Invitation Strategies in Yemeni Arabic and English: A Pragmatic Contrastive Study

Mohammed Hasan ALFattah*

Department of English and Translation, University of Amran, Yemen

Abstract

The present study aims to examine the politeness strategies employed by Yemeni Arabic speakers and native English speakers in the speech act of invitation. The study seeks to explore and compare how these two communities produce invitations, specifically focusing on the utilization of politeness strategies. The sample for the study consisted of 330 Arabic native speakers who were students from different departments in three public Yemeni universities, as well as 20 native speakers of English representing four English-speaking countries: the USA, Britain, Australia, and South Africa. By analyzing the performance of these two language groups in producing invitations, the study aims to gain insights into the similarities and differences in politeness strategies employed in this particular speech act. The data collected through discourse completion task questionnaire (DCT) based on Blum-Kulka (1984) with some modifications. Each of the valid responses was analyzed separately to identify the type of strategies used. The findings revealed that the Interrogative invitations, conditionally hedged invitations, and invitations using performative verbs are the most common strategies employed by the native speakers of English. In Arabic, on the other hand, the most common strategies utilized by speakers are interrogative invitations, statement of personal desire, invitations using the performative verbs, Bald on record imperative strategies, obligatory/necessity statements, conditionally hedged invitations, and expressing pleasure.

Keywords: Invitation speech act, native speakers, pragmatic contrastive, politeness strategies, Yemeni Arabic

الملخص: تقوم الدراسة الحالية بأستقصاء استراتيجيات التهذيب اللغوي في خطاب الدعوة لدى اليمنيين والناطقين باللغة الانجليزية. تهدف الدراسة الى الكشف عن أساليب توجيه الدعوة التي يتبعها اليمنيون والناطقون باللغة الانجليزية حيث تحاول البحث في أساليب توجيه الدعوه كما يؤديها مجتمع الدراسة بالإشارة الى أسايب التهذيب اللغوي. تتكون عينة الدراسة من 330 من المتحدثين اليمنيين ينتمون الى أقسام مختلفة في أربع كليات تتبع ثلاث جامعات يمنية حكومية بالإضافة الى عشرين متحدثا باللغة الإنجليزية ينحدرون من أربع جنسيات هي البريطانية واالأمريكية والأسترالية وجنوب أفريقيا. تم جمع البيانات عبر استبيان استكمال الخطاب بناءا على نموذج بلم كولكا (1984) مع بعض التعديلات. كما تم تحليل الردود الصحيحة كلا على حده لمعرفة نوع الاستراتيجية المستخدمة. كشفت نتائج الدراسة أن الطريقة الاستفهامية والدعوة المشروطة والدعوة باستخدام الفعل هي الاستراتيجيات الأكثر شيوعا والمستخدمة من قبل الناطقين باللغة الإنجليزية. بينما يستخدم اليمنيون الناطقون باللغة العربية استراتيجيات الدعوة الاستفهامية وعبارات الرغبة الشخصية والدعوة باستخدام الفعل واستراتيجيات الأمر المباشر والعبارات الإلزامية والدعوة المشروطة واستهلال الدعوة بالتعبير عن السرور.

1. Introduction

Invitations are a common form of communication in everyday conversations, particularly for maintaining and fostering positive relationships. Invitations are considered one of the most crucial speech acts for social interaction, offering valuable insights into communicative patterns within a linguistic community, particularly in terms of politeness strategies (Eshreteh, 2014). The present study aims at exploring the speech act of invitation as performed by Yemen Arabic speakers and the native speakers of English, with special reference to politeness strategies. According to Searle (1976), invitations are directives. As I invite you, I direct you to do something. It is arugued by Gies (1995), "invitations are face respecting acts rather than face threatening acts" (cited in Ehreteh, 2014, P. 160). Invitations are intended to address the positive face of the invitees (Nadia, et.al., 2022). However, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), the speech act of invitation is considered a type of face-threatening act (FTA). When an inviter extends an invitation to an invitee, it can potentially threaten the invitee's desire for negative face, as they may feel a loss of freedom or perceive it as an imposition. As direct speech acts may directly threaten the invitee's face, indirect speech acts are expected to function as "the fundamental politeness element" to preserve the invitee's want of face. Blum-Kulka et al.(1989) also pointed out , studies of speech acts need to move away from Western languages and include as many non- western languages and cultures in their scope of study as possible. The present study intends to extract and categorize the range of

_____

*Corresponding Author Emails: fdr.mohammed@yahoo.com

politeness strategies in the speech act of invitations in Yemeni Arabic (non-western culture) and English (Western culture).

In all the major studies of politeness (Lakoff, 1972; Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Ervin Trip 1978; Blum-Kulka, 1987; Ide, 1989; Fraser, 1990; Kespar, 1990), there appears to be general agreement that there are different degrees of politeness manifested in linguistic expressions. This certainly lends theoretical support to the intuitive views that polite expressions can be put on a graduated scale ranging from very polite to not very polite. While further evidence would illuminate the scalar nature of linguistic politeness in different languages, the question remains what determines the appropriate degree of politeness and motivates the choice of the corresponding linguistic expression. This is by no means a trivial question in terms of both theory and pedagogy. Understanding the mechanism of choice is the key to understanding the politeness phenomenon. It would also help the language learner to acquire mastery over the use of polite expressions. However, it is on this question that there are diverse opinions and theories (Yeung, 1997; 505-6)

The present study distinguishes itself from others by utilizing authentic specimens of communicative acts in English and Arabic languages. An additional objective is to demonstrate how cross-cultural politeness has influenced modern Arabic speech. Realistic dialogues from both English and Arabic will be analyzed to explore politeness strategies across cultures, which forms the central focus of this study.

Politeness is expressed and interpreted differently across cultures, particularly in cultures such as Arabic, where religion plays a significant role in interpersonal interactions. In these contexts, religious norms often provide individuals with the necessary expressions to convey politeness in various situations.

The aim of this empirical study is to identify and compare the sociolinguistic rules of politeness in making invitations in English and Yemeni Arabic. While most studies in this area typically focus on the outcomes of the interaction, namely, what is said to whom in specific circumstances, it is important to acknowledge that this approach represents only a single measure of a complex phenomenon (Hill et al., 1986).

This study is an attempt to use Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness as a point of departure for a specific study of politeness phenomena in English and Arabic cultures.

It is also an attempt to examine the proficiency of Yemeni Arabic speakers in employing appropriate politeness strategies when making invitations, in comparison to native English speakers. The study revealed that English native speakers demonstrate a higher preference for indirectness, whereas Arabic native speakers ranked directness as their primary strategy. These findings highlight a divergence in politeness strategies between the two communities. The disparity can be attributed to various factors influencing cultural norms and communication patterns.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) prediction that the degree of indirectness of an utterance realizing an FTA, is commensurate with the sum of the distance between the interlocutors (D), the power of the hearer over the speaker (P) and the ranking of imposition (R) which FTA entails in the culture in question were investigated.

In Arabic the most common strategies utilized by the native speakers of Arabic are interrogative invitations 27% statement of personal desire (20.6%) invitations using the performative verbs (17%) bald on record imperative strategy (16.6%), obligatory necessity statements and conditionally hedged invitations.

