A Comparative Study of Ostensible Invitations in English and Persian

Mehdi Dastpak[1,*]; Fatemeh Mollaei[2]

[1]Jahrom University of Medical Sciences, Iran.
PhD student of University Malaya, and Faculty Member of Jahrom university of Medical Sciences, English, Department, Jahrom, Iran
[2]Shiraz Islamic Azad University
MA, Shiraz Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
*Corresponding author.

Abstract

The present study was carried out with the purpose of describing the defining features of Persian genuine and ostensible invitations in terms of pragmatics. The data were collected based on the spontaneous Persian invitations. 120 EFL (English as a Foreign Language) graduate and undergraduate students participated in this study. Then, the results were compared with genuine and ostensible invitations in English. The framework of data collection and analysis was the work of Isaacs and Clark (1990). Our results indicated that Persian ostensible invitations in some cases were more complex than the English ones. The features presented for ostensible invitations in English were not sufficient to distinguish the ostensible invitations from the genuine invitations in Persian. In some cases, invitations meeting the criteria for being genuine in English can be classified as ostensible by Persian speakers. Persian speakers use a considerable number of ostensible invitations in their daily activities as a manifestation of ritual politeness (ta'arof). A chi-square was carried out to analyze the data and determine whether Persian native speakers benefit from the same strategies in their extending invitations as their English counterparts do. The results of the data analysis revealed that the ways of extending invitations in Persian are similar to those of English. But the difference was only a matter of degree. On the other hand, the relationship between ostensible and genuine invitations in Persian and English regarding seven strategies defined by Isaacs and Clark (1990) was not significant. This is to say that in some strategies there were meaningful relationships between two types of invitations but in some strategies there were no such relationships.

Key words: Ostensible invitation; English; Persian; Pragmatics

INTRODUCTION

We use language to perform some communicative functions such as apologizing, requesting, inviting etc. within a context. This study focuses on the interactional context. Needless to say, the definition of the term pragmatics serves as a good point of departure. Levinson (1983, p.34) defines pragmatics as "the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they are appropriate."

Central issues dealt with pragmatics are speech acts, conversational principles and politeness theory. Austin (1962) used the term 'speech act' to refer to an utterance and the total situation in which the utterance is issued. Speech act theory has to do with the functions and use of language. The notion of speech act theory has motivated a great number of researchers to fathom the relationship between form and meaning. A conversation is an interpersonal speech activity. It involves at least two speakers interacting in a give-and-take process of communication. Discourse analysis and conversation (al) analysis can be considered as the two major approaches to the analysis of conversation. But the two approaches have distinctive and largely incompatible styles of analysis, which may be characterized as follows:

Discourse analysis employs both the methodology and the kinds of theoretical principles and primitive concepts

typical of linguists. In contrast, conversation (al) analysis is first of all a rigorously empirical approach which avoids premature theory construction.

Along with Speech Act Theory (e.g. Austin 1962 and Searle 1969), Grice worked on the cooperative principle initiated the current interest in pragmatics, and led to its development as a separate discipline within linguistics. One of the defining features of conversation is that it is cooperative in nature (Fais, 1994: 231-242). A basic underlying assumption we make when we speak to one another is that we are trying to cooperate with one another to construct meaningful conversations. This assumption is known as the Cooperative Principle. Leech's Politeness Principle (PP) is based on Grice's Cooperative Principle. Leech (1983) sees cultural rules at work in expressions of politeness and attempts to categorize in more detail some of the underlying intention behind these forms by articulating a set of rules or politeness maxims at work in polite dialogue. Politeness, as depicted by Brown and Levinson, is an admixture of both formal and functional features which accompany an inherently face-threatening speech act including positive and negative ones.

The term "invitation" finds occasion in the contexts of "politeness" and "face". Invitations are usually viewed as arrangements of a social commitment.

Inviting, as an illocutionary act, like ordering, is a commissive act, whose point is to commit the speaker to some future course of action (Searle1979:14).

Based on the data collected by observations in natural settings, Wolfson identifies the features that can be used to distinguish ambiguous invitations.

Slightly different from Wolfsons classification, Isaacs and Clark (1990) call ambiguous invitations, ostensible invitations. From a collection of spontaneous examples, Isaacs and Clark argue that ostensible invitations possess five defining properties: 1) pretense (i.e., the inviter pretends to make a sincere invitation); 2) mutual recognition (i.e., the interactants mutually recognize the inviters pretense); 3) collusion (i.e., the invitee responds appropriately to the inviters pretense); 4) ambivalence (i.e., when asked Do you really mean it? the inviter cannot sincerely answer either yes or no); and 5) off-record purpose (i.e., the inviters main purpose is tacit).

