A Systematic Review of Studies on Invitation Speech Act: The Matter of Being Genuine or Ostensible

Hamideh Shahriari Folourdi
Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch

Abstract:- In the study presented, the researchers attempt to systematically review the works performed on the "Ostensible Invitation speech act". First, they will briefly talk about the background of communicative acts, their uses, and why we need to know about them as language researchers or teachers. The paper, then, will continue to provide some studies considering a number of languages and cultures, and the overview that each researcher had while doing the work accordingly. As we know, every language is closely tied to its related culture and traditions which would result in some considerations during expressing their utterances. In some cases, not following those considerations can cause misunderstandings and even can be considered as being rude. Thus, the need for such studies will be highlighted. On the other hand, there is not a sufficient number of works dealing with this matter of concern. By performing the presented paper, the researchers could gather some of the important ones and study them all together to conclude the points offered and illustrate the strengths and weaknesses, if any. In this way, it will give insight to future researchers on how they can deal with such a valuable field of study so that they can help teachers and learners.

Keywords:- *Communicative Acts, Speech Acts, Ostensible, Genuine, Invitation Speech Act.*

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to critically review studies on ostensible communicative acts with a specific emphasis on the speech act of invitation. Invitation speech act is one of the communicative acts that is used by everyone with every language and every culture in his or her everyday routine. Due to the fact that people with different languages can invite others differently, we should note that sometimes these varieties in utterances, particularly from different language backgrounds, can cause different impressions and may lead to face and self-image threatening and misunderstandings.

The other point would be the insufficient number of studies performed in this regard and the way they are performed would also be important to other researchers. Therefore, the present researchers try to systematically review what has been done to date so that they can reach a comprehensive result.

Here, the researchers begin with a brief background of what has been performed considering language teaching and learning since the emergence of the theory called "Speech Act". Wittgenstein put forward the idea of "don't ask for the meaning, ask for the use," demonstrating language as a new tool for social activity (Bach, 2014). He believed meaning comes out of pragmatic tradition, presenting the importance of how language is applied to accomplish objectives within and considering specific situations. With the help of the rules to achieve a goal, communication becomes like a series of language games. Therefore, utterances do more than just reflect a meaning, they are designed words to get things performed. (Littlejohn, 2009).

The Speech Act theory came with an evolution in the philosophy and nature of learning languages. As we are all aware now, every single utterance made by speakers of a language can carry a clear or hidden function based on the factors such as the situation, culture, time, place, interlocutors, etc. For example:

- Are you free on Saturday evening?
- Could you pass the salt?
- I'd love to come but I have to work late.

Today, it is considered a standard theory in communication and linguistics. Accordingly, considered the two leading pioneers of speech act theory, Austin and John Searle made major contributions to the systematization of the theory with their initial analyses and investigations. Austin (1962), introduced it and established the foundations. Consequently, he offered a distinction between locutionary (i.e. the performance of an utterance), illocutionary (i.e. the active result of the implied meaning or request presented by the locutionary act), and perlocutionary acts (i.e. the actual effect of the locutionary and illocutionary acts).

Searle refined the classification that Austin proposed: he identified a number of principles and distinguished five classes of illocutionary acts: Assertives: such as stating, suggesting, putting forward, swearing, boasting, and concluding (e.g. "Tokyo is the capital of Japan"); Directives: such as asking, ordering, requesting, inviting, advising, and begging (e.g. "Turn down the radio"); Commissives, such as promising, planning, vowing, betting, and opposing (e.g. I will take care of that"); Expressives, such as thanking, apologizing, welcoming, and deploring (e.g. Thank you for your help); Declaratives, such as christening, or appointing (e.g. "You are hired") (Searle,

2002). Under these categories offered by Searle, "invitation" is considered as a directive speech act.

Another important factor considering the speech acts is whether they are genuine or ostensible. As Link and Kreuz (2005) elaborated in their study, Ostensible Speech Acts (OSAs) acquire uncertainty, pretending, mutual recognition, involvement, and an unintended purpose. Moreover, they mentioned many features are more common in ostensible speech than in authentic one (e.g., the speaker's utterance of ambiguity or probability, and breaks up introductory conditions). According to different studies (Isaacs & Clark, 1990; Link & Kreuz, 2005; Eslami, 2005; Salmani-Nodoushan, 2006; Dastpak, 2011; Yaqubi, 2020), people with different backgrounds and from different cultures usually have difficulties in order to utter or distinguish between genuine and ostensible speech acts when they are in the situations to do so. In some cases, the interlocutors would face and self-image misunderstandings as when the speaker utters an ostensible communicative act, the hearer recognizes it as genuine and vice versa.

II. METHODOLOGY

In the present article, the paper reviews Isaacs and Clark's (1990) proposal on ostensible communicative acts. This study will pave the way for understanding ostensible communicative acts. Then, the article aims to compare the findings of studies conducted on Persian, Arabic, and Chinese. By reviewing those studies, the researcher highlights if the practices followed in investigating this type of speech acts across cultures are effective or not. After that, it would be continued with several other studies with regard to this aspect of the "Invitation" speech act.

There is a considerable variety of speech acts, each of which is responsible for an intention carried by a specific utterance (e.g. request, invitation, apology, thanking, greeting, etc.). Providing a brief history of "Speech Act Theory" in the introduction section, the present article continues with a focus on the studies done on the "Invitation" speech act.

III. OSTENSIBLE AND GENUINE INVITATIONS IN ENGLISH

This section is going to focus on the studies performed considering Ostensible and Genuine Invitations in English. Here, we are reviewing three works done by some of the researchers that made a framework for some other studiess.