2. Statement of the Problem

Based on the researcher's experience, it is obvious that Yemeni university students as non-native speakers of English face difficulties in handling invitations properly. This study may help them to be more aware of selecting patterns of this speech as used by native speakers of English. There are also implications of this investigation on terms of intercultural understanding , training and teaching, which are of great strategic importance to Yemeni policies in foreign language education, and especially English-language teaching.

Politeness touches on issues that are crucial not only for the sociolinguist and social anthropologist but also in the life of human beings communications. In the present study linguistic politeness is crucially conceptualized as a social phenomenon. It is argued that understanding politeness properly might constitute an important key to the understanding of a number of sociolinguistic problems. It highlights some of the main points and notions presented by Brown and Levinson (1987).

A pragmatic focus on politeness strategies allows language users to recognize politeness as a valuable addition to conversations, facilitating interactions between speakers and hearers. The significance of studying politeness lies in its ability to provide insights into the dynamics and relationships among participants in specific situations or events. By systematically describing the characteristics of politeness in both languages and highlighting the distinctions and contrasts between the two systems, the problem becomes clearer and potentially more solvable.

3. Objectives of the Study

The present study aims to:

1. explore the ways Yemeni Arabic speakers and English native speakers realize invitation speech acts with special reference to politeness strategies.

2. make a pragmatic contrastive analysis of the strategies of invitation and politeness phenomenon in the production of invitation speech acts by Yemeni Arab and English native speakers.

4. Questions of The Study

1. How do Yemeni Arabic speakers and English native speakers perform invitation speech act? And what politeness strategies do they employ?

2. How similar/different are politeness strategies in the performance of the two communities? Why?

5. Literature Review

As a polite and constructive type of behavior, an invitation can be seen as a social act. Speech act theory as developed by Searle's model (19676) following Austin's (1962) model is based on the assumption that language is a form of behavior, and it is conditioned by a set of rules (1962: 22). He added "invitation is a directive illocutionary speech act, which refers to the attempts that the speaker makes to get the hearer to perform something (1976: 11). The idea that language is behavior is the basis demand that helps us understand how language functions in a social context. Previous research on varied politeness formulas shows that social norms vary from culture to culture. Therefore, what can be seen as a polite behavior in one culture may not be seen so in another. However, in all speech communities, an invitation can be seen socially as an acceptable humanitarian polite behavior.

By invitation making, we mean all those social occasions (e.g. party, meal, drink etc) in which someone is verbally invited to take part. According to Wolfson (1989: 119) "an invitation is a speech act contains reference to time and/or mention of place or activity, and most important, a request for response." A simple example would be the following.

<u>Do you want</u> to see a movie <u>tomorrow</u>?

(request for response) **(activity)** **(time)** Invitations are usually viewed as arrangements for a social commitment. There are, however, a number of cases in which an invitation is extended but is not necessarily followed by the conclusion of the arrangement under discussion. In other words, one can never be sure whether such invitations were ever intended to be completed. However, the utterance (i.e. commitment) itself embraces a number of characteristics that make it recognizable to the interlocutors that the invitation is not a real one. These characteristics include the following:

a) Time is always left indefinite;

b) A response is not required (there is no Yes/No questions); and

c) A model auxiliary such as ("must" or "should" is almost always used. An example could be: come   over   to   my   place   sometime   (Nodoushan,   2006)

The present study has chosen invitations as the topic of investigation, with a particular emphasis on exploring politeness strategies. Invitations have been selected due to their significant communicative role in everyday interactions. Furthermore, invitations are among the most extensively studied speech acts in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics.The selection of the situations was controlled by three major situational variables. The relative power (p) or speakers and hearers, the social distance (D) of speakers and hearers, and the absolute ranking (R) of imposition suggested by Brown and Levinson's (1987) claimed that these variables were culturally sensitive and independent from each other.

The study reported here was undertaken as an empirical investigation of certain types of linguistic politeness in English and Yemeni Arabic. The immediate aim was to obtain quantitative evidence as a basis for comparing the systems of sociolinguistic politeness in invitations in the two languages. The first step is to compare the overall systems of politeness in the two cultures and to identify the common elements and strategies, as well as to characterize the essential differences. Comparative studies may give an obvious picture about the cultures of the two communities (Arabic and English).

Hill et al (1986) pointed out that such comparative studies in speech acts may give details about the specific systems of the two communities (Eastern and Western). They will also provide empirical insights regarding certain linguistic issues such as politeness and cross-cultural miscommunication.

The notion of politeness in the communicative acts appears to be the most widely used in recent linguistics. Researchers in semantics and pragmatics argue that the performance of the speech acts, and the understanding of utterances depend upon situational circumstances of language use (Streeck, 1984). Therefore, the use of politeness for situational speech acts can be more useful in the communicative strategies.

Politeness is not only connected with constantly recurring linguistic formulae but also in particular with recurrent behavior patterns, which regulate social interaction and gain their fraction and significance from specific constellations for which they are obligatory (Held, 2005: 148).

The paradigmatic framework of politeness research highlights the fact that politeness has evolved into a social norm that can be empirically observed in language and reliably analyzed within the field of linguistics, particularly in the context of recent developments and the growing focus on pragmatics. Haliday (1973) emphasized the centrality of politeness as a theme of study. Since then, politeness has garnered interest due to its connection with the acting and speaking subject, as well as its role in achieving interactional goals through context-specific selection of linguistic strategies between individuals.

The researchers' approach to the issue of politeness is functional in the sense that politeness is studied through the way it manifests itself in interaction. The general framework adopted for the present study is based on Brown and Levinson (1987). Investigation of politeness in the present research is based on Brown and Levinson's theory. Brown and Levinson's monograph (Gu, 1990) can be seen in two ways. One is that it is fairly thorough cross-cultural treatise on face threatening acts (FTAs). The other is that it is a cross-cultural account of politeness phenomena by way of examining how politeness is employed to redress the performance of FTAs.

In Brown and Levinson's theory politeness is defined as redressive action taken to counter balance the disruptive effect of face threatening acts (FTAs). Since the list of the speech acts which adversely affect the speaker's and/or the hearer's positive or negative comprises any kind of linguistic actions that involves the interlocutors relationship (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 65), communication is seen as fundamentally dangerous and antagonistic endeavor. As Schmidt comments "the theory represents an overly pessimistic rather than pananoid view of human social interaction" (1980): 104) (cited in Kasper, 1990: 194). Brown and Levinson's model (1987) of politeness usage is posited as a valuable framework for understanding social interactions, especially the strategic use of language.

Within the Brown and Levinson's conceptualization, politeness becomes a model for all human public social interaction, and the correct and appropriate use of conventional politeness form is seen

to be embedded is an understand of social relations and human action (Snow et al., 1990). This theory has played a leading role in the study of speech acts and politeness strategies (Ji, 2000).

Brown and Levinson, however, admit that much cultural elaboration is expected on the level of, for example, what kinds of speech acts threaten face, what kinds of politeness strategies are preferred and what kinds of social relationship will trigger face- protective strategies.

A major concern of the present study is to attempt to contrast two cultures (Western and Eastern) using samples with different backgrounds. An analysis of the communicative behavior of each one makes a comparison of the two systems.