In addition to the seven defining properties of ostensible invitations, Isaacs and Clark (1990) describe seven strategies speakers use in fulfilling the above-mentioned requirements. These features signal to the invitees that the invitation is an ostensible one.

They also point out that these seven features appear predominantly in ostensible as opposed to genuine invitations.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This study is basically a sociolinguistic study with some definitions of pragmatics and speech act theory.

Sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society. In order to broaden our understanding of communication in different social contexts, we must study sociolinguistic phenomena. The value of sociolinguistics is the light which is thrown on the nature of language in general, or the characteristics of some particular language. Sociolinguistic theory is the offspring of the process of transition from the so-called structuralism to contextualism. In contrast to linguistic theory, sociolinguistic theory emphasizes the appropriateness of verbal message in context. In modern linguistics, pragmatics attends to the analysis of all the factors that affect interlocutors, the choice of language made by them, and constrains and limitations they have in using language in social interaction. Leech and Levinson (1983) consider pragmatics as the study of the use of language in communication. Leech (1983) believes that there are two branches of pragmatics namely, pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics is "the particular resource which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions" (Leech, 1983: 11).

Sociopragmatics, on the other hand, refers to "the sociological interface of pragmatics" (Leech 1983: 10). In other words, sociopragmatics is the study of the way in which conditions on language use derive from social situation.

The notion of speech act refers to the pragmatic force of speech. The term "speech act" has been used by Crystal (1992: 362) to refer to a communicative activity defined with reference to the intentions of a speaker while speaking and the effects achieved on a listener. Forms of language generally serve specific communicative functions. Politeness has been defined as the feature of language which serves to mediate norms of social behavior, in terms of such notions as courtesy, rapport, deference and distance.

Brown and Levinson (1987) offer a universal theory of politeness to show considerable cross-cultural parallels in language usage. The main idea is that the members of a society make use of different strategies for interactional behavior in their social life. They apply a specific mode of reasoning or rationality to satisfy their wants and desires. The wants concerning politeness are the wants of "face". Work on invitations has been mainly the focus of those who sought to study native speaker's lack of recognition of their own speech patterns.

In their study of invitations, Wolfson, et al. observe that since speech communities around the world vary greatly with regard to the rules that constraint speech behavior, the non native speakers cannot hope to interact effectively in the target speech community unless they learn rules. In this case, the rules for the appropriate management of invitations are well below the conscious awareness of speakers. The context, the shared knowledge of the interactants, and the question intonation are three important factors that affect most, if not all, invitation

exchanges.

Two significant studies have been carried out with the aim of examining the so-called ostensible invitations. The first of these studies concerns itself with what it calls as *Ambiguous Invitations*. The second study focuses on, and emphasizes the importance of what has been referred to *as Ostensible Invitations*. Clark and Isaacs (1990) carried out a research project on the so-called ostensible invitations. The term "ostensible acceptance" has been used by these scholars to define the positive response of the invitee to such invitation. Take the following example:

Mary: Let's do lunch sometime.

Justin: Yes, let's.

Mary's utterance is an example of ostensible invitations. Justin's response is an example of ostensible acceptance. Mary's invitation is insincere because she does not really want Justin to come to lunch.

A meticulous analysis of the data revealed five importation points about ostensible invitations:

1) Pretense: The inviter is only pretending to extend a sincere invitation;

2) Mutual recognition: Inviters intend their pretense to be vividly recognized by them and their addressee. This is called mutual recognition;

3) Collusion: Invitees are intended to collude with the inviters on the pretense by responding in kind. In other words, they are intended to response in a way which is appropriate to the pretense;

4) Ambivalence: If inviters were asked, "Do you really mean it?" they could not honestly answer either yes or no. This is a paradoxical point in relation to ostensible invitations.

5) Off-record Purpose: Ostensible invitations are extended as a way of expressing certain intentions off-record. A person who issues an utterance can be held accountable for certain interpretations of that utterance and these are said to be record.

Clark and Isaacs could find seven different ways of making the pretense obvious:

1) A makes B's pretense at event E implausible. To do so, the inviter usually sets out to violate the felicity conditions needed for establishing genuine invitations.