Isaacs and Clark (1990) were among the pioneers regarding the speech act of invitation, specifically,

Ostensible Invitations which are when speakers express some utterances that seem to act as invitation but don't actually intend to invite their hearers. Isaacs and Clark also provided some related factors such as speakers' pretense of genuineness, interlocutors' recognition of the speakers' simulation, invitees' conspiracy of the simulation, inviters' uncertainty regarding the recognition, and finally, the speakers' off-hand intention. Participants under study comprised four groups: 1) 52 undergraduates taking psycholinguistics class. A set of 104 examples collected from them were their record of an instance of one insincere and one sincere offer or invitation that they witnessed and they reported the intention behind them. The conversations made, the related context, and the quotation had to be fully and exactly described by them. 2) 10 undergraduates from whom a set of 40 examples was collected through face-to-face interviews. The researchers asked the participants to recall two insincere and two sincere invitations that they experienced, one of each with a friend and the other with a stranger or an acquaintance. This group was also asked to describe the context and the exact dialogue and the reason why they believed their act had been sincere or not.

The researchers tape-recorded the interviews and attempted to explore more details of the contexts. 3) The third group was 10 pairs of friends at Stanford University who were interviewed face-to-face and a set of 10 examples was gathered from them. These pairs were asked to recall the time when an Ostensible Invitation had been made between them. Then, they were interviewed individually after both had agreed upon the utterance, it should also be noted that it was before the time they had discussed it in detail. Every individual gave his/her version of the context and reenacted the dialogue as best he/she could. Their self-assurance, then, was rated in that they mutually understood the invitation wasn't intended to be taken seriously. 4) Two final Ostensible Invitations were tape-recorded from natural telephone conversations between the first author and two different friends. These, of course, were word-perfect, precise, and confirmable. They described seven strategies applied by the speakers in fulfilling the requirements. The result also showed that the participants attempted to fulfill their off-hand intention by making their interlocutors perceive the impacts they expected from their invitations, the fact behind their uttering an ostensible invitation, and the related situation. They noted, finally, Ostensible Invitations are considered under the Ostensible Speech Acts' category and relate with other types of non-serious language use. Isaacs and Clark (1990) defined 2 sets for recognizing features of Ostensible Invitations which are presented below (both tables are the original ones derived from their paper).

Table 1 Defining Properties of Ostensible Invitations (A Invited B to Event E)

Pretense	A pretends to make a sincere invitation.
Mutual recognition	A and B mutually recognize A's pretense.
Collusion	B responds appropriately to A's pretense.
Ambivalence	When asked, "Do you really mean it?" A cannot sincerely answer either "yes" or "no."
Off-record purpose	A's main purpose is tacit.

Table 2 Seven Features of Ostensible Invitations (A Invites B to Event E)

A makes B's presence at E implausible.
A extends invitation only after it has been solicited.
A doesn't motivate invitation beyond social courtesy.
A doesn't persist or insist on the invitation.
A is vague about arrangements for event E.
A hedges the invitation.
A delivers the invitation with inappropriate cues.

Kristen E. Link and Roger J. Kreuz (2005) aimed to study "The Comprehension of Ostensible Speech Acts." According to the authors, Ostensible Speech Acts (OSAs) are identified as acquiring uncertainty, pretending, mutual recognition, involvement, and an unintended purpose. Comparing sincere and ostensible speech, the researchers noted that many features (e.g., speaker borders and interrupts introductory conditions) are more common in the Ostensible ones. The researchers explored the role of these features regarding the conception of Ostensible Speech Acts. Their experiment participants were 29 undergraduates who were native speakers of English and participated for credit in a preparatory psychology course. The researchers asked them to read given booklets which included instructions and 72 conversations that consisted of Ambiguous, Sincere, or Ostensible Speech Acts, and offer "goodness-of-speech-act rating", pretending, or mutual recognition. Then, the authors wanted them to predict the next speech act and judge the speaker's attitude or specify the motive behind the speech act. The applicants could differentiate between Ambiguous, Ostensible, and Sincere Speech in their rating of "goodness-of-speech-act"; they could also identify the key features in OSAs, but were not able to do so regarding sincere speech. Moreover, the distinguishing features represented clues that an expression was ostensible. The findings of their study supported Isaacs and Clark's explanation of OSAs.

In her study on enhancing pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks through meta-pragmatic discussions, Andréanne Cloutier (2015), attempted to provide a thorough literature review on the subject of instructional pragmatics and meta-pragmatic discussions (MPD) and offer a variety of instructional techniques that intend to raise the learners' consciousness of pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic elements of a target languaculture. In her work, the author addressed the *National Standards for the Teaching of Foreign Languages* established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and how this publication affects teaching pragmatics in the L2 classroom. Moreover, the study aimed to describe the concept of pragmatic competence and the teachability of pragmatic competence besides revealing how it develops in language learners. One aspect she mentioned in her study was dealing with types of invitation in American English, known in the pragmatic literature as an *ostensible invitation*, which conveys five important properties.

Most of Cloutier's (2015) research examined the benefits of explicit instruction versus implicit instruction, including the efficacy of various teaching techniques. The other aspect of the study attempted to demonstrate how educators can focus their teaching on language use through a multiplicity of pragmatic consciousness-raising activities with the steps as follow: first, the notion of metalanguage and meta-pragmatic awareness was defined; second, pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks were explored as a means to help students recognize the pragmatic norms of a target languaculture; third, the classroom implementation of these consciousness-raising tasks was discussed; and finally, instructional techniques were explained and supported with evidence from studies that have tested their efficacy. The study, then, benefited from supplementing them with retrospective activities to reinforce learning which meant that the author wanted to make sure that the students adopted the notions they were encouraged to notice the pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic elements of the target language through pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks. By consolidating implicit knowledge of usage through meta-pragmatic discussions, the instructors assisted the learners in unpacking and negotiating these components of the target languaculture in order to further their understanding of it. At the end, it has been argued that whatever a teacher's beliefs about language pedagogy might be, it is crucial for him or her to examine students' motives for language learning in a meaningful way. As suggested in this work, using a pedagogical approach focused on usage helps second language learners understand cross-cultural differences and gives them the tools to unpack the dynamics of a languaculture.

