachers' difficult areas of application of grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns with speech acts contextually.

This analysis of questionnaire is divided into two main sections: grammatical constructions category and lexico-grammatical patterns. With grammatical section's results indicates that the higher the value of weighted percent, the higher the teacher's incorrect answers. Unlike the imperative domain which has the highest weighted percent, modal domain has the best result among the other domains due to the lowest weighted percent of incorrect answers. While gerund domain is located between them. As a result, the teachers have poor performance in applying of the grammatical constructions within speech acts contextually.

Table (10): The Results of the Teachers' Answers Descended According to the Difficulty in Applying Grammatical Constructions with Speech Acts Contextually.

Item No. in the Q.	Items	Never 1	Almo st never 2	Occasion ally 3	Almost every 4	Ever y time 5	weighte d mean	weigh ted perce nt %
10	Differentiating between advice, suggestion and offer acts through 'Let' imperative construction	11	6	3			4.40	88%
9	Utilizing emphatic imperative construction to convey insistent invitation.	11	5	3	1		4.30	86%
17	Expressing a negative communicative act to protest a listener by means of gerund construction	9	10			1	4.30	86%

11	Relating imperative construction to convey threat act.	10	7	2	1		4.30	86%
7	Expressing wishes act by modal construction or by idioms pattern.	9	9		2		4.25	85%
16	Asking politely with an interrogative form by gerund.	12	3	3	2		4.25	85%
4	Distinction between expressing invitation and offer speech acts with modals construction .	10	6	3		1	4.20	84%
8	Applying a pragmatic particle to soften the imperative and change it from a command act to a polite request act.	10	3	7			4.15	83%
12	Teaching supplication via imperative construction .	5	13	2			4.15	83%
14	Applying imperative explicitly or implicitly to convey condition.	5	13	2			4.15	83%

19	Illuminating gerund imperative.	8	8	3	1		4.15	83%
6	Using 'may, might, can could' modals to convey request and permission acts formally and informally.	8	8	3		1	4.10	82%
18	Revealing the different illocutionary forces of the same verb followed by gerund and infinitive constructions.	5	12	2	1		4.05	81%
13	Drawing hearer's attention to the existence of Advertisements.	6	10	3	1		4.05	81%
20	Utilizing gerund as a grammatical construction to convey enjoying act.	8	6	5	1		4.05	81%
15	Granting Permission by person with authority.	7	7	4	2		3.95	79%
3	Connecting suggestion act with modal construction.	9	6	3		1	3.95	79%
5	Associating advice illocutionary	8	7	3		2	3.95	79%

	y act with modals.							
2	Using modals to express necessity and lack of necessity acts.	9	5	1	5		3.90	78%
1	Discriminating between expressing ability, possibility and obligation by means of modals.	9	4	1	4	2	3.70	74%

According to the lexico-grammatical category in the questionnaire, the following results in Table (11) are attempted with three domains routine formulae, lexical bundles, idioms and collocation patterns. Unlike the lexical bundles domain which has the highest weighted percent, routine formula domain has the best result among the other domains due to the lowest weighted percent of incorrect answers. As a result, the teachers have problems in applying of the lexico-grammatical patterns within speech acts contextually.

Table (11): The Results of the Teachers' Answers Descended According to the Difficulty in Applying Lexico-grammatical Patterns with Speech Acts Contextually.

Item No. in the Q.	Items	never	Almo st never	Occasion ally	Almo st every	Every time	weigh ted mean	weigh ted perce nt %
6	Linking warring speech act with both routine formulae lexical bundles.	10	5	5			4.25	85%
9	Distinguis hing between idioms and proverbs in expressing pragmatic acts.	9	8	1	1	1	4.15	83%
10	Applying collocatio n in typical ironic function.	8	8	3	1		4.15	83%

5	Connecting suggestion speech act to lexical bundles.	9	6	4		1	4.10	82%
8	Utilizing lexical bundles patterns to marks vague informally.	9	4	7			4.10	82%
2	Distinction between expressing apology and regret speech acts with routine formula.	6	11	1	2		4.05	81%
3	Associating fully-fledged illocutionary acts with routine formulae.	10	3	6		1	4.05	81%
4	Differentiating between using lexicogrammatical patterns congratulation and encouraging act.	7	7	6			4.05	81%
7	Using lexical bundles to convey declarative announcement act.	9	3	7	1		4.00	80%
1	Using formulaic patterns to express	7	7	4	2		3.95	79%

	greeting act.							
--	------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5.1. Conclusions