The present study provides an obvious picture of linguistic politeness in the communication strategies and distinguishes cases where politeness is communicated from those where it is not. It provides a characterized explanation of polite behavior is such situation. Jary (1998: 18) states, "most importantly, it provides an alternative to the view that polite verbal behavior is motivated by the desire to communicate politeness, while still being able to explain situations – such as repair – where there is a strong case for characterizing polite behavior in terms of communication."

The reason why politeness has become a viable issue in the study of language use is that it offers one explanation for speakers linguistic behavior; that is, politeness is a factor that determines what a speaker says and how he/she says it, which explains why all theories of politeness have focused on the speaker (Chen, 2001).

In conclusion, the main purpose of this study is to see how well Yemeni Arabic speakers, compared to native English – speaking people, in the context of making invitations. It aims to determine the nature and extent of gaps between the two communities performance in invitation speech act strategies. The study takes a look at politeness phenomena and politeness strategies in the performance of Yemeni Arabic speakers and English native speakers. The basic problem remained since Brown and Levinson discussed whether one can use a model of politeness to cover all such phenomena in all languages and in all cultures, Kurzon, (2001) or whether it would be more helpful if politeness is investigated within strictly defined boundaries, be it language, medium, discourse types, society etc.

This investigation provides a methodological tool to identify and explore sociopragmatic performance differences between the two groups.

In this study, it is hypothesized that invitation making is influenced by a number of social factors such as the social distance between the participants that are involved have a fundamental impact on the type of strategies employed by them. The researcher's approach to the present data is based on the notion of politeness as developed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

To achieve the goal, the researcher designed a questionnaire consisting of four situations covering a wide range of strategies of invitations ranging from the most formal (e.g. inviting the dean of the college to a party) to the least formal (inviting your friend to dinner). The basic of the situations included in these sections were two scales; the social distance scale, which is concerned with the participants relationships, and the formality scale relating to the setting and type of the interaction scenarios involved the subject and other classmate, the subject and the dean, and the subject and a friend. In each scenario, the subject is supposed to be familiar with the participant. Each prompt simulated a situation that could be formal (i.e. where the invitation is made to take part in a wedding party), or informal (i.e. where the invitation could be made for having dinner or watching a movie).

Syntactially, the invitation speech act can be achieved by different strategies, such as using declarative, imperative and interrogative statements.

The framework that the researcher would now rely on to analyze the data in politeness theory with special reference to Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) to provide a basis for a mode of discourse analysis of this empirical data.

5.1. Related Work

One of the earliest studies that dealt with the concept of politeness 'formulas' with reference to Arabic is that of Ferguson (1976). He points out that there is considerable variation between different cultures. Ferguson examines data from Syrian Arabic and American English.

AL-Hamzi (2020) made a pragmatic contrastive analysis of invitation strategies of Yemeni and Indonsian EFL Learners. The participants of the study were 60 Yemeni and Indonesian EFL Learners. The researcher used Discourse Completion Task (DCT) to collect the data. The data analysis was based on Bruder and Tiillitt (1999), ALKhatib (2006) and Suzoki (2009) compilations of invitation strategies. The findings of the study revealed some similarities and differences in terms of invitation making. In this respect, Indonsian learners preferred to be indirect in the use of speech act whereas Yemeni EFL Learners preferred being direct in the use of invitation speech act. Both groups were affected by their first language.

Al-khatib, (2006) conducted a study investigating the pragmatics of invitation making and acceptance in the Jordanian society. The study explores the nature of invitation making and acceptance in the Jordanian society from pragmatic point of view. It attempts to systemize the various strategies used for the purpose of inviting in Jordanian society; and to highlight the socio-pragmatic constraints governing their use. The sample composed of 120 informants. The data was studied and analyzed following Austine (1962), Searle (1967,1976) concepts on speech acts theory, and Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) notion of politeness and face-threatening acts. It has also been argued that Jordanian Arabic has a special patterning of inviting that can be understood and appreciated only by people sharing the same socio-cultural background. The results of the study have implications for intercultural communication, and applied linguistics as well as for a possible theory of foreign/second language teaching.

Negative and positive politeness strategies in the performance of invitation speech acts by learners whose first language is Arabic are first discussed by Scarsella and Brunak (1981).

Clark and Isaacs (1990) carried out a research project on ostensible invitations.According to these scholars, native speakers of American English often extend invitations they do not intend to be taken seriously. They argue that the aim of such invitation is not to establish invitations but to accomplish some other unstate purposes.

In order to pinpoint the defining properties and the characteristic features of ostensible invitations, Clark and Isaacs collected a repertoire of 156 invitation exchanges. Fifty-two undergraduates taking a course in psycholinguistics were required to record an instance of one sincere and two insincere invitation or offer they witnessed. Forty other examples were gathered from face-to-face interviews with ten undergraduates who would remember the sincere and this insincere invitations of their own experience. Ten examples were also gathered in face-to-face interviews with ten pairs of friends at Stanford university. The two final examples were recorded from spontaneous telephone calls between Ellen A. Isaacs and two different friends. The analysis of the data revealed five important points about ostensible invitations mentioned above.

Nodoushan, (2006) has carried out a study to distinguish between ostensible and genuine invitations in English and Farsi. The results of the data analysis revealed that Persian ostensible invitations can also be distinguished from Persian genuine invitations by features and properties identified by Clark and Isaacs.

The comparison of the findings of this study reveals that the apparent difference between English and Persian ostensible invitations is a matter of "degree" rather than "kind." In other words, the nature of the strategies by the invitees in the process of extending ostensible invitations in Persian does not differ from that of English inviters. However, the extent to which one feature is present in Persian ostensible invitations slightly differs from that of the English language.

6. Methodology

The present study identifies and examines politeness strategies used by native speakers of English and Arabic when producing invitation speech acts. Are there any links between these two cultures while using politeness strategies? Throughout the data collected, politeness strategies are investigated.

.

6.1 Data Collection

The methodological paradigm of this research is based on the assumption that observable differences in the choice and variation of politeness strategies, as used by the Yemeni Arabic speakers and native speakers of English upon inviting. in relation to some sociological factors such the social distance between the speaker and he hearer. To examine this assumption, a number of invitation speech act situations were given to the subjects.

The data, were collected by means of a discourse completion task questionnaire (DCT) given to the undergraduate university students and the native speakers of English.

The researcher designed a questionnaire based on Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1983-1984) to analyze politeness strategies used by the Yemeni learners and native speakers of English. He visited classes at Sana'a University, Amran University, and ALMahwit University to administer the questionnaire in the first semester of the academic year 2021-2022.

6.2 The Population of the Study

330 undergraduate students at Sana'a University, Amran University and ALMahwit university, Yemen, collaborated as the target native speakers of Arabic. They were from different majors (English, Arabic, physics, Chemistry, Mathematics), and the average time for them to finish the task was approximately 20 mins.

English native speakers: To elucidate the differences between the Yemeni Arabic speakers and the English native speakers in the actualization of invitation, baseline intra-cultural norms were essential. Twenty native speakers of English from four English speaking countries (Britain, U.S, Canada, and Australia) participated in the project. The average length of time for them to complete the task was approximately 20 mins.

The respondents are relatively homogenous in term of their cultural background (Yemeni Arabs), academic / linguistic experiences and age. They are between 22 to 23 old from level four majoring in various departments at four colleges at Sana'a University and Amran University, and ALMahwit university.English respondents were also selected randomly by the researcher. He contacted them through universities websites and by emails. They are all university professors, with different majors, belonging to four English speaking countries, USA, Britain, Australia, and South Africa.