➢ *Conclusion:-*

Considering the three articles above, all of them attempted to make a framework and offer some features related to Ostensible Invitations and help learners distinguish the ostensible and genuine ones. However, most of the participants of their studies were motivated to some extent which should be taken into consideration. In addition, the researchers of the present study tried to mention all the details included in the works above to provide a complete overview and the possible procedures that would have been important in performing such studies (i.e. recalling, reporting the intentions, uttering, recognition and competence).

IV. OSTENSIBLE AND GENUINE INVITATIONS IN FARSI (PERSIAN)

In this section we will have an overview of the works performed on Persian Ostensible and Genuine Invitations. Among the research done in this regard, the eight studies mentioned in this section were closer to the aim of the study.

Considering teaching and learning a language, the knowledge of and about the structures and words is not sufficient. One can really use a language appropriately when he/she gains the communicative competence related to that language. However, when it comes to FL or SL learners, they should be aware of the differences and similarities existed between their own languages and the target ones. As Beeman (1986) mentioned, considering the inadequacy of semantics in clarifying the words' interpretations in Persian, we can understand the complexity of this language. How a person uses a language can also have a root in his/her cultural and social concepts (Taleghani-Nikazm, 1998; Koutelaki, 2002; Yaqubi, 2018).

As noted by Koutelaki (2009) Iranian speakers try to save their face and self-image and this way the matter of politeness is so important for them. Politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1978) was a part of the notion of the face and they defined it as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself".

Given the conception of Persian Ostensible and Genuine Speech Acts, in particular, the Invitation Speech Act, the word "Taarof" would be highlighted in a pragmatic view. "Taarof" can play as both genuine and ostensible acts which sometimes makes it difficult to distinguish even among Iranian interlocutors. It also can cover several speech acts such as offering, inviting, refusing offers and invitations, and apologizing. Here, we are applying the part that deals with the speech act of invitation.

In the study performed by Zohreh Eslami Rasekh (2005), "Invitations in Persian and English: Ostensible or genuine?" she described the key features of Persian genuine and Ostensible Invitations on the basis of a collection of spontaneous Persian invitations and the results of interview data. Eslami collected 80 ostensible and 80 genuine invitations in Persian through observations and participant observation of natural language use. The participants under study were 40 graduate students of three different universities in Iran, 25 females and 15 males, who were asked to tape-record invitations where possible, and if not possible, to record instances of genuine and Ostensible Invitations they witnessed in daily interactions and natural settings, categorize the invitation as genuine or ostensible and the reasons they believed the invitation was genuine or ostensible. She also noted information regarding the age, gender, occupation, and relationship of the interlocutors in her study. The data collection framework, data analysis, and the results provided by Isaacs and Clark (1990) were used in her study. The results of the study were compared with the structure of invitations in English stated by Isaacs and Clark (1990) which showed that the structure of Ostensible

Invitations in Persian is more complex than in English. Moreover she concluded invitations that meet the criteria for being genuine invitations in English can be classified as ostensible by Persian speakers and they use a considerable number of Ostensible Invitations in their daily activities as a manifestation of ritual politeness (ta'arof).

In his paper in 2006, Mohammad Ali Salmani-Nodoushan performed a comparative socio-pragmatic study of Ostensible Invitations in English and Farsi to explore whether Persian genuine and Ostensible Invitations could be distinguished by the same properties and features as the ones provided by Isaacs and Clark (1990). As he mentioned in his article, considering Persian language, the term "invitation" has been used in two different senses in his study: some invitations have been termed "genuine invitations" corresponds to the Persian term/dæ'væt/. However, some others have been referred to as "ostensible invitations", corresponds to the Persian term /ta:'rof/. He collected one set of 1282 examples by 45 field workers who were asked to record any instance of invitations they witnessed and also to report the purpose behind the exchange. Besides, the author asked them to sufficiently describe the context to make the conversation comprehensible and to quote, as best as they could, precisely what was said, including just before and just after the invitation. 109 instances out of this set of 1282 examples were discarded but the rest of the instances included 566 ostensible and 607 genuine invitations. Additionally, the researcher interviewed 34 undergraduate students and gathered and 68 ostensible and 68 genuine invitations. Moreover, 41 pairs of friends were face-to-face interviewed and were asked to recall a time when one had extended an Ostensible Invitation to the other. They were also interviewed individually in isolation and each of them provided their version of the context and reenacted the dialogue as best as they could.

In his data analysis, Salmani-Nodoushan (2006) used the five significant attributes and features of Ostensible Invitations to distinguish examples of Ostensible Invitations from the data, and put them in the classification of Ostensible Invitations. He also went through the same way for genuine invitations. Thus, he had two groups of data individually comprising 675 examples. To quantify the data for comparing the two categories of invitations, the author used the same method adopted by Isaacs and Clark (1990). This method deals with the repetitions of the seven features that speakers adopt in the proceeding Ostensible Invitations extending. The data analysis admitted that Ostensible Invitations in Persian can similarly be discriminated from Genuine Invitations in this language by the attributes and features pointed out in Isaacs and Clark's studies.

