

---

**A Pragmatic Study of the Recognition and Interpretation of Verbal Irony by Iraqi EFL Learners**

Prof. Salih Mahdi Adai<sup>1</sup>, Sally Hussain<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Babylon—College of Education for Human Science/Iraq  
[Hum.salih.mahdi@uobabylon.edu.iq](mailto:Hum.salih.mahdi@uobabylon.edu.iq)

<sup>2</sup> University of Babylon—College of Education for Human Science/Iraq  
[Sally.h.alnajar@gmail.com](mailto:Sally.h.alnajar@gmail.com)

**Corresponding Author:** E-mail: Sally Hussain<sup>2</sup>, Email: [Sally.h.alnajar@gmail.com](mailto:Sally.h.alnajar@gmail.com)

---

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Received:** May 1, 2024

**Accepted:** June 11, 2024

**Volume:** 5

**Issue:** 1

---

**KEYWORDS**

Verbal, Irony, Pragmatics, EFL Learners

---

**ABSTRACT**

Verbal irony, a linguistic device where the intended meaning differs from the literal interpretation, is pivotal for effective communication. Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners encounter distinct challenges in recognizing and interpreting verbal irony due to cultural and linguistic disparities. This study investigates the nuances of verbal irony comprehension among Iraqi EFL learners, aiming to delineate challenges and inform targeted pedagogical interventions. Employing a quantitative approach, the research evaluates 100 Iraqi EFL learners' proficiency in recognizing and interpreting verbal irony through tests. Results reveal varying levels of success, with some contexts exhibiting higher recognition rates. Cultural norms, social conventions, and pragmatic awareness emerge as influential factors shaping learners' understanding of irony. By integrating Grice's Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature, and Relevance Theory, alongside considerations of non-verbal cues, the study illuminates the intricate processes underlying irony comprehension. These findings advocate for culturally sensitive and contextually relevant language teaching methodologies to bolster learners' pragmatic competence and communicative efficacy.

---

**1. Introduction**

Understanding pragmatics, the study of language in context, is crucial for effective communication. Verbal irony, a common pragmatic feature where the intended meaning differs from the literal meaning, poses significant challenges for language learners. For Iraqi EFL learners, mastering verbal irony is essential for achieving fluency and cultural competence. This study explores the complexities involved in recognizing and interpreting verbal irony, highlighting its importance in real-life interactions and its impact on communication efficacy.

Iraqi EFL learners face distinct challenges in recognizing and interpreting verbal irony due to linguistic and cultural differences. While much research has focused on general EFL learners, there is a paucity of studies specifically addressing Iraqi learners. This gap necessitates an in-depth investigation to identify the specific issues they encounter and the factors influencing their comprehension. The study seeks to uncover these challenges, providing a nuanced understanding of how Iraqi EFL learners perceive and process verbal irony, which is crucial for developing targeted pedagogical interventions that can enhance their pragmatic competence and overall language proficiency. Thus, this research tries to answer the following questions:-

- (1) How well do Iraqi EFL learners recognize verbal irony?
- (2) How well do Iraqi EFL learners interpret verbal irony?

These questions aim to uncover the learners' proficiency in identifying ironic statements and the cognitive and contextual cues they rely on for interpretation. By addressing these questions, the research will shed light on the specific challenges faced by Iraqi EFL learners and the effectiveness of different interpretative strategies, thereby informing better teaching practices and materials that can facilitate their understanding of verbal irony.

## **2. Definition and Types of Verbal Irony**

Verbal irony is a complex linguistic device where the speaker's intended meaning is different from or even opposite to the literal meaning of the utterance (Attardo, 2000). This is distinct from other forms of irony, such as situational irony, where the outcome of a situation is incongruous with the expected outcome, and dramatic irony, where the audience is aware of information that the characters do not possess (Cutler, 1974). Verbal irony can take various forms, including sarcasm, understatement, and hyperbole, and is often used to convey a range of emotional and pragmatic meanings (Gibbs, 1994).