2) A invites B only after B has solicited the invitation. B can solicit invitations in two ways: through the context or directly. In the former case, B can take advantage of the cultural connotations of politeness formulas.

3) A does not motivate the invitation beyond social courtesy. If the invitation is genuine, A usually uses utterances to make the invitation more attractive. In other words, A tries to induce B's acceptance of the invitation.

4) A doesn't persist or insist on the invitation. For genuine invitations, it is often polite for A to issue an invitation several times before B accepts.

5) A is vague about the arrangements. Unless they are established by the situation and the shared knowledge of the interactants,

6) A hedges the invitation to B. A can show that his/her heart is not really in it by hedging the invitation with such expressions as "well," "I guess," "I mean," etc.

7) A delivers the invitation with inappropriate cues. Usually genuine invitations are very vivid and crystal clear.

It should, however, be noted that these seven features are not independent of each other.

METHOD

1. Subjects

The subjects of this study belong to two different groups. The first group consists of undergraduate student interviewed by the writer. This group is composed of 60 students from Jahrom University and 60 students from Hafez University in Shiraz and they will be asked to record any instance of sincere and insincere invitations or offers they witnessed and also report the purpose behind the exchanges. Each student was asked to recall two sincere and two insincere invitations from their own experience. One is to involve a friend and the other an acquaintance or a stranger. All these subjects were the invitees in the exchange they recalled. The students then 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.

The second group of subjects consists of 20 postgraduate students who were also being interviewed by the writer. These students were chosen from Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. They were asked to recall a time when one had made an ostensible invitation to the other. Each of them gave his/her version of the context and reenacted the dialogue as best they could. They described what they thought and had been expressed through the invitation and rated their confidence that this interpretation had been mutually understood. Unfortunately, there was not any native speaker available, therefore I referred to the Clark and Isaacs (1990) paper and used its data in order to compare ostensible invitations in Persian and English.

2. Instrumentation

At first I decided to collect data through questionnaire. Providing a proper questionnaire was impossible since the best way in which the socially appropriate communicative patterns of a speech community can be understood is through empirically based descriptive analysis (Labov, 1966: 455; Bloom &Gumperz, 1972: 430). As Wolfson (1989: 9) asserts. Our best access to communication patterns is through direct observation of speech in use. Ostensible invitations are rare in most situations, so it is difficult to collect more than the occasional example by combing ordinary conversations. It also seemed highly unnatural to elicit them in any experimental situation we could think of. Therefore, the present data were gathered

through observation and participation in a variety of spontaneously occurring speech situations and the researcher collected ostensible and genuine invitations in Persian through observations and participant observation of natural language use.

They described what they thought had been expressed through the invitation and rated their confidence that this interpretation had been mutually understood.

The accuracy of this method is higher than other methods because each interactant recalls his or her words.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data suggested that ostensible invitations constitute a coherent class of speech acts. These speech acts are identifiable by a small number of properties. In the analysis of the data, any exchanges which meet all the five features or properties of ostensible invitations will be treated as ostensible. Although no claim is made that the analysis of speech patterns presented here is representative of all Persian speakers, every effort was made to sample the speech of people from as broad a range of occupational and educational backgrounds as possible. This method of investigation has made it possible to discover a great deal about how invitations function in Persian and the cultural values that form the bases of linguistic performance. The data collected were analyzed based on the analysis framework used by Isaacs and Clark (1990). This method has to do with the frequencies of the seven interrelated features that speakers exploit in the process of extending ostensible invitations. These features are the ones that appear predominantly in insincere as opposed to genuine invitations. Those instances of the data which did not comply with the five defining properties of ostensible invitations would probably belong to either the "genuine invitation" class or some other speech act. Chi-square analysis is used to determine whether ostensible and genuine invitations in English and Persian will vary based on the seventh features reported in Isaacs and Clark paper (1990). In order to run the analyses, version 15 of SPSS is employed.

In the analysis of the data for the present study, 240 exchanges were collected and compared based on five features of ostensible invitations. Since they were not a kind of invitation but the other exchanges were qualified as ostensible and genuine 27 of collected exchanges were discarded.

RESULTS

As data show, the preparatory conditions were not met in 44(48%) exchanges of Persian ostensible invitations, but they occur in only 6(7.5%) of the genuine ones. On the contrary, these conditions are not met in 32(44%) exchanges of English ostensible invitations, but in only 5(7%)of the genuine ones. As a result, the data indicate that this feature can be a defining characteristic for distinguishing ostensible versus genuine invitations in Persian and English.