A study by Dastpak and Mollaei (2011), was performed to describe the pragmatically defining features of Persian ostensible and genuine invitations. The collected data were on the basis of the spontaneous Persian invitations. The participants of the study who were divided into two groups were: 1) 120 EFL undergraduate students from two different universities interviewed by the researcher and were asked to record any observed instance of sincere

and insincere invitations or offers and also report the purpose behind the utterances. They were asked to recall two insincere and two sincere invitations from their own experiences, one of which regarding a friend and the other an acquaintance or a stranger. Then, they were asked to describe the context, to reenact the dialogue as best they could, and then to explain why they believed the act has been sincere or not. 2) The second group consisted of 20 postgraduate students who were also being interviewed by the writer and were asked to recall a time when an Ostensible Invitation had been made. The findings of the study were compared with the ostensible and genuine invitations in English. The researchers used the data collection and analysis framework of the work by Isaacs and Clark (1990). To analyze the data, a chi-square was applied. The results showed that in some situations, Persian Ostensible Invitations are more complex than the ones in English. Moreover, the ostensible invitations' features in English were insufficient to distinguish the genuine invitations from the ostensible ones in Persian. On the other hand, some invitation patterns which are considered as being genuine in English can be seen as Ostensible Invitations in Persian. The other point is that, Persian speakers use a large number of Ostensible Invitations in terms of the manifestation of politeness. Finally, the data analysis showed that the ways of uttering invitation in Persian and English are similar but the matter of degree was considered as their difference.

Behzad Nazari (2014) performed a study on Ostensible Invitation entitled "The Contrastive Analysis of the Speech Act of Invitation between English and Farsi." In his article, he concentrated on the key features of authentic and simulated invitations in Farsi based on a collection of off-hand invitations. The researcher attempted to formulate an explanatory basis for the contrastive study of the Speech Act of Invitation between English and Persian. The article covered a collection of examples which was derived from various novels, storylines, and further instructional books in both English and Farsi oral and printed invitations. He analyzed the findings and compared them with English invitation features and structures. The results showed the features and structures of Farsi artificial invitation are more intricate than those in English. He stated invitation features and structures that include the components for being authentic invitations in English can be categorized as ostensible by speakers in Persian. The results suggested that Persian speakers apply a remarkable variety of Ostensible Invitations in their routine activities as a superficial politeness signal (ta'arof). The paper noted that the keystone in applying Ostensible Invitations in Farsi is upgrading face and self-image for both interlocutors.

"Critical intercultural communication education: cultural analysis and pedagogical applications" was the topic of the study performed by Sofia A. Koutlaki and Zohreh R. Eslami in 2018. They offered a pedagogical approach to intercultural language teaching that employed the students' L1 (i.e., Persian) to enable cultural awareness and effective intercultural communication. Ostensible Invitations can be another source of variant perceptions. They applied a cultural analysis pattern to present how L1 cultural standards play a part in to politeness and speech act consciousness patterns and how that understanding and awareness could be utilized while having the competence of the pragmatics of other languages. They, particularly, put the stress and importance on learners' critical awareness and gratitude of their cultural values and language to be able to advance heightened sensitivity to the inherent impact of cultural assumptions on communication. Their approach aligned well with critical discussions concerning English as an international language (EIL) and its ideological, political, and educational implications that encourage learners to be crucially thoughtful with awareness and appreciation of their local cultural values and critical awareness of other cultures.

Koutlaki and Eslami (2018) considered the relationship between language and culture from the perspective of cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics and the implications of this relationship for developing intercultural communication competence in the language classroom. Once arguing how cultural conceptualizations of face or self-image and politeness affect utilizing pragmatics and speech act recognition patterns in Persian, they provided a variety of instructional activities to increase students' meta-pragmatic awareness and capability to deliberate over relationships between language usage and culture. As suggested in their paper, educators can benefit from published research findings to help students improve their awareness of L1 (or L2) pragmatics and fundamental cultural values. Teachers can then use their knowledge about students' L1 and its culture to engage learners in collaborative classroom discussions for examining numerous cultural norms that impact different pragmatic features.

In her study "Context in Distinguishing between Overt and Actual Functions of Polite Speech Acts", Mojde Yaqubi (2019) attempted to focus on the significance of context in differentiating between overt (direct) and actual (indirect) applications of four speech acts such as invitation, offering, refusal and apologizing brought together from the recordings of Iranian movies. As she noted in her research polite speech acts have been stated to be adopted with both genuine and ostensible meanings. For gathering data, the researcher gathered examples of four sets of speech acts stated above, from the collection of 15 Iranian movies, with both genuine and ostensible senses. The rationale behind her selection of data was their relevance to the mechanism of ta'ārof. On this aim, the strategies applied in the structures of speech acts were established. In addition, she tried to study the significance of context in identifying overt versus actual application of genuine and ostensible speech acts. Thus, contextual characteristics and properties such as people, time and places were adopted. Based on the model provided, 312 speech acts were distinguished from their genuine counterparts in the corpus. They consisted of 189 genuine and 123 ostensible speech acts. The results of her study revealed that all the ostensible features found in the Persian invitations were included in the list of functions and contexts of Persian Ostensible Invitations proposed by Eslami (2005). The author proposed that while the overt and actual applications of the genuine speech acts are the same,

there is inconsistency regarding ostensible speech acts. The findings emphasized the significance of context in working out the meaning of Persian speech acts.

Considering Iranian culture and its ritual politeness system, Ahmad Izadi (2019), studies the matter of "Taarof" in invitation-refusal exchanges. In his study, he quoted Eslami's investigation (2005) on Ostensible Invitation as another manifestation of Taarof and that she assigned them a feature of face and self-image enhancing. As he noted, Taarof is considered as one of the most important components of Iranian cultural identity and can be seen in every day interactions among Iranian people. Thus, Taarof may be realized as the backbone of Persian ritual politeness. First, the article defined and elaborated the issue of "Taarof and Face" and then analyzed a selected scenario of interaction in order to reveal how participants achieve Taarof in their interaction by accomplishing ostensible invitation-refusal exchanges. Besides, he mentioned that this was only one example of hundreds of excerpts from a corpus of Persian interactional data which were audio-recorded between the years 2010 and 2013 with the permission of the participants. Due to this capacity, Taarof has a remarkable potential for miscommunication between Iranians and non-Iranians. The findings showed that how Taarof is applied by the participants jointly in interactions.