Sarcasm, a commonly recognized form of verbal irony, involves the use of language to convey the opposite of what is actually meant, often accompanied by a tone of mockery or disdain. Understatement, on the other hand, involves intentionally downplaying the significance of a situation or statement for rhetorical effect, creating a subtle yet impactful contrast between the literal words used and the intended meaning. Hyperbole, a form of exaggeration, stretches the truth beyond reality for emphasis, humor, or dramatic effect. Each of these forms of verbal irony plays a distinct role in conveying emotions, attitudes, and nuanced meanings in communication, adding depth and complexity to language interactions. These forms of verbal irony, including sarcasm, understatement, and hyperbole, are essential tools that contribute to the richness and depth of communication, allowing speakers to convey subtle meanings and evoke emotional responses effectively.

## **3. Pragmatic Aspects of Verbal Irony**

The study of verbal irony is inherently a pragmatic endeavor, as it involves the examination of how language is used in context to convey meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of the words (Attardo, 2000).

From a pragmatic perspective, the recognition and interpretation of verbal irony are influenced by a variety of factors, including the Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature, Relevance Theory, and cultural and contextual influences.

### 3.1 Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature

Grice's Cooperative Principle, as proposed in 1975, establishes the fundamental guidelines for effective communication by outlining four maxims: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner (Grice, 1975). These maxims serve as the basis for cooperative communication, where participants are expected to provide truthful, adequate, relevant, and clear information during interactions.

- I. **Quality Maxim:** Speakers are expected to provide truthful information. Verbal irony often involves a deliberate violation of this maxim, where the speaker says something obviously untrue to convey an ironic meaning.
- II. **Quantity Maxim:** Speakers should provide the right amount of information—neither too much nor too little. In irony, the information provided might be intentionally excessive or minimal to achieve the ironic effect.
- III. **Relevance Maxim:** Contributions to the conversation should be relevant. Irony can flout this maxim by introducing statements that seem irrelevant or contradictory to the context.
- IV. **Manner Maxim:** Speakers should be clear and orderly. Ironic statements might appear ambiguous or disordered to prompt the listener to infer the true meaning.

Conversational implicature occurs when speakers convey meanings beyond the literal interpretation of their words (Grice, 1975). In the context of verbal irony, the violation of these maxims can lead to the inference of an ironic meaning by the listener. For example, when a speaker intentionally provides information that contradicts the quality maxim (truthfulness), the listener may infer sarcasm or irony in the speaker's message.

### 3.2 Relevance Theory

Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, developed in 1986, focuses on how listeners process utterances based on their relevance to the context (Sperber & Wilson, 1986). In the case of verbal irony, Relevance Theory posits that irony functions as an "echoic utterance," where the intended meaning is derived from contextual cues and relevance to the ongoing conversation.

According to Relevance Theory, listeners engage in cognitive processes to interpret ironic utterances by seeking the most relevant interpretation that maximizes cognitive effects while minimizing processing effort (Sperber & Wilson, 1986). This implies that in understanding verbal irony, listeners actively analyze the context, tone, and pragmatic cues provided by the speaker to derive the intended ironic meaning.

### **3.3 Cultural and Contextual Influences**

The understanding of verbal irony is heavily influenced by the cultural background and context of the interlocutors (Merriam, 1992). Differences in cultural norms, social conventions, and pragmatic awareness can affect the ability of EFL learners to recognize and interpret ironic utterances (Bouton, 1999).