6.3 Sample and Sampling

The subjects participated in this study are of two groups.

330 Arab speakers studying in various departments at Sana'a University, Amran university and ALMahwit university and 20 native speakers of English from four different nationalities, British, Americans, Australians and South African.The sample of English speakers seems to be too small in comparison with Arabic speakers. The reason behind that the researcher contacted more than fifty English native speakers from different countries, but only 20 of them responded and cooperated.

7. Data Analysis

Data analysis is based on two scales; the first scale is the strategy type used by Yemeni learners the second scale is the politeness scale, in other words, what type of politeness strategy as patterned by Brown and Levinson with special reference to invitation speech act.

In this study the researcher seeks to empirically investigate the ways in which Yemeni Arabic speakers and English native speakers realize invitations, focusing on politeness strategies as patterned by Brown and Levinson.

Each of the valid responses was analyzed separately to identify the type of strategies used. The study is of a descriptive nature, frequencies, percentages and the means of these percentages are used. The main aim is to find out the politeness strategies used and the frequency of their use.

In this research, the data is collected from the interpretation of the subjects' responses, which serves as the basis for the analysis. The researcher conducts a pragmatic analysis, comparing the elements of politeness in English and Arabic based on the framework described in Brown and Levinson's model.

All responses were analyzed from a functional viewpoint of each utterance in the two groups. The responses of each subject were individually analysed. Statistical analysis was undertaken to measure pre significance of the difference between the programmes of the subject groups. All the subjects are given a number and their responses were analysed individually.

Accordingly, the researcher was able to evaluate the learner's answers by comparing them to the native norms of variability on the same test and within the very same testing item. Only the comparison with native speakers' behavior on the same test can provide the tester with criteria for evaluation.

8. Results and Discussion

Examples derived from the data analysis play a crucial role in the discussion. The analysis in this study is grounded in the theoretical framework proposed by Brown and Levinson in 1987.

The data analysis in this study is both socio-pragmatic and pragmalinguistic in nature. Contextual factors ranging from cultural, social and situational to conversational sequences will also be considered. For cultural context, the analysis will include Arabic as well as English cultural backgrounds. It will discuss the foundations of making invitations and present the ways in which Yemeni Arabic speakers and native English speakers realize invitations in various situations.

8.1 Realization of Invitation Strategies

Based on the available data under discussion, ten strategy types that can accomplish the speech act of invitation have been identified in the subjects' responses. Four situations are used to elicit this speech act strategies. They differ in the sociological variables. In the first situation the invitee is quite superior in social status (Deans of the College).

The second situation engages a close friend in the invitation whereas in the third situation the invitee is a little bit superior in social distance (less close than friend) classmate. In the fourth situation the invitee is also quite high in social distance (father of the inviter); hence a high degree of indirectness is expected as it is in the first situation. On the other hand, in the second situation, a high degree of directness is anticipated. Close friendship implies a sense of solidarity, which is associated with positive politeness. As a result, making bald on-record invitations is expected. In situation 3, where the interlocutors are classmates and not socially distant, the prompt may elicit solidarity politeness strategies (as proposed by Scollon and Scollon, 1983), which also imply directness. This hypothesis will be examined further in the subsequent analysis, where various synthetic forms of invitations will be explored to ascertain its validity.

Situation 1: Inviting a superior
You are having a party and you want to invite the dean of the college to attend your party. What would you say?
Situation2: You want to invite a friend to go out to have dinner. What would you say?
Situation3: Your brother's wedding will be next week, and you want to invite a classmate to attend the wedding, what would you say?
Situation4: You have a graduation celebration in the college, and you want to invite your father to attend this celebration, what would you say?

8.1.1 Interrogative Invitations

This strategy mainly addresses H's negative face wants and gives him/her a way out. It occurs in the English interlanguage data in a high frequency (39.5%) whereas it occurs in a low frequency in both the English native speakers' data and Arabic native speakers' data (10%, 21.2% respectively). Invitations taking the interrogative form are 'requests for responses.' Look at the following examples:
1. Professor ... may we invite you to our party next Saturday? (subject 12 – English data)
2. Hadrat alameed min fadlak mummkin ann taati alhafllah? (Your presence dean, can you/could you please come to the party) (Subject 3 – Arabic data).

3. Mummkin natasharrf bihudhorukum alhaflah? (can / could we have the honor by your coming to the party) (subject 33 – Arabic data).

4. Min fadhlak mummkin tahdhur haflatna ghadan (please can/could you attend our party tomorrow (Subject 138 – Arabic data).

5. Hal min almummkin in tagum bitakarrum bil hudoor ela alhafla alati sangyeemaha (can you/could you be generous enough to attend the party we will held? (subject 169 – Arabic data)

The occurrence of such type of invitations is less frequent in English and Arabic data (10%, 21.2%). This can be attributed perhaps to the age of the inviters in the English data whereas in Arabic data this can be attributed to a cultural factor. In Arabic culture when making an invitation the Arabic inviters usually don't prefer interrogative invitations.

As illustrated in table (2) the interrogative invitation strategy appeared in a low statistical frequency (10%) in English data although this type of invitations is the most common in English societies especially the British one.

The occurrence of this strategy in English data is in inconsistency of the findings which have been highlighted by many researchers as an inherent feature of English language.

Table (1): Invitation strategies (Situation one) (Arabic)

Strategy type		Frequency	Means
Valid	Statement of personal desire	95	28.8
	Interrogative invitation	70	21.2
	Invitations using the performative verbs	60	18.2
	Bald on record (softened imperative invitation)	30	9.1
	Expressing pleasure	30	9.1
	Conditionally hedged invitation	25	7.6
	Opting out	9	2.7
	No answer	8	2.4
	Multiple head acts	3	.9
	Total	330	100.0

Table (2): Invitation strategies (Situation one) for English Native

Strategy type		Frequency	percentage
Valid	Conditionally hedged invitation	11	55.0
	Invitations using the performative verbs	4	20.0
	Interrogative invitation	2	10.0
	Statement of personal desire	1	5.0
	Multiple head acts	1	5.0
	Opting out	1	5.0
	Total	20	100.0

Arabic native speakers on the other hand, never use interrogative invitation in a high frequency in situation one (21.2%). This strategy appeared as the second ranking strategy in Arabic data as shown in table (1). In Arabic culture, they are not socially the most suitable. They can be considered by Arabic rude and insincere invitations. Invitations like 'do you want to come?' or 'could/can you come?' which are acceptable in English are very embarrassing in Arabic context (AL-Zumor, 2003). An invitation should be sincere, serious and firm in Arabic culture especially in the context of

inviting someone to a party. An effective invitation should be emphatic and the best way to achieve emphasis in the Arabic society is through hedged performative invitation or statement of personal desire.

Table (3): Invitation strategies (Situation 2) for English Native

Percentage	Frequency	Strategy type	
75.0	15	Interrogative invitation	Valid
20.0	4	Statement of personal desire	
5.0	1	Expressing pleasure	
100.0	20	Total	

Table (4): Distribution of Invitation strategies (Situation two) (Arabic)

Means	Frequency	Strategy type	
50.0	165	Interrogative invitation	Valid
20.6	68	Bald on record (softened imperative invitation)	
16.7	55	Invitations using the performative verbs	
10.3	34	Statement of personal desire	
1.2	4	Opting out	
.6	2	Conditionally hedged invitation	
.3	1	Expressing pleasure	
.3	1	Tacitly dec. invitation	
100.0	330	Total	

As shown in tables, (4) in the second situation the inviter invites his/her close friend, Arabic respondents seem to share the same conception as the native speakers of English In all the two samples of the data this strategy occurred in a high statistical frequency (50% in Arabic data, 75% in English data.