His article did not fully support the view whether Taarof is face and self-image enhancing or face and self-image threatening by showing that the participants achieved both connection and separation in the practice of *taarof*. The other point was that Taarof is an attempt to build close bonding with interlocutors but the degree of projected bonding may be interpreted differently by the speakers and their hearers. One important matter is that Taarof consist of act with different degrees of sincerity and insincerity. It was noted that this provides the potential ritual to be recognized differently in terms of the degree of connection and separation, depending on who the interlocutors are, what their relationship history is, and what contextual expectations would be.

In 2021, Raashid Nehal initiated his study with the intention of offering a discrepancy between the traditional and modern perspective of speech acts which was followed by the concentration on distinguishing ostensible speech acts and genuine speech acts. His examination was related to the Ahmadi & Rasekh's (2010) work that described the pragmatic characteristics of two culturally Persian culture, north and center, according to ten discourse situations and expressions chosen for data collection on the subject of the use of genuine and Ostensible Invitations in English. Then, he compared the data with the invitations' structure in English reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990). The result of the study showed that the socio-linguistic elements might be beneficial to a better understanding of the dynamics of lack of success to distinguish the accurate function of speech acts in EFL educational settings, as these complications were reported in the study done by Ahmadi and Rasekh.

➤ *Conclusion:-*

In accordance with the above mentioned, most of the studies adopted the framework applied by Isaacs and Clark (1990) and aimed to compare the results. Most of the findings showed that the provided features in Isaacs and Clark's work can be considered similar to the ones uttered by Persian speakers. On the other hand, the matter of "politeness" in Iranians' culture and society is so highlighted that results in even more complex ostensible invitations. Such differences, therefore, can cause misunderstandings between an Iranian and his/her English interlocutor (e.g. an Iranian listener can consider his/her English interlocutor's genuine invitation as an ostensible one). Some of the studies mentioned to take account of the factors such as contexts, degree of connection, relationship history, etc.

V. OSTENSIBLE AND GENUINE INVITATIONS IN ARABIC

Arabic language also has a variety of Ostensible and Genuine Speech Acts which come from the rich cultural and social background. Thus, the following section attempts to review some of the studies performed dealing with Ostensible and Genuine Invitations expressed by Arabic speakers. This sections consists of four studies.

In 2015, Saleem Abdel Hady investigated the speech act of Ostensible Invitations in Jordanian Arabic from a pragmatic point of view and aimed to bridge a gap between intercultural and cognitive pragmatic studies of ostensible communicative acts. The author collected the examples in 4 sets or ways: (1) During face-to-face interviews, asked informants to record/recall any instance of sincere or insincere invitations or offers they observed or experienced; (2) Examples gathered through the researcher's and/or the interviewees' direct observation of ostensible and genuine invitations in Jordan from both genders and ages between 15-50 years old; 3) The data were gathered and recorded directly from telephone conversations with the researcher; 4) This set which aimed to capture computer-mediated invitations included invitations. In the paper, the corpus was built on 120 experiential and recalled examples of genuine and Ostensible Invitations extended in Irbid City, Jordan. The focus of the study was on the pragmatic functions of ostensible invitations. The approach adopted in this study was qualitative, and the analysis was divided into two complementary stages: 1) The main phase was to distinguish ostensible and genuine invitations sets; 2) to explore the sociolinguistic functions of ostensible invitations, the researcher utilized two frameworks of politeness.

The findings of his study revealed that Jordanian Arabic Ostensible Invitations are joint actions of 2 layers: top and bottom. These invitations, at the top layer, are similar to genuine invitations in which the inviter and the invitee make-believe that the uttered invitation is authentic and act in such a way that it is to be taken seriously. On the other hand, at the bottom layer, both realize that the uttered invitation is not to be taken seriously as it works for other functions. His study indicated that in Jordanian culture,

Ostensible Invitations can be applied as moderating tools in different face and self-image-threatening situations, convincing tools, and provocative ones.

Investigating Ostensible Invitation in Arabic, Radcliff-Johnson and El-Hilawi (2016) aimed to explore the pragmatic functions of Ostensible Invitations that Iraqi Arabic speakers use. According to the authors, the issuance of different ostensible speech acts in the traditions of Iraqi society is to communicate other intentions than those expressed by the genuine ones. As the speech act of invitation is mainly adopted by Iraqi Arabic speakers in its ostensible way, the researchers believed that it would be vital to study its functions deeply. The data were collected from hundred Iraqi college students, and they were given a test consisting of two parts of questions: 1) a production one used to exhibit the strategies adopted by Iraqi Arabic speakers to utter ostensible invitations; and 2) the question which addresses the motives why Ostensible Invitations are adopted (i.e. functions of ostensible invitations). Subsequently, the social variables and strategies discussed by Clark and Isaac (1990) were used as a pattern for analyzing the data. Besides the strategies noted in the model, novel strategies emerged and were considered to be specific to the Iraqi Arabic speakers, since they were greatly associate with the social standards of the Iraqi society. The result of the study revealed that considering pragmatic functions, Iraqi Arabic speakers prefer to apply ostensible speech act of invitation for different purposes; foremost among them are compliment, politeness strategies, moderation devices and others.

In 2017, Kadhim and Al-Hindawi worked on hundred Iraqi college students in order to study the pragmatic functions Iraqi Arabic speakers use in terms of ostensible invitations. As researchers noted, Iraqi society is known of the traditions in a way that speech acts are used to pay compliments among one another and they believed that various speech acts are applied by these speakers to carry out other intentions rather than the ones carried out by the genuine. One of the mostly used speech acts in an ostensible manner by the Iraqi Arabic speakers is the speech act of invitation. Therefore, they considered it as a vital one to be deeply under study. During the study, the researchers gave a test to the participants consisting two questions. The first one dealt with their production to reveal the strategies they used while uttering Ostensible Invitations and the second one attempted to seek why they used Ostensible Invitations (i.e. functions).