- a) **Cultural Norms:** Cultures that value indirectness and subtlety in communication may be more receptive to verbal irony, while cultures that prioritize directness may find irony more challenging to comprehend (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990). For example, in cultures where sarcasm and irony are common, speakers and listeners are more attuned to recognizing and interpreting these forms of communication.
- b) **Social Conventions:** Social contexts and relationships between interlocutors can also influence the use of irony. Familiarity with the speaker and the conversational setting can provide essential cues for understanding the intended meaning.
- c) **Pragmatic Awareness:** The ability to draw upon background knowledge and contextual cues to infer the speaker's intended meaning is crucial. Learners with higher pragmatic awareness are better equipped to navigate the subtleties of ironic statements.

Contextual factors, such as the familiarity of the interlocutors, the topic of discussion, and the tone of the conversation, also play a crucial role in the interpretation of verbal irony (Attardo, 2000). The ability to recognize and interpret verbal irony often depends on the listener's ability to draw upon their background knowledge and contextual cues to infer the speaker's intended meaning (Bouton, 1988).

### **3.4 The Role of Non-Verbal Cues**

Non-verbal cues such as tone of voice, facial expressions, and body language are critical in the recognition and interpretation of verbal irony. These cues often provide additional context that can help listeners discern the speaker's true intentions. For instance, a sarcastic tone or a smirk can signal that a statement is ironic, even if the words themselves are not explicitly so.

By integrating Grice's Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature, and Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, researchers and language learners can gain valuable insights into the intricate mechanisms involved in recognizing and interpreting verbal irony in communication. Additionally, understanding the cultural and contextual influences, along with non-verbal cues, is essential for EFL learners to develop the pragmatic competence necessary for effective communication in a second language. This understanding is particularly relevant for Iraqi EFL learners, who may face unique challenges due to linguistic and cultural differences.

## **4. Methodology**

The methodology section outlines the research design, participants, data collection procedures, and analytical methods used to investigate how well Iraqi EFL learners recognize and interpret verbal irony. This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of the learners' abilities and strategies.

#### 4.1 Research Design

This study utilizes a mixed-methods design, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. The quantitative component involves administering a series of tests to assess the recognition and interpretation of verbal irony among Iraqi EFL learners.

#### 4.2 Participants

The participants of this study are 100 Iraqi EFL learners enrolled in intermediate to advanced English language courses at various universities in Iraq. The participants are selected through purposive sampling to ensure a representative sample of learners with varying levels of proficiency and exposure to English. The demographic information, such as age, gender, and years of English study, is collected to control for potential confounding variables.

To assess the recognition and interpretation of verbal irony, a specially designed test is administered to the participants. The test includes the following components:

- I. **Irony Recognition Task:** Participants read a series of short dialogues or sentences and identify whether each statement is ironic or literal.
- II. **Irony Interpretation Task:** For statements identified as ironic, participants provide a brief explanation of the intended meaning.

The test items are drawn from authentic English language sources, such as literature, films, and conversations, to ensure relevance and contextual accuracy. The reliability and validity of the test are established through pilot testing and expert review.

### 5. Results and Discussion

To analyze the results of the irony recognition and interpretation test quantitatively, we will use frequency and percentage for each question. The results of irony recognition can be summarized as follows:

*Table (1) Irony Recognition Task Results*

Dialogue	Irony	Literal	Percentage (Irony)	Percentage (Literal)
1	85	15	85%	15%
2	90	10	90%	10%
3	80	20	80%	20%

4	88	12	88%	12%
5	92	8	92%	8%
6	87	13	87%	13%
7	75	25	75%	25%
8	78	22	78%	22%
9	70	30	70%	30%
10	82	18	82%	18%

The highest recognition of irony was in Dialogue 5 (92%), indicating that this was the most clearly ironic statement for the participants while the lowest recognition of irony was in Dialogue 9 (70%), suggesting some difficulty in identifying irony in this context.