Going by the analysis done so far and the data discussion presented in chapter four of this study, some conclusions are summarized below:

- 1- The conveying of specific speech act with grammatical constructions and with lexico-grammatical patterns represents a problem for EFL learners to deal with for being remarkably overlapped with other different speech acts in certain contexts.
- 2- The context has a significant role in the interpretation of utterances. Since, it serves as a conversational hint for speeches when there is no existing linguistic feedback.
- 3- The performance of the EFL students using grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns communicatively in the speech is poor at the recognition and production levels which in turn suggests the problems existed in these areas.
- 4- According to the teacher's responses, the teacher' performance at the questionnaire seems poor due to unfamiliarity with grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns fields.
- 5- The EFL teachers have a number of difficulties that related to the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns which in turn may make them unaware of the correct use of grammatical constructions or lexico-grammatical patterns pragmatically in the related context.
- 6- The EFL teachers may not use the suitable teaching techniques that enable their students to communicate effectively by using grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns contextually.

5.2. Recommendations

On the basis of the results and findings of the current study certain recommendations could be made:

- 1- EFL Instructors have to teach the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns concentrating on both the linguistic forms, and the constrains of the given communicative situation.
- 2- Syntactic rules related to the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns should be paid attention while using language in different situations to refresh learners' memory and thus developing their communicative and performative competence.
- 3- Instructors and teachers should encourage and motivate the EFL learners to practise English as much as possible trying to make such a practice regular through the years of study via free conversations, spoken situations, daily life topics, etc.
- 4- Teaching English must be built on exercises and drills that enable Iraqi EFL learners to understand and recognize the syntactic, pragmatic and semantic relations among the linguistic forms in utterances, to form messages that are coherent to the context of use.
- 5- More exercises about the grammatical constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns used in speech acts should be provided to show students the pragmatic role in conversation.
- 6- Teachers must be trained on how to direct EFL students' attentions to pragmatics and how to teach it in context.
- 7- Using communicative techniques lead to give the students freedom in expressing the pragmatically genuine constructions. As a result, it encourages the students to acquire correct competences.

References

- Aithal, A., & Aithal, P.S. (2020). Development and Validation of Survey Questionnaire & Experimental Data – A Systematical Review-based Statistical Approach. *PharmSciRN: Medications in Pharmacy (Topic)*. Munich Personal RePEc Archive. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/103996/>
- Al-Hessa. S. A. (2014). *The Use of Modal Verbs in Permission, Offer, Obligation, and Possibility by English BA Major Students at Middle East University* [M.A. Thesis, University of Amman].
- Al-Marrani, Y. M. A., & Suraih, N. S. (2018). Invitation strategies as produced by Yemeni EFL learners. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(2), 15-24.
- Aydin, M. (2013). *Cross Cultural Pragmatics: A Study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey* [MA. Thesis: Minnesota State University] <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/269/>
- Azar, B. S. (2003). *Fundamental of English Grammar*. Pearson Longman.

- Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Test*. Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Pearson.
- Brown, K. & Miller, E. (2013). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The Grammar book: an ESL/EFL teacher's course*. 2nd ed. Heinle & Heinle.
- Clear, J. (1993) From Firth Principles. Computational Tools for the Study of Collocation. In Baker, M., Francis, G. & Tognini-Bonelli, E. (Eds.), *Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 271–292). John Benjamins.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. University Press. Edinburgh.
- Crystal, A. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th Ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- De Pablos-Ortega, C. (2020). Directive Speech Acts in English and Spanish Filmspeak. *Pragmática Sociocultural / Sociocultural Pragmatics*, 8(1), 105-125. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soprag-2020-0001>
- Delancer, E. (2002). *Resource Booklet for Teachers of English as Foreign Language in Central Asia*. Nepal Halliday, M.A.K. (1992) Language as system and language as instance: the corpus as a theoretical construct. In Svartvik, J. (Ed.), *Directions in corpus linguistics: proceedings of the Nobel Symposium 82*, (pp.61 –77). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kroeger, P. R. (2005). *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, G. (2006). *A Glossary of English Grammar*. University Press Ltd.
- Leech, G., Denchar, M. and Hoogenraa, R. (1982). *English Grammar for Today*. Macmillan press.
- Lester, M. (2008). *The McGraw-Hills Essential ESL Grammar*. A Handbook for Intermediate and Advanced ESL Students. McGraw – Hill.
- Linden, W. J. V. & Glas, C.A.W. (2010). *Statistics for Social and Behavioral Sciences: Elements of Adaptive Testing*. Springer Science & Business Media, LLC.
- McNamara, T. (2000). *Language Testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Mousavi, S. A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Language Testing* (2nd Ed.). Rahnama Publication.
- Munshid , H. (2017). *Infinitival and Gerundial Constructions of Aspectual Verbs/Adjectives in Iraqi EFL University Students' Performance*. [Unpublished MA. Thesis]. Al- Mustansiriya University.
- Oliva, P. (1988). *Developing the Curriculum* (2nd Ed.). Foresmand.
- Pearson, B. (2006). Discourse, Narrative and Pragmatic Development. In Mey, J. L. (Ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatic* (pp.206-213). Elsevier Ltd.
- Pizziconi, B. (2006). Politeness. In Mey, J. L. (Ed.) *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (pp.706- 711). 2nd Ed. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Quirk, R., Sidney, G., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. Longman.
- Quirk, R., Sidney, G., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
- Richards, J. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (3rd Ed.). Pearson Education Limited Longman.
- Roopa, S. & Rani, M.S.(2017). Questionnaire Designing for a Survey. *The Journal of Indian Orthodontic Society*, 46(4), 273-277.
- Rueda, t. Y. (2006) Developing Pragmatic Competence in A Foreign Language. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 8, 169-128.
- Sayer, I. (2007). The Pragmatics of Infinitives and Gerunds in English. *Journal of Al-Anbar University for Humanities Sciences*, 2(8), 506-515.
- Schmid, H. (2014). Lexico-grammatical patterns, pragmatic associations and discourse frequency. In T. Herbst, H. Schmid & S. Faulhaber (Ed.), *Constructions Collocations Patterns* (pp. 239-294). München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110356854.239>
- Schwarz, N. & Sudman, S. (1995). *Answering Questions: Methodology for Determining Cognitive and Communicative Processes in Survey Research*. Jossey- Bass Publisher.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, modularity and mind-reading. *Mind and Language*, 17, 3–23.
- Swan, M. (1980). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford University Press.

Takahashi, M. (2004). *The English Imperative: A Cognitive and Functional Analysis* [Doctoral Dissertation. Hokkaido University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/2115/28248>

Trask, R. L. (1993). *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. Routledge.

Vagias, W. (2008). Likert-Type Scale Response Anchors, *European Network for Rural Development*. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1964054/likert-type-scale-response-anchors/2715819/>

APPENDIX (A) "test"

University of Tikrit

College of Education for Human Sciences

Department of English Language

Dear Sir, madam

The researcher intends to conduct a study entitled " **Pragmatic Problems Faced by Iraqi EFL University Students in Grammatical Constructions and Lexico-grammatical Patterns**". As you are an outstanding figure in the field of linguistics and teaching English, your opinions are of great value in passing judgment on the validity of the test items and its suitability at recognition and production levels.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation

Ph. D. Student/ English department

Arwa A. Abdulrahman

Part One: Test at the recognition level:

Read the following situations and decide whether the underlined utterances are intended to be:

- | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|
| -Invitation | -Conclusion | - Expressing wishes | - Avoiding |
| -Offer | - Advice | - Permission | - Apologizing |
| -Request | - Warning | - Obligation | |
| -Command | - Complain | - Greetings | |
| -Suggestion | - Requirement | - Thanking | |

1- Your house needs to be painted and there is no painters. You say to your brother "starting now?"