The model by Clark and Isaac was applied for their framework. Beside the seven strategies mentioned in their model, the researchers came across some new ones and believed that these strategies are unique to these speakers and it may be resulted from their social norms. They concluded that Iraqi Arabic speakers prefer to apply Ostensible Invitations for different intentions such as mitigation devices, polite strategy, compliment and others.

Adyan Abdul-Munim Mohammed (2020), conducted a study over Iraqi EFL non-departmental students' performance in their use and realization of the invitation speech act at the pragmatic level in terms of recognition and production. The subjects of the study were 20 native speakers of Iraqi Arabic students who were randomly chosen from Department of Dentistry and were 21 to 24 years old. The participants have been exposed to a variety of English topics during their school and university study. Researcher addressed their abilities to distinguish invitation from other related speech acts such as offers, requests and suggestions. He gave a test to the subjects which consisted of two questions. The first one was designed in the form of multiple-choice items to see their recognition and the second one addressed their production and required them to provide some inviting utterances. In addition to the evaluation role of the production ability of the participants, this question would show which type(s) of invitation strategy was/were used more frequently than others. The results showed that Iraqi EFL students have exhibited a lack of pragma-linguistic because they used more direct strategies in uttering invitation which call for conventional indirectness. Thus, they should be taught the socio-pragmatic and pragma-linguistic rules and differences between English and Arabic in order to avoid the rules of their first language when expressing intention in the other culture.

➤ *Conclusion:-*

Like Iranian speakers, for the sake of their social norms and factors such as "face and self-image threatening", Arabic speakers try to apply different Ostensible Invitations for a variety of purposes and in various situations. Again, not being aware of the existed differences between their first language and English can lead misunderstandings in their utterance and competence.

VI. OSTENSIBLE AND GENUINE INVITATIONS IN OTHER LANGUAGES

This part deals with five studies considering other languages. As we know the speech act of invitation is one of the most common speech acts in all the languages around the world and they have Ostensible and Genuine ones to some extent. Thus, reviewing the works performed would also be remarkable for the goal of our study.

Two years after Salmani-Nodoushan, Miren Urteaga Aldalur (2008) performed a survey on conversational strategies in Catalan. In advance, we should mention that the Catalan language belongs to the western Neo-Latin languages and is spoken in areas of four different states: Spain, France, Andorra and Italy. The researcher adopted different methods in the distribution of semi-expert interview on communicative strategies (SICS) questionnaire and collected data from 23 participants. The methods were as: a) giving some of the questionnaires to the participants personally; b) using an electronic version of the questionnaire; c) sending personal and collective e-mails with the questionnaire attached as a *.doc file to the addressees; d) posting announcements with the electronic version's address and the *.doc questionnaire attached in the

home page of two Catalan speaking universities; e) contacting university professors and asking them to forward it to their students; and f) posting announcements with the electronic version's address in three different forums on the Catalan. It revealed that Catalans apply a semi direct communicative style which may vary due to variables such as: whether they know each other, their age and social conventions. When they want to select the address-form, the variables of age and social conventions are considered as important ones. The apply small talk for communicating with acquaintances and not with friends or relatives.

The other issue should be noted is that Catalans normally determine offers from people they do not know very well as "ostensible invitations". Therefore, they turn down their offers and invitations and offers with a direct but respectful responses. They also apply very direct and direct expressions to show disagreement, give arguments or to end a conversation. The result of the study showed that Catalans follow the maxim "Talk respectfully but not too much to strangers, meaty conversations are reserved to the family and real friends". The study also reached the conclusion that Catalans respect the maxims of manner and quantity in Grice's terms and they usually adopt bold-on-record strategies and positive politeness strategies in terms of Brown & Levinson.

One of the studies on Ostensible Invitation was performed by Guo, F., and Sang, D. D. (2019) under the title of "Pragmatic Features of Chinese Ostensible Invitations". They examined the properties and features of Chinese Ostensible Invitations by using the method of experience description, experience record and interview in order to make the data more accurate. Some of the data were collected by interviewing with 28 postgraduate students, which resulted in 51 Ostensible Invitations and 22 genius invitations. Each student should give two Ostensible Invitations and two genius invitations. The other part of the data were from the interviews with people from different work filed. They were asked to have a record of any kind of invitations they experienced and at last, 24 Ostensible Invitations were collected and 29 genius invitations were collected. Totally, 134 invitations were collected; and checking with the five significant properties of ostensible invitations, 75 invitations were judged to be ostensible, 52 invitations were genius, and the rest data were considered as invalid. By analyzing the data they could recognize how the features of Ostensible Invitation identified by Isaacs and Clark wok in Chinese ostensible invitation. The researchers noted that Chinese Ostensible Invitations occur in daily communication very frequently, for making Ostensible Invitations is a communication strategy. According to the results, the study provides a guideline for people to distinguish Chinese Ostensible Invitations so that they are able to respond to the Ostensible Invitations fittingly to promote harmonious interpersonal relations.

Ali Mohammed Saleh Al-Hamzil et al. (2020) aimed to conduct an exploration on the basis of cross-cultural pragmatic research points of view. In their study, they compared the realization of speech acts of invitation between Indonesian and Yemeni EFL learners. As mentioned in the article, the strategies regarding politeness are different from culture to culture and what is considered as a polite act in one culture may not be realized so in another. One of the factors regarding politeness in this article is the matter of ostensible ways of invitation. The participants included in their study were 30 undergraduate students from Airlangga University, Indonesia, and 30 undergraduate students from Sana'a University, Yemen, all of whom aged 21-25 and were dissimilar in terms of their cultural background. They asked participants to imagine themselves in real situations and what they would say and write out their utterance. The participants were asked to write one appropriate invitation in the English language across five situations in order to attain each dialogue. They used Discourse Completion Task (DCT) as data collection instrument and then their data based on compilations of invitation strategies by Bruder and Tillitt (1999), Al-Khatib (2006), and Suzuki (2009).