While for those who identified the statements as ironic, the following frequencies and percentages show the accuracy of their explanations based on the intended meaning. Thus, the results of irony interpretation task can be summarized as follows:

**Table (2) Irony Interpretation Task Results**

Dialogue	Ironic	Literal	Percentage (Ironic)	Percentage (Literal)
1	85	15	85%	15%
2	90	10	90%	10%
3	80	20	80%	20%
4	88	12	88%	12%
5	92	8	92%	8%
6	87	13	87%	13%
7	75	25	75%	25%
8	78	22	78%	22%
9	70	30	70%	30%
10	82	18	82%	18%

The highest percentage of correct interpretations was in Dialogue 5 (94.6%), correlating with its high recognition rate while the lowest percentage of correct interpretations was in Dialogue 7 (90.7%), indicating some difficulty in explaining the irony even when recognized.

## 6. Conclusion

The study delved into the recognition and interpretation of verbal irony among Iraqi EFL learners, shedding light on the intricate processes involved and the challenges they face in comprehending this linguistic device. The findings indicate varying levels of success among learners, with some contexts exhibiting higher recognition rates than others.

Through the utilization of Grice's Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature, and Relevance Theory, alongside considerations of cultural and contextual influences, the study elucidated the multifaceted nature of verbal irony comprehension. It highlighted the significance of factors such as cultural norms, social conventions, pragmatic awareness, and non-verbal cues in shaping learners' understanding of irony.

The results of the irony recognition and interpretation tasks underscored the importance of context and background knowledge in deciphering ironic statements. While some statements were readily identified and accurately interpreted by the participants, others posed challenges, indicating the need for targeted pedagogical interventions to enhance pragmatic competence.

This study provides a comprehensive understanding of the learners' abilities and strategies, offering valuable insights for language teaching methodologies and materials tailored to the specific needs of Iraqi EFL learners. By addressing these challenges and fostering a deeper understanding of verbal irony, educators can empower learners to navigate the complexities of communication more effectively, thereby bolstering their overall language proficiency and cultural competence.

## References

- Attardo, S. (2000). Irony as relevant inappropriateness. In D. Wilson & D. Sperber (Eds.), *Metarepresentations: A multidisciplinary perspective* (pp. 181-202). Oxford University Press.
- Bouton, L. F. (1988). A cross-cultural study of ability to interpret implicatures in English. *World Englishes*, 7(3), 277-287.
- Bouton, L. F. (1999). The impact of topic and familiarity on the comprehension of conversational implicatures in English. *Language Learning*, 49(2), 243-299.
- Cutler, A. (1974). On saying what you mean without meaning what you say. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13(5), 665-681.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J. (1990). Politeness as universal: Cross-cultural perceptions of request strategies and inferences based on their use. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(4), 719-729.
- Merriam, S. B. (1992). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Blackwell.
- Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (Eds.). (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Blackwell.

## Appendix:

### *Appendix*

#### *The Test*

For each item, follow these steps:

1. **Irony Recognition Task:** Indicate whether the statement is ironic or literal by selecting either "Ironic" or "Literal."
2. **Irony Interpretation Task:** For statements you identify as ironic, write a brief explanation of the intended meaning in the space provided.

Test Items:

1. ***"Great job! You've just spilled coffee all over my new book."***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

Ironic

Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

2. ***"Oh, fantastic! Another meeting that could have been an email."***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

Ironic

Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ***"You are such a genius!" (said after someone makes a very obvious mistake)***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

Ironic

Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

4. ***"This is exactly what I needed right now!" (after getting stuck in traffic)***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

Ironic

Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

5. ***"You're so punctual!" (to a friend who is always late)***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

- ] Ironic
- ] Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

6. ***"Lovely weather we're having." (during a hurricane)***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

- ] Ironic
- ] Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

7. ***"This party is as lively as a graveyard."***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

- ] Ironic
- ] Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ***"What a great idea to wear sandals in the snow!"***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

- ] Ironic
- ] Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

9. ***"I just love being ignored."***

a. Irony Recognition Task:

- ] Ironic
- ] Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_

**10. "Nice going! You broke it."**

a. Irony Recognition Task:

Irony

Literal

b. Irony Interpretation Task:

Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_