2- Ali is your bus driver. He has come late and you have missed the first lecture. You say to him "come early tomorrow?"

3- Your friend's lunch box has been stolen. You give him food. You say "Have another cookie."

4- Your brother is trying to be slim and there is a gem next to your flat. You say, "I propose starting at once."

5- Your son has dropped out the college. You say to him "How could you do something like that."

6- You have a secret and your friend knows about it. You say to him. "No talking about this to anyone."

7- You are asking your father for forgiveness your sister. You say "Shouldn't we at least give her a chance?"

8- Your classmate has asked you to come with him. You say "no offence meant but, I have a plan."

9- You are in the taxi. You feel thirsty and want to buy a bottle of water. The driver brings one for you. You said "Thank you so much."

10- Salim is a clerk. He wants to leave early. He says, "may I leave now?"

11- Your son will go to his duty. You say to him "be well".

12- You are in a bad situation and no one from your friend support you. After a while, you have met your friend and says "you are a fine friend".

13- You are in a kitchen and see a cat has injured. You say to your cousin "what a pity?"

14- There is an exam tomorrow. Your classmate does not study well because he is ill. You say "failure to pass may lead to bad situation."

15- Samara's employer says to her at work "may you check these letters before I sent them out?"

16- You are at a clinic. The weather is hot. You say, "Can I open the window?: Oh, open it then."

17- Your friend's car broke down in the street. You stop to see what happen. You say, "can I give you a lift?"

18- Abdulrahman is visiting his partner at the college. He says "long time no see you."

19- There is an exam tomorrow. Your new classmate doesn't study because he is coming late. You say "You really must come and study together tonight."

20- Your elder cousin is sitting on sofa. You accidently footfall him. You say "I am m sorry for stepping on your toe?"

21- Your little daughter offers an ice cream to you. You say "far from that, it is will hurt me."

- 22- Your friend is a story writer. You say " Have you thought about typing it?".
- 23- There is a postcard in the zoo says " Be careful! The jungle is too dangerous for you ".
- 24- Your sister asks you what would you like to have in dinner. You say "Why don't we have a barbecue tonight?".
- 25- You are asking your father for forgiveness your neighbour. he says "I think it was wrong to give him a chance."

Part two: Test at the production level:

What would you say to issue different acts as in the following situations by using the modals, imperative, gerund constructions and lexico-grammatical patterns?

- 1- Your brother has graduated from the university. How can you congratulate him?
- 2- You are in the train. Ask the other passenger to open the window.
- 3- You are writing to a friend. Invite her to visit you on weekend.
- 4- You are at the dinner table. How do you thank your boss to have dinner with you?
- 5- If you are in the pharmacy to buy a medicine for yourself according to doctor prescription. Ask the pharmacist to warn you about the usage medicine.
- 6- You are walking in town with a friend. Suggest having a cup of coffee.
- 7- The little boy has turned on the light. What would you say to him to let you sleep quietly?
- 8- There is a child crossing the road in front of you while your brother is driving the car. What would you say to advice your brother?
- 9- You are very tired. Request the person in the charge of the station to call you a taxi.
- 10- All your family at the dinner table. Express wishes.
- 11- You are carrying a tray. Say something to avoid hitting the furniture.
- 12- You are the only one between your friends who have a car. What do you say to offer a lift?
- 13- Your friend has arrived from London. Say something to greet him.
- 14- How a woman, you has helped, thanks you?
- 15- Your brother has an exam. Encourage him not to be afraid.
- 16- Your sister's arm has been broken. She wants to make tea. Advise her.
- 17- You are studying for an exam and do not want any kind of noise. What will you say to threaten your rowdy little sister?
- 18- Your brother's birthday party next week. Complain about the date of the party.
- 19- A friend has called you at your flat. Invite him to come in.
- 20- Tonight starts a nice program on TV. You reject to watch this.
- 21- How do you obligate your son for doing homework?
- 22- Your brother's birthday party next week. Expresses wishes for preparing party.
- 23- Your son has broken the window of the neighbour's house. How to say sorry for him.
- 24- You are invited at the dinner table with Ali. Complain round this occasion.
- 25- You are inquiring about your friend's intentions. How you will say that?