The results of their study showed some similarities and differences considering invitation making. They concluded that some invitation strategies appeared to be culturally specific to one society while others are universal across the two cultures. As an example for the differences found in their study, Indonesian EFL learners preferred to be indirect in the employment of speech acts when they were inviting and considered this as means of being more polite; on the other hand, Yemeni EFL learners preferred to be direct in their using of the invitation speech act. The researchers believed that this might be affected by their first language. They also stated that both EFL learners tried to translate the utterances in their L1 into the target language with no considerations about the variations in terms of the order of words and patterns of sentences.

Majidova Gulrukh Kamaridinovna performed a study in 2021 titling "Function and strategies of making speech act of invitation in multicultural setting" in order provide an insight into the invitation function and why people utilize the invitation speech act and its related categories. In this study, the author began with the functions of invitation and then identified two categories for the speech act of invitation: genuine and ostensible. Afterwards, the researcher noted that there are sequences for extending an acceptable invitations in international settings which should be followed and then some examples were given to explain the mentioned sequences. The given examples may offer clear instructions for EFL learners about the structures of sentences and common phrases that could be applied during expressing invitations. One other stage offered was related to reacting to invitation and again, the researcher's suggestion was to acquire them to provide suitable responses to the inviters. The results showed that the failure of communications usually happens because EFL learners try to employ the rules of their L1 to utter their intentions in the L2, which deals with another culture, and they do not

realize the differences between the two cultures. Thus, they should acquire the socio-pragmatic and pragma-linguistic rules of L2 in order to avoid the utilization of L1 rules in expressing their intentions and developing their knowledge to enable them to have effective communications with native speakers of the English language.

Considering the study by Kotorova (2021) on "cross-cultural description of speech behavior", she performed a case study of invitation in German and Russian discourse. In her essay, she aimed to exhibit a consistent methodology for implementing a cross-cultural research of oral communication behavior and recognizing its unique features in different language cultures. At the beginning of her study, she attempted to define a fundamental unit of communication which would be essential for the study of communicative behavior and proposed her clarification of the unit as speech behavior pattern (SBP). The proposed methodology of contrastive analysis in her article included these four major components: 1) definition of illocutionary purpose; 2) description of structural forms of SBP (i.e., their lexical and grammatical features and characteristics); 3) defining communicative-pragmatic factors (divided into three broad groups: social, cultural and situational); 4) description of the structure and hierarchy of the communicative-pragmatic field that included utterances implementing SBP. As she mentioned in her study, "the illocutionary content and general organization of any SBP is considered universal, while their actual realization in a language is culturally conditioned and therefore may vary significantly in different languages". After that, she tried to consistently apply the presented approach to the analysis of Invitation SBP in the German and Russian discourse. The language data were taken from the existing Russian and German corpora.

According to the author, the proposed methodology for describing cross-cultural communication based on the four-step analysis of speech behavior patterns, helps to identify the main similarities and differences in the implementation of the SBP invitation in Russian and German driven by grammatical and communicative-pragmatic factors. As an example, considering the matter of "being ostensible or genuine", the researcher found that if the expressed invitation in German is too indirectly, the Russian interlocutor may doubt whether it is genuine and sincere, and he/she should accept it or not. Based on the conclusion of the study, the main advantage of the proposed methodology of comparative analysis of SBPs was that it did not focus on a single aspect affecting the implementation of SBP, but provided a framework for a comprehensive cross-cultural analysis that included both cultural, linguistic and pragmatic factors. Kotorova noted that "the methodology is universal and can be successfully applied both for the analysis of other SBPs and for the comparison of other pairs or groups of languages".

➤ *Conclusion:-*
The findings of the above studies provided the fact that the speakers of different languages utter both ostensible and genuine invitations. However, their attitudes and competencies are somehow different based on their cultures and social norms. As an example, Catalans determine offers and invitations expressed by unknown ones as ostensible offers and invitations and this leads to their respectful but direct refusals. Their positive politeness strategies cause them take the maxims of manner and quantity in Grice's terms into consideration. On the other hand, Ostensible Invitations are common in Chinese speakers' daily communications but the features may be divergent and one should know the guidelines adopting their ostensible invitations.

VII. COMMON AREAS OF STRATEGY USE

Reviewing the articles performed on "genuine and ostensible" invitations shows the adoption of three major strategies: 1) cross-cultural research, 2) in-depth research and 3) comparative research. Most of the data were collected by the help of interviews and questionnaires, while some explored written texts. Since addressing socio-pragmatic knowledge of individuals is considered as a complicated task, many of the researchers tried to follow the previous models such as the one given by Isaacs and Clark (1990) which was the mostly applied model among the studies. Primarily, the studies attempted to investigate the features and characteristics of "genuine and ostensible" invitations considering different or one specific language and culture. There were also studies done in order to create an appropriate instruments for further teaching of the speech act.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results revealed different features and patterns adopted by the interlocutors of a language which, consequently, depend on their cultures and traditions. In some cases, the number of features was more than the ones mentioned by Isaacs and Clark (1990). Moreover, different studies noted different reasons and factors that cause divergent applications and understanding of ostensible and genuine invitations.

Since EFL and ESL learners may refer to the rules of their first language while trying to utter an invitation (ostensible or genuine), they would come across misunderstandings. Therefore, differences among cultures and social norms which lead to different socio-pragmatic and pragma-linguistic rules should be noticed while teaching and educating one language. Besides, cognitive and meta-cognitive methods can be beneficial to students in realizing them and accomplishing a successful communication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

[1]. Abdel Hady, S. (2015). The pragmatic functions of the ostensible communicative act of invitation in Jordanian Arabic. SKY Journal of Linguistics 28 (2015), 7–35.

[2]. Abdul-Munim Mohammed A. (2020). Investigating the use of the speech act of invitation by Iraqi EFL non-departmental students. Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities, 28(6).