Table 1 indicates the number of occurrences of ostensible and genuine exchanges in Persian and English based on the subcategories of the first feature of ostensible and genuine invitations regarding Isaacs and Clark (1990). And it shows that in 13 of these Persian ostensible invitations, A knew B either had other plans B would be unlikely to break or didn't have the means to get to the event. In another 19, A knew B would have little interest in coming. And in 12 others, A couldn't practically provide what had been offered.

Table 1
Number of Occurrences of Seven Features in Genuine and Ostensible Invitations

Feature	English		Persian	
	Genuine	Ostensible	Genuine	Ostensible
1. A makes event E implausible	5(7%)	32(44%)	6(7.5%)	44(48%)
a) B can't come	2(3%)	6(8%)	2(2%)	13(14%)
b) B isn't interested	3(4%)	16(22%)	2(2%)	19(21%)
c) A can't provide	0	10(14%)	0	12(13%)
2. A makes E plausible	67(93%)	40(56%)	82(91%)	58(63%)

Referring to Tables 1-1.and 1-2. the meaningful relationships between English and Persian Genuine and ostensible invitations are determined regarding the first strategy reported by Isaacs and Clark. NS shows that P > 0.5 thus, there are no meaningful relationships between variables. The chi-square analysis indicates that there is no meaningful difference between the preparatory conditions that affect ostensible and genuine invitations in English and Persian.

$$c^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E} \quad c^2_{yates\,correction} = \sum \frac{(|O-E|-0.5)^2}{E}$$

Table 1-1
A Makes Event E Implausible

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine*	English	5	5.5	-0.5	25	0.045	0.09	1	NS
	Persian	6	5.5	0.5	25	0.04			
Ostensible	English	32	38	-6	36	0.95	1.89	1	NS
	Persian	44	38	6	36	0.95			

Table 1-2
A Makes Event E Plausible

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine	English	67	74.5	-7.5	56.25	0.75	1.5	1	NS
	Persian	82	74.5	-7.5	56.25	0.75			
Ostensible	English	40	49	-9	81	1.65	3.31	1	NS
	Persian	58	49	9	81	1.65			

According to Table 2, 37(40%) of Persian ostensible invitations were extended only after they were solicited. However, only 13(14%) of the genuine invitations were solicited. In contrast, 54(75%) of English ostensible invitations were met after they were solicited but only 14(19%) of the genuine ones were solicited. In Persian, this feature is not as strong as a discriminating factor between ostensible and genuine invitations as it is in English. In English, 54(75%) of the ostensible invitations were solicited, whereas this feature in Persian is only 37(40%).

Table 2 reveals the number of occurrences of ostensible and genuine exchanges in English and Persian in terms of the second feature of ostensible and genuine invitation reported by Isaacs and Clark(1990).

Table 2
Number of Occurrences of Seven Features in Genuine and Ostensible Invitations

	English		Persian	
Feature	Genuine	Ostensible	Genuine	Ostensible
B solicits invitations first	14(19%)	54(75%)	13(14%)	37(40%)

Referring to Table 2-1.the meaningful relationships between English and Persian Genuine and ostensible invitations are determined regarding the second strategy reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990). NS shows that P> 0.5 so, there are no meaningful relationships between variables. The chi-square analysis indicates that there is no meaningful difference between ostensible and genuine invitations in terms of solicitation.

Table 2-1
B Solicits Invitations First

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine	English	14	13.5	0.5	0.25	0.02	0.09	1	NS
	Persian	13	13.5	-0.5	0.25	0.02			
Ostensible	English	54	45.5	8.5	69.7	1.53	3.06	1	NS
	Persian	37	45.5	-8.5	69.7	1.53			

As shown in Table 3, in Persian 26(28%) of ostensible invitations were not motivated beyond social courtesy. However, only 3(3%) of the genuine invitations were not motivated. On the other hand, 42(45%) of ostensible invitations were motivated in Persian as compared with genuine ones which are 84(91%). But in English 59(82%) of ostensible invitations and 34(47%) of the genuine ones were not motivated beyond social courtesy. Whereas only 13(18%) of the ostensible exchanges were motivated in comparison with 38(53%) of the genuine invitations. Thus, this feature is a strong criterion for distinguishing the type of invitations in English, whereas it may not be a strong feature in relation with recognizing the invitations type in Persian.