The most interesting thing that can be observed in situation two is the high statistical occurrence of the interrogative invitation in English and Arabic. This strategy unexpectedly occurred in situation 2. It was not expected to be occurred in such situation. Although the invitee is a close friend to the inviter, the respondents preferred indirectness to redress the FTAs. Consider the following examples:

- Mummkin tiji ma'ana linatanawal ala'a shaa (Is it possible to come with us to have dinner (subject 17 – Arabic data0
- Hall bi emkanak titnawal ala'a sha'a ma' naa (can & could you have dinner with me? (Subject 69 – Arabic data0.
- Hal tureed in tita'asha maai? Haya? (Do you want to have dinner with me? Come on(subject 120 – Arabic data)
- Hal ladaika wakt Li tatanawal ala'asha'a ma'ai? (Do you have time to take dinner with me? (subject 187 – Arabic data)
- Do you fancy meeting up for dinner sometime soon? (Subject 19 – English data).
- Do you feel like going out for dinner sometime soon? (subject 20 – English data)

Table (5): Distribution of Invitation strategies (Situation 3)(Arabic)

Means	Frequency	Strategy type	
27.3	90	Invitations using the performative verbs	Valid
18.2	60	Statement of personal desire	

Means	Frequency	Strategy type
16.4	54	Interrogative invitation
14.8	49	Bald on record (softened imperative invitation)
10.0	33	Obligatory necessity statement
5.8	19	Expressing pleasure
4.5	15	Conditionally hedged invitation
.9	3	No answer
.9	3	Invitations in the form of reminder
.6	2	Multiple head acts
.6	2	Opting out
100.0	330	Total

Table (6): Distribution of Invitation strategies (Situation 3) for English Native

Means	Frequency	Strategy type	
75.0	15	Interrogative invitation	Valid
20.0	4	Statement of personal desire	
5.0	1	Expressing pleasure	
100.0	20	Total	

In situation three where the inviter and invitee are acquaintances, interrogative invitation appeared in a low statistical frequency in Arabic (16.4%,) whereas it was employed in a great statistical frequency in English data (75%). (See tables (5-6).) Directness or solidarity politeness strategy is preferable in such situation in Arabic culture. Consider the following examples:

• Could I perhaps invite you to my brother's wedding? (subject 18 – English data)

• Halla sharraftana bihudoorak haflat akhi? (can you / could you give us the honor by your coming to my brother's wedding party) (subject 16 – Arabic data)

• Halla sharraftna bilhudoor Ela alhaflah? (can/could you honor us by coming to the party) subject 42 – Arabic data0

• Tegdar tiji ors akhi al elsbooa algadim? (Can/could you come to my brother's party next week? (Subject 107 – Arabic data).

• Hall sauf ta'ati haflat ors akhi al eshooa aljay? (Will you come to my brother's wedding party next week? (subject 135 – Arabic data)

Table (7): Distribution of Invitation strategies (Situation 4) English Native

Means	Frequency	Strategy type	
80.0	16	Interrogative invitation	Valid
10.0	2	Conditionally hedged invitation	
5.0	1	Obligatory necessity statement	
5.0	1	Invitations in the form of remiders+bald on record	
100.0	20	Total	

Table (8): Distribution of Invitation strategies (Situation 4) (Arabic)

Means	Frequency	Strategy type	
25.2	83	Statement of personal desire	Valid
23.0	76	Bald on record (softened imperative invitation)	

22.7	75	Interrogative invitation
11.2	37	Obligatory necessity statement
5.8	19	Invitations using the performative verbs
4.8	16	Conditionally hedged invitation
2.4	8	Invitations in the form of reminder
1.8	6	No answer
1.2	4	Expressing pleasure
1.2	4	Tacitly dec. invitation
.3	1	Opting out
.3	1	Interrogative invitation+ tacitly decl invitation
100.0	330	Total

In situation (4) where the invitee is in a high social status the (inviter's father) this strategy again appeared to be employed in a high statistical frequency in the English data (80%) whereas it was used in a low statistical data by Arabic speakers (22.7%). The situation involves a high degree of politeness because the invitee is the learner's father and a high degree of formality and indirectness is needed to soften the imposition of the FTAs that is likely to happen to the invitee. The interpretation of its low occurrence is that in Arabic culture with the relatives of the same family negative politeness (formality) is not preferable. Positive (solidarity) politeness is more suitable.

The great occurrence of this strategy in English data shows consistency with Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) and Leech (1983) who pointed out that a high degree of indirectness means politeness necessarily used to mitigate the face loss happened to the addressee (see the exemplary below).

• 'There is a graduation celebration, can you come?' (English data)

• 'I am graduating; do you want to come to the ceremony?' (English data)

Interrogative invitations appeared in a low frequency in situation four because in Arabic culture it is not suitable and perfect behavior to use interrogative invitations with superiors especially when addressing an important person like father-mother. In Arabic, it is more suitable to use invitations using performative verbs or statement of personal desire strategy when addressing superiors.

• Lau samaht ya waldi atastatea an ta'ati litara haflatana fi alkuliah? (Excuse me my father; can you come to see our party in the college? (Arabic data).

• Atiji haflat attakharuj? Annta ma'azum (Will you come to the graduation celebration? You are invited) (Arabic data).

• Waldi satogeem Edarat alkuliah haflat takhrruj atastateea in tahdur? (My father the administration of the college will design a graduation celebration can / could you attend? (Arabic data).

8. 1.2 Statements of Personal Desire Strategy

The examples below illustrate the occurrence of this strategy. I am having a party and just want to give you your invitation to it (English data).

• Afwan ya doctor ana amilah haflah sagheerah yareet tiji wa tisharfona (Pardon doctor, I am having a small party I hope you come and honor us by your coming and honor us) (Arabic data).

• Siadit alameed narju min siadatkum attakarrum Lihdur haflat azzafaf(Your Excellency dean, we hope from your Excellency to be generous to attend the wedding party) (Arabic data)

• Oreed an adauk lilhafl ghadan wa ataman ann tahdur (I want to invite you to the party tomorrow and I hope you come) (Arabic data).

• Li asharaf bi da'awatikum lihidur alhaflah (I have the honor to invite you to attend the party) (Arabic data).

These examples, which are cited from situation one (inviting a superior) demonstrate the complex structure of invitation speech act which is a salient feature of Arabic and English. Having a

superficial look at the structure of the speech act of invitation, the sequence starts or ends with a personal desire containing the performative verb (invite) and (come) followed or preceded by a mitigator or softener to reduce the imposition of the imperative mood of invitation "please come" or with expressing the gratitude by the conditional clause 'I would be thankful if you come' or sometimes using the interrogative invitation at the end of the utterance such as "can you come?"

In Arabic examples, on the other hand, the subjects preferred a high degree of politeness by using expressions of respect and formality such as "siaddat alameed" (your excellency, dean), "tisharrifena" (you give us the honor).