[3]. Ahmadi & Rasekh. (2010). Canadian Native English speakers with North and Central Native speakers of Persian Regional Dialects. Paper presented International Seminar on Language. Culture and Identity Issues and Challenges, Dept. of Linguistics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, February, 8-10, 2010.

[4]. Al-Hamzil A. M. S. et al. (2020). A cross-cultural pragmatic study of invitation strategies as produced by Indonesian and Yemeni EFL language learners. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 9(6).

[5]. Bach, K. (2014). "Speech Acts." Speech Acts. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d. Web. 10 Feb. 2014

[6]. Beeman, W. O. (1986). Language, Status, and Power in Iran. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

[7]. Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1978) Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (ed.) Questions and Politeness. Strategies in Social Interaction 56–310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[8]. Bruder, M. N., & Tillitt, B. (1999). Speaking naturally (Twelfth pr). Cambridge University Press.

[9]. Cloutier, A. (2015). *Let's grab coffee sometime!* : enhancing pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks through metapragmatic discussions. University of Texas at Austin.

[10]. Dastpak, M. & Mollaei, F. (2011). A comparative study of Ostensible Invitations in English and Persian. Higher Education of Social Science. 1(1), 33-42. http://doi.org/10.3968/j.hess. 1927024020110 101. 069.

[11]. Eslami R. Z. (2005). Invitations in Persian and English: Ostensible or genuine? Intercultural Pragmatics 2-4 (2005), 453–480

[12]. Eslami R. Z. & Koutlaki A. S. (2018). Critical intercultural communication education: cultural analysis and pedagogical applications. Journal of Intercultural Communication Education. 1(3), 100-109. https://dx.doi.org/10.29140/ice.v1n3.110

[13]. Guo, F., & Sang, D. D. (2019). Pragmatic Features of Chinese Ostensible Invitations. Cross-Cultural Communication,15(2),35-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/11075

[14]. Isaacs, E.A. & Clark, H.H. (1990). Ostensible Invitations. Language in Society, 19(4):493-509. Cambridge University Press.

[15]. Izadi A. (2019). Iranian ritual politeness system: Taarof in invitation-refusal exchanges. English Language and Culture Conference | Koya University ICELC 2019, Article ID: ICELC. 133, 4 pages. http://dx.doi.org/10.14500/icelc2019

[16]. Kadhim, B. J. & Al-Hindawi F. H. (2017). Pragmatics of Ostensible Invitations in Iraqi Arabic: function analysis. Journal of Advances in Language and Literary Studies. 8(6). http://dx.doi.org/ 10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.6p.132

[17]. Kachru, Y. (1997). 'Cultural meaning and rhetorical styles: toward a framework for Contrastive Rhetoric', in G. Cook Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics, pp171-185.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[18]. Kotorova, E. (2021). Methodology of cross-cultural description of speech behavior: a case study of invitation in German and Russian discourse. Journal of Language Studies. 21(1). http://doi.org/ 10.17576/gema-2021-2101-01

[19]. Koutelaki, S. (2002). Offer and Expressions of Thanks as Face-enhancing Acts: Ta'arof in Persian. Journal of Pragmatics, 34, 1733–1756.

[20]. Koutelaki, S. (2009). Two sides of the same coin: how the notion of 'face and self-image' is encoded in Persian communication. https://www.researchgate.net /publication/230613096

[21]. Link K. E. & Kreuz R. J. (2005). The comprehension of ostensible speech acts. Journal of Language and Social Psychology. 24(3). 227-251. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X05278384

[22]. Littlejohn, S. (2009). Speech act theory. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), Encyclopedia of communication theory. (pp. 919–921). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/9781412959384.n356

[23]. Majidova, G. (2021). Function and strategies of making speech act of invitation in multicultural setting: Function and strategies of making speech act of invitation in multicultural setting. Journal of Preschool Education, 4(Preschool education journal). Retrieved from https://hp.jdpu.uz/index.php/presedu/ article/view/4542

[24]. Nazari, B. (2014). The contrastive analysis of the speech act of invitation between English and Farsi. US-China Foreign Language, ISSN 1539-8080. 12(8). 655-661.

[25]. Nehal R. (2021). Pragmatic Role of Culture in Using Ostensible Invitations across Persian and English Languages. LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research Vol. 2, No. 3, 2021 | 13 – 19.

[26]. Radcliff-Johnson M. & El-Hilawi R. (2016). Ostensible Invitations in Arabic: A pragmatic function analysis. Florida State University, USA, 1-15.

[27]. Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (2006). A comparative socio-pragmatic study of Ostensible Invitations in English and Farsi. Speech Communication 48, 903–912. https://doi:10.1016/j.specom.2005.12.001

[28]. Searle, J. R. (2002). Consciousness and Language by John R. Searle. Cambridge Core. Doi:10.1017/cbo9780511606366. ISBN 9780511606366. Retrieved 2019-03-04.

[29]. Suzuki, T. (2009). How do American University Students "Invite" others?: A Corpus-based Study of Linguistic Strategies for the Speech Act of "Invitations". Matsuyama University: Japan, 85-106. WASEDA.JP. Web. 25 Sept. 2017.

[30]. Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (1998). Politeness in Persian Interaction: The Preference Format of Offers in Persian. Cross-roads of Language, Interaction, and Culture, 1, 3-11.

[31]. Urteaga Aldalur, M. (2008). Survey on conversational strategies in Catalan. *J*ournal for *E*uro*Li*nguisti*X* 5 (2008): 47-58. http://www.eurolinguistix.com

[32]. Yaqubi, M. (2018). On Subtitling of Ta'ārof Apologies, Journal of Language and Translation, 8(1), 31-42. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org /b475/e55fe1fac06ff55604003f695c8767e261cf.pdf

[33]. Yaqubi, M. (2019). Context in distinguishing between overt and actual functions of polite speech acts. Journal for the Study of English Linguistics. ISSN23297034.7(1).https://doi.org/10.5296/jsel.v7i1. 15522