Table 3 shows the number of occurrences of ostensible and genuine exchanges in English and Persian regarding the third feature of ostensible and genuine invitation reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990).

Table 3
Number of Occurrences of Seven Features in Genuine and Ostensible Invitations

Feature	English		Persian	
	Genuine	Ostensible	Genuine	Ostensible
3) A doesn't motivate invitation	34(47%)	59(82%)	3(3%)	26(28%)
A motivates invitation	38(53%)	13(18%)	84(91%)	42(45%)

Based on Tables and 3-1.and 3-2. the meaningful relationships between English and Persian Genuine and ostensible invitations are determined regarding the third strategy reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990). The results show that P < 0.5 so, there are meaningful relationships between variables. The chi-square analysis indicates that there is a meaningful difference between the degree of motivating for ostensible and genuine invitations in terms of motivation.

Table 3-1
A Doesn't Motivate Invitation

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine*	English	34	18.5	15.5	225	12.16	24.32	1	0.01
	Persian	3	18.5	-15.5	225	12.16			
Ostensible	English	59	42.5	16.5	272.25	6.41	12.81	1	0.01
	Persian	26	42.5	-16.5	272.25	6.41			

Table 3-2
A Motivates Invitation

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine	English	38	61	-23	529	8.67	17.34	1	0.01
	Persian	84	61	23	529	8.67			
Ostensible	English	13	27.5	-14.5	210.25	7.64	15.29	1	0.01
	Persian	42	27.5	14.5	210.25	7.64			

As it can be seen in Table 4, in 74(85%) of Persian ostensible invitations B hesitated or declined the first invitation and, on 84(84%) of those times, A didn't issue a second invitation. The difference between genuine and ostensible invitations in English is much greater than that of Persian. Therefore, in Persian in comparison with English, there are more refusals or hesitations in ostensible and genuine invitations. Also, there are more persistences in Persian regarding both ostensible and genuine invitations.

Table 4 shows the number of occurrences of ostensible and genuine exchanges in English and Persian based on the forth feature of ostensible and genuine invitation reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990).

Table 4
Number of Occurrences of Seven Features in Genuine and Ostensible Invitations

Feature	English		Persian	
	Genuine	Ostensible	Genuine	Ostensible
4) B hesitates or refuses	23(31%)	39(54%)	84(84%)	74(85%)
a. A doesn't persist	6(8%)	32(44%)	12(13%)	22(23%)
b. A does persist	17(23%)	7(10%)	72(71%)	52(62%)

Based on Table 4-1.the meaningful relationships between English and Persian Genuine and ostensible invitations are determined regarding the fourth strategy reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990). The results show that P < 0.5 so, there are meaningful relationships between variables. The chi-square analysis indicates that there is a meaningful difference between the degree of persistence for ostensible and genuine invitations.

Table 4-1
B Hesitates or Refuses

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\dfrac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine	English	23	53.5	-30.5	930.25	17.39	34.77	1	0.01
	Persian	84	53.5	30.5	930.25	17.39			
Ostensible	English	39	56.5	-17.5	306.25	5.42	10.84	1	0.01
	Persian	74	56.5	17.5	306.25	5.42			

In this sample, A is vague about the arrangements in 26(28%) of Persian ostensible invitations, whereas it happens in 24(26%) of the genuine invitations. But A leaves arrangements vague in 16(22%) of English ostensible invitations and 40(56%) of the genuine ones. On the other hand, in 28(40%) of the Persian ostensible invitations A makes arrangement specific but it occurs in 3(3%) of the genuine ones. However, in English in 11(69%) of the ostensible invitations A makes arrangements specific, but it happens only in 3(3%) of the genuine ones. As it is shown, A makes arrangements specific rather than leaving them vague in English and Persian.

Table 5 indicates the number of occurrences of ostensible and genuine exchanges in English and Persian based on the fifth feature of ostensible and genuine invitation reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990).

Table 4
Number of Occurrences of Seven Features in Genuine and Ostensible Invitations

	English		Persian	
Feature	Genuine	Ostensible	Genuine	Ostensible
A leaves arrangements vague	40(56%)	16(22%)	24(26%)	26(28%)
A makes arrangements specific	3(8%)	11(69%)	3(3%)	28(30%)

Based on Tables 5-1.and 5-2. the meaningful relationships between English and Persian Genuine and ostensible invitations are determined regarding the fifth strategy reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990). There is a meaningful difference between the ways inviters make arrangements vague in genuine invitations in Persian and English but there is not such a relationship regarding ostensible invitations in Persian and English. On the other hand, there is no meaningful relationship between the ways inviters make arrangements specific in relation with genuine invitations in Persian and English but there is a significant relationship between Persian and English ostensible invitations.