The complexity of the speech act structure and the use of high degree of politeness suggest a feeling of deliberate imposition on the hearer's negative face, which leaves no option, but to comply, otherwise the inviter would feel offended (AL-Zumor, 2003: 119). Falling to comply with this adamantine invitation threatens the inviter's positive face. This interpretation is applicable to Arabic language and culture. In the Arabic data such invitations are used in (20.6%) of the responses, as the second ranking strategy.

The occurrence of this strategy in situation one of Arabic data seems to be in a high incidence (28.8%) as the first ranking strategy, because the invitee is in a high social distance (dean of the college). In Arabic culture, it is suitable and perfect to use hope/wish/want statement to express desire to convince the invitee to accept the invitation. Arabic speakers also use high formal forms of address and compliment expressions to avoid the refusal of the invitation. In the second situation, this strategy was not found in a high incidence (10.3%) because the receiver of the invitation is a close friend. Hence, the inviter preferred bald on record imperative invitation, interrogative invitation and invitations using the performative verbs as shown in tables (6-8).

In the third situation, this strategy returned once again to occur in a high incidence (18.2%) as the second ranking strategy. The interpretation of this is that the relationship between the interlocutors is not as close as it is in the second situation. Once again this strategy appeared to be the first ranking strategy in situation four (25.2%) because the invitee is in a high social distance (inviting the learner's father to attend his/her graduation celebration).

In English data, on the other hand, this strategy appeared in situation three in a high incidence (20%) whereas it appeared in a low incidence in situations two and three (5%). However, in situation four it was not found at all. The interpretation of this is that in English language when inviting a superior, the interrogative invitation is preferable to show indirectness and hence reduce the imposition happened the invitee's negative face. Consequently, interrogative strategy appeared to be employed in English data in a high statistical frequency (48.6%) to soften the FTAs.English speakers prefer interrogative invitations even when the invitee is a close friend. The evidence is the occurrence of this strategy in situations two and four in a very high frequency (90%, 80% respectively) as shown in tables (3 and 7).

8.1.3 Invitations Using the Performative Verb

This type of invitations is so called because the utterance contains the performative verb (invite) or any of its inflected forms. The expression 'I invite you' is called performative clause because the speaker "I" actually performs the act of inviting (i.e. makes the invitation by means of using this clause). The crucial constituent of an explicitly performative clause is the performative verb. According to Keith Allan (1986), "Because the meaning of the performative verb is the essence of the illocution, the verb effectively spells out the illocutionary force of the performative clause (cited in AL-Zumor, 2003: 121). In Arabic data, it occurs as the third rank in frequency of occurrence (17%) after the interrogative invitation (27.6%) and the statement of personal desire (20.6%). In the English data, on the other hand, it occurs only in the first strategy in a rate of 20%. In the third situation of both samples, it occurs as the first ranking strategy ((S1.51.4%),S2 52.96%)S3 30%, S4 54.5% and in Arabic data, S1 18.2%, S2 16.7%, S3 27.3%, S 45.8). In the fourth situation of both samples it occurs in a low statistical frequency (5.1, 5.8 respectively).

It is a rather formal strategy especially in Arabic culture. Arabic native speakers consider it as the most suitable strategy to make emphatic invitation and to persuade the invitee to accept the

invitation. This pragmatic feature of the learners' LI affected their performance of the foreign language. Consider the following examples from the data:

• I am having a party at my house and would like to invite you to come if it is possible for you to come (English data).
• Annta ma'azoom Enndi dharori tahdur (you are invited to my party, it is necessary to attend (Arabic data).
• Doctor, Enndi haflah wa oreed aazimak ala alhafllah. hall mummkin tagbal da'awate? (Doctor, I have a party and I want to invite you to it, can you accept my invitation? (Arabic data)
• Sawf yesharrfni ann tahdur haflat orrs akhi wa ella sawf a'zaal (It will honor me to come to my brother's wedding party otherwise I'll be angry? (Arabic data)
• Annta maa'zom enndi lahflat ors akhi wala quboof li ai othr (you are invited to my brother's wedding party and no excuse will be accepted) (Arabic data).

Example (1) illustrates the complexity of the speech act of invitation. The illocutionary force is indicated by three invitation speech acts (1) 'Please sir, I want to invite you to attend my party,' (2) 'Can you come?' (3) (I will be happy if you come to my party.' The inviter collects the utterance to make a highly emphatic invitations.

Example (5) indicates that Arabic native speakers use passive voice structure (Ennta ma'a zom' (Mada'u) (you are invited). The inviter also uses the obligatory necessity to avoid the refusal of the invitation by the invitee. It is also obvious in the above examples that Arabic speakers use a high degree of politeness or formality to respect the invitee.

It is also worth mentioning here to point out that in Arabic culture a feeling of intimacy and solidarity are found among friends. This will be discussed below, inviting a very close friend formally can imply distancing him/her (AL-Zumor, 2003: 121). This pattern (using the performative verbs in invitations) occurs very rarely in the English data, perhaps because it seems an informal way of invitation. The informal invitations, performatives may not be used in English.

In the Arabic data, this pattern is used by (17%) of the respondents as the third ranking strategy. This finding is in consistence with the findings of Atwanch & Sridhar (1993) and AbdulWahid Qassim (2003).

8. 1.4 Conditionally Hedged Invitations

Unlike some of the other presented strategies, this pattern is not coercive. The invitee is given the option to accept the invitation or not. This invitation threatens the H's positive face. If he/she accepts the invitation, it is an indication of observing S's positive face wants. The inviter would be happy 'if the invitee attend the party.' This is according to Brown and Levinson (1987) a positive face wants. If H does not join the party, it implies he/she does not want the same wants of S. This pattern is called conditionally hedged invitation because the speech act contain 'if clause' which modifies the force of the act, consider the following examples cited in the data.

• Etha ammkan saa koon saeed etha ateet alhflah (If possible I will be happy if you come to the party) (Arabic data).
• Sadiqi Etha kan Ladaik wakt oreed an ada'aook Lillkhurooj wa tanawol ala'asha (My friend, if you have time, I want to invite you to go out and have dinner) (Arabic data)

Conditionally hedged invitations are used in English data in a high frequent occurrence in situations one and four. The interpretation of this is that the invitees in these two situations are in a high social distance (dean of the college-father) so the inviters preferred to make option for the invitee to accept or refuse the invitation. They only expressed their happiness if the invitees accepted the invitation by using conditional clause. E.g. we are having a party next week and would be really pleased if you could make it (English data).

8.1.5 Bald on Rrecord (softened) Imperative Invitation

The pattern demonstrating the highest incidence in Arabic data (16.8%). This pattern seems to be employed in a high statistical frequency in Arabic data. 16.9% of the respondents used this strategy. In the English data on the other hand, this strategy was never employed by the native speakers of

English. The interpretation of this is that the native speakers of English don't prefer directness even with close friends in such situations. The examples below illustrate the occurrence of this strategy in the English interlanguage and Arabic data.

Ta'al ma'ai Elyom ala ala'asha, tamam? (come with me today for dinner, ok? (Arabic data).

- Ji Enndana alesboa alkadim li annho ors akhi (come to my house next week because it is my brother's wedding) (Arabic data).
- Lau samaht ya waldi tiji elyom enndana hafl fi alkuliah dharoori (Excuse me father, come today, we have an important party in the college) (Arabic data).

8.1.6 Expressing Pleasure / Appreciation over Compliance:

Expressions of pleasure over accepting an invitation raise the degree of solidarity among the interlocutors. These are positive politeness strategies. They indicate that the presence of friends in such occasions is itself a source of pleasure and joy, hence the happiness would be multiplied. When an invitee receives an invitation with compliment and praise that contains such expressions, he/she would feel that his/her presence in the party is very essential to maintain the support with the inviter. The inviter here use compliments and appreciation to avoid rejecting the invitation by the invitee.

In Arabic data, this strategy appeared in a high frequency (4.1%). However, in the English data it was not employed at all. Consider the following examples:

- Yusa' doni ann taa ti ma'ai litanawal ala'alasha (It makes me happy to come with me to have dinner (Arabic data).
- Ya zamili ma'ana oros akhi alesbooa alkadim wa yusa'a doni ann tahdur wa bi wihudorak tatim alfaraah wa ssroor (My colleague, we have our brother's wedding next week and it makes me pleased to attend. By your presence, happiness and pleasure will be complete) (Arabic data).
- Yousharifuna ann nadao ad doctor alameed lihidoor haflana wala taktamil alfarhah Ella behidoorak (Its honor to invite the doctor/dean of the college to attend our party and happiness will not be complete without your presence (Arabic data).

8.2 Summary of the Results

Several aspects of many strategies presented here, have been highlighted and approached from a socio-pragmatic perspective. The results therefore stand in strong support of Brown and Levinson's (1987) claim that the choice of politeness strategies is influenced by three parameters. These are the social distance (D) between the speaker and the hearer; the relative power (P) between them and the rank of imposition (R). According to Brown and Levinson (1987) the speaker can calculate the size of face-threatening (FTA) on the basis of these three parameters.

Table (9): Summary of Invitation strategies all Situations) (Arabic)

Means	Frequency	Strategy type	
27.6	364	Interrogative invitation	Valid
20.6	272	Statement of personal desire	
17.0	224	Invitations using the performative verbs	
16.9	223	Bald on record (softened imperative invitation)	
5.3	70	Obligatory necessity statement	
4.4	58	Conditionally hedged invitation	
4.1	54	Expressing pleasure	
1.3	17	No answer	
1.2	16	Opting out	

.8	11	Invitations in the form of reminder
.4	5	Multiple head acts
.4	5	Tacitly dec. invitation
.1	1	19
100.0	1320	Total

The analysis of the data revealed that English native speakers didn't use as various strategies as their counterparts of Arabic users. In situation one for instance, the native speakers of English used only seven strategies. Interrogative invitations conditionally hedged invitations and invitations using performative verbs are the most common strategies employed by the native speakers of English.

In Arabic data, the informants employed a wide range of invitation strategies (ten strategies). In Arabic, the most common strategies utilized by the native speakers of Arabic are interrogative invitations (27.6%), statement of personal desire (20.6%), invitations using the performative verbs (17%), Bald on record imperative strategies (16.9%) obligatory/necessity statements (5.3% conditionally hedged invitations (4.4%) and expressing pleasure (4.1%).

The interrogative invitations occurred in (27.6% of the Arabic data and (66.25%) for the English data. Statement of personal desire occurred in (20.6%) of Arabic data whereas and (7.5%) of the English data. Invitations using the performative verbs were employed by (17%) of the Arabic native speakers whereas it was employed by and (5%) of the native speakers of English. Bald on record imperative strategies appeared in a higher statistical frequency in the Arabic data, whereas this strategy was not found in the English data because the English native speakers don't prefer directness in their every day speech even when inviting close friends. On contrary, Arabic native speakers prefer positive politeness (solidarity) devices to invite close friends.

Furthermore, such intensifiers employed by the two groups as you would honor us, 'we would be very pleased by your participation; (we would be happy to invite you, and 'it's a pleasure to see you in the party' may be addressed to the positive face of the invitee in order to strengthen the illocutionary force of the utterance and consequently, heighten the perlocutionary effect of the act of inviting on him/her.

It should be noted here that the politeness in this type of invitation resides in the insistence of the addressor on the addressee to accept the invitation. Upon hearing this, the addressee may communicatively receive the message by implicating that he is so important to the addressor, otherwise, he/she would be angry at the invitee and this perhaps affects their relationship. This implicature is brought about on the part of the addressee by making use of the generosity maxim (Leech, 1983) from an Arab point of view, where such acceptance my result in "maximizing the expression of benefit to self and minimizing the expression of cost to self."

The comparison of English and Arabic invitations reveals that the apparent difference between the two languages is a matter of degree rather than nature. In other words, the nature of the strategies employed by the inviters in the process of extending invitations in Arabic are different from that of the English. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the presence and usage of certain features in Arabic invitations may vary in comparison to the English language. This divergence aligns with the principles of pragmatics, which acknowledge the existence of cross-cultural variations in communication patterns. However, it is worth mentioning that the disparity between English and Arabic invitations is not significantly greater in terms of the strategies employed and their respective frequencies, as demonstrated in the examples provided earlier.

Conclusion

This study investigated empirically how Yemeni Arabic speakers and the native speakers of English behave linguistically and politely in producing invitations with special reference to politeness strategies. It examined the notion of politeness strategies in the speech act of invitations among English and Yemeni Arabic native speakers.

In contrast, the native speakers of Arabic predominantly utilized imperatives and statements of personal desire to convey invitations. Statements of personal desire emerged as one of the primary directive types in Arabic data when it came to making invitations. Arabic native speakers tend to be more direct in their invitations compared to English native speakers, who exhibit a preference for indirectness. Additionally, the use of deferential address terms was more frequent in Arabic data compared to English data. This discrepancy can be attributed to the positive (solidarity) politeness orientation of the Arabic language, which emphasizes expressions of solidarity and closeness in interpersonal communication. In this regard,therefore, there must be some additional factors affecting the performance of the two groups not investigated in the present study. One possible case is that the subjects of the two groups have sociolinguistic roles of politeness, which apply to the speech act under investigation, but they do not all necessarily have the same rules, whereas there is more tacit consensus among the Arabic subjects. This supposition is supported by some interesting statistics derived from the data. English native, speakers show high agreement on the appropriate forms for making certain invitations The Arabic subjects, on the other hand, show less diffuse correlation between these particular features and appropriate form of speech act.

The realization patterns of invitations by Yemeni Arabic speakers are presented in details and are compared and contrasted with the patterns found in English.

The difference between Arabic speakers and their counterparts is that they use more emphatic invitations by using intimacy devices and positive politeness to show membership and closeness such as Ennta awal almadaween (you are the first of the invitees). They attempt to oblige the invitee to accept the invitation. English native speakers on the other hand, prefer to use formality to some extent, when making invitation because they expect the rejection of the invitation by the invitee.

In Arabic the most common strategies utilized by the native speakers of Arabic are interrogative invitations 27% statement of personal desire (20.6%) invitations using the performative verbs (17%) bald on record imperative strategy (16.6%), obligatory necessity statements and conditionally hedged invitations.

Also, it can be observed in the data upon inviting, Arabic speakers tend to offer a variety of good wishes, as an important strategy for inviting. This happen by using such expressions as "atamana ann taqbal dauti lihafllat ors akhi) I hope you accept my invitation to my brother's wedding, "Arju in ann tulabi dawati wa tiji elhaflah" (I hope / wish you will accept my invitation and come to the party.' It is likely sometimes that Arabic native speakers tend to offer a lot of good wishes upon inviting, because of their positive effect on the addressee. So, an appropriate use of them can be seen as a polite strategy through which the address attempts to arouse a positive feeding in the hearer, and as such make him accept to share this happy occasion with the inviter. This happens by using the expressions as "nuhibb ann tusharkuna afrahana" (we would like you to participate us our happiness). "La yatim alfarah wassroor ella behudoorakum" (Happiness and pleasure will not exist without your presence).

References

AL-hamzi, Ali (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), 42 – 53.*

AL-Zumor, Abdul Wahid (2003). "Apologies in Arabic and English; an Inter-language and cross-cultural study" in Arabic and English :An interlanguage and cross-cultural study http://www.iboro.ac.uk/departments/ea/politeness/apologies in arabic and english.htm

ALKhatib, M. (2006). Investigating the Pragmatics of Invitation Making and Acceptance in Jordanian society. Semantic Scholar.

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-pragmatics-of-invitation-making-and-acceptance-Al-Khatib/fcd33c66ea311355e1c812ddfbbec4c83962657f

Austin , J. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Blum-Kulka, House, J. and Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics; requests and Apologies.Norwood, N.J. Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and Politeness in requests; same or different.*Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 131- 145.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). *Inter and intra-lingual aspects of speech act realization.* Paper presented to TESOL, New York.

Blum-Kulka Shoshana and Elite Olshtain, (1983). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8, 47-61.

Blum-Kulka, S.& Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). Applied Linguistics, 5(3), 169-213.

Brown, P. and Levinson, B. (1987).Politeness. Some universals in language usage.   Cambridge University Press, London.

Bruder, M.,N., and Tiillitt, B. (1999). Speaking naturally: Communication skills in American English. Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H.H., Isaacs, E.A. (1990). Ostensible Invitations. *Language in Soc*iety. 19(4),493-   501.

Chen, Rong (2001) Self Politeness: A proposal, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (200)   87-106. Ervin-Tripp, Susan, (1978). "The structure of some American directives", *Language in Society* 5: 25-66.   .

Eshreteh, Mamood, (2014). A Cross – Cultural –Sociopragmatic Study of   Invitations   in Parestinan Arabic and American English. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Philology and Linguistics, Coplutense University, Madrid, Spain.

Ferguson, C.A. (1976). The structure and use of politeness formulas. *Language in   Society* 1: 137-51.

Gu Yeuguo (1990) politeness phenomena in Modern Chinese, *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (1990) 237-257 Elsevier North Holland.

Haliday,Michael (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*, London: Arnold 1978 Language as a social semiotic, London: Arnold.

Held, Guldrun, (2005). *"Politeness in Linguistic research." In Politeness in   language: Studies in its history and practice*, Richard J. Watts, Sachiko Jole and Konrad Ehlich (eds), 131-153, Mouton de Gruyter New York.

Hill, B. et al (1986) Universals of linguistic politeness, Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English, *Journal of Pragmatics* 10, 347-371   North Holland.

Ide, Sachiko, (1989). "Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness" *Multilingua* 12: 7-11.

Jary, Mark, (1998). Relevance theory and the communication of Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30, 1-19.

Ji, Shaojun (2000). 'Face' and Polite verbal behaviors in Chinese culture. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1059-1062.

Kasper, Gabriele (1990), Linguistic Politeness, Current Research Issues, *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 193-218. North Holland.

Kurzon, D. (2001). The politeness of judges: American and English judicial behavior. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 61-85.

Lakoff, R. (1972). The logic of politeness of minding your P.s and Q.s proceedings of the ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.

Nadia, M., H. et.al (2022). Iraqi EFL University Students' Strategies of Producing Invitation. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation, 5(3),. 11 – 18.*

Nodoushan, M., (2006) A comparative socio pragmatic study of ostensible invitations in English and Farsi. *Speech Communication* 48, 903-912.   .

Scollon, Ron and Scollon, Suzanne, (1983). *Face in interethnic communication."* In   language and communication, J. Richards and R. Schmidt (eds), 156-188, London: Longman.

Searle, J. R.(1976). *Indirect speech acts*. In p.cole, & J. l. Morgan (Eds.). MA: Blackwell publishers.

Snow, C. et al., (1990). Developmental Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 289-305.

Streeck, Jurgen (1984). Emboied Contexts, Transcontextuals and the Timing ofSpeech Acts. Journal of Pragmatics 8, 113-137.

Susoki, T. (2009). *How politeness is controlled in invitations, their acceptances and refusals in English: A Case Study in the U.K*. A research project, Waseda University, U.K.

Wolfson, N. (1989). Perspectives: sociolinguistics and TESOL. Newbury House Publishers, New York.

Yeung, L. (1997). Polite requests in English and Chinese business correspondence in Hong Kong. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 505-522.

Appendex 1

DCT Questionnaire

Dear Respondents

I'm doing a research paper entitled "**Invitation Strategies in Yemeni Arabic and English: A Pragmatic Contrative Study".** The population of my study consists of the native speakers of English and Arabic.

The research is databased and therefore, your kind help is required. You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire, which contains situations in which you might find yourself. This discourse completion tasks (DCT) will help in analyzing Yemeni Arabic speakers' English native, which is expected to yield fruitful results.

Your responses will be dealt with in purely academic manner and will never be used for any other purposes than for this research.

I would appreciate it if you could complete this questionnaire as soon as possible. Thanking you for your help and co-operation.

Please read the following short descriptions of situations in which you may find yourself. Think of what you might say in response. Write your response in the space provided. Respond as if you were in a real situation.

1. You are having a party and you want to invite the dean of the college to attend your party. What would you say?

…………………………………………………………………………...

…………………………………………………………………………...

2. You want to invite a friend to go out to have dinner. What would you say?

…………………………………………………………………………...

……………………………………………………………………………...

3. Your brother's wedding will be next week, and you want to invite a classmate to attend the wedding what would you say?

……………………………………………………………...

……………………………………………………………...

4. You have a graduation celebration in the college and you want to invite your father to attend this celebration, what would say?

…………………………………………………………………………...

…………………………………………………………………………...

Appendex 2

استبيان لردود الفعل في مواقف الحياة اليومية

عزيزي الطالب..

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته، وبعد..

من فضلك اقرأ الأوصاف التالية لمواقف قد تحدث لك. فكر ماذا تقول رداً على كل موقف، واكتب الإجابة في الفراغ المخصص له، اكتب بنفس القدر الذي تقوله، لو مثلاً حدثت لك مثل هذه المواقف مستخدماً لهجتك وليس الفصحى.

1. لديك حفلة وتريد دعوة عميد الكلية لحضور هذه الحفلة فماذا ستقول؟

....

2. تريد دعوة صديق للخروج وتناول العشاء معك. فماذا ستقول؟

....

3. حفلة عرس أخيك الأسبوع القادم وتريد دعوة زميلك لحضور الحفلة. فماذا سقول؟

....

4. لديك حفلة تخرج في الكلية وتريد دعوة والدك لحضور الحفل فماذا ستقول؟

....