Table5-1
A Leaves Arrangements Vague

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\dfrac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine	English	40	32	8	64	2	4	1	0.05
	Persian	24	32	-8	64	2			
Ostensible	English	16	21	-5	25	1.19	2.38	1	NS
	Persian	26	21	5	25	1.19			

Table 5-2
A Leaves Arrangements Specific

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\dfrac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine*	English	3	3	0	0.25	0.08	0.16	1	NS
	Persian	3	3	0	0.25	0.08			
Ostensible	English	11	19.5	-8.5	72.25	3.71	7.41	1	0.01
	Persian	28	19.5	8.5	72.25	3.71			

As shown in Table 6, the number of hedges used in Persian was greater than that of English. Only 47(48%) of Persian ostensible invitations contained hedges and 6(6.6%) of the genuine invitations had one or more hedges. But in English 39(42%) of the ostensible exchanges contained hedges and only 14(19%) of the genuine ones include hedges. Thus, hedging in genuine invitations did not serve the same function as it did in ostensible invitations. They were used to show politeness and deference to the higher status person. However, in ostensible invitations hedging was used to show tentativeness and hesitancy, therefore, signaling the

inviter's presence.

Table 6 indicates the number of occurrences of ostensible and genuine exchanges in English and Persian

according to the sixth feature of ostensible and genuine invitations reported by Isaacs and Clark (1990).

Table 6
Number of Occurrences of Seven Features in Genuine and Ostensible Invitations

	English		Persian	
Feature	Genuine	Ostensible	Genuine	Ostensible
A hedges invitation	14(19%)	39(42%)	6(6.6%)	47(48%)

Referring to Table 6-1. the meaningful relationships between English and Persian Genuine and ostensible invitations are determined regarding the first strategy reported by Isaacs and Clark. NS shows that P > 0.5

thus, there are no meaningful relationships between variables. As a result, there is no meaningful difference in the amount of hedging between ostensible and genuine invitations.

Table 2-1
B Solicits Invitations First

	Group	O	E	O - E	$(O-E)^2$	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	x^2	df	p
Genuine	English	14	10	4	16	1.6	3.2	1	NS
	Persian	6	10	-4	16	1.6			
Ostensible	English	39	43	-4	16	0.37	0.74	1	NS
	Persian	47	43	4	16	0.37			

In order to analyze conversations for nonverbal signals, the conversations had to be videotaped. Since the data collected for this study were either tape-recorded or transcribed after the event, an analysis of nonverbal data is not concluded.

As noted by Isaacs and Clark, these seven features, of course, are not independent of each other and they are interrelated. If the defective feature seems obvious enough that A would have to expect that they would mutually recognize it, B has reason to believe the invitation is ostensible. Making an event implausible and leaving the arrangements vague both work because the preparatory conditions for the invitation don't hold. Failing to motivate beyond social courtesy, failing to persist, and hedging all show A's lack of commitment to the invitation. And so does an inappropriate delivery.

Once any of these features become obvious enough, B has reason to suspect the invitation is insincere. If the defective feature seems obvious enough that A would have to expect that they would mutually recognize it, B has reason to believe the invitation is ostensible.

DISCUSSION

In this part of the present chapter, research questions will be restated and elaborated individually.

RQ 1: Whether Persian native speakers extend invitations for the purposes of politeness?

As data and tables reveal, Persian native speakers extend genuine and ostensible invitations for the purpose of politeness. They use Ta'arof in their interpersonal

interactions. Ta'arof is a system of formality composed of stylized and ritualized linguistic patterns. The data indicate that Ta'arof is reflected not only in the linguistic system but also in the preference organization of Persian. In formal social contexts, Iranians frequently accept invitations only after several rejections. In a formal relationship in Iran, an immediate acceptance would often be perceived as 'impolite'. Meanwhile, the data indicate that acceptances and rejections of invitations in Iran are accomplished in a markedly different way than in American English.

RQ 2: Whether Persian ostensible invitations observe all the defining properties of English ostensible invitations?

RQ 3: Whether Persian inviters take advantage of the same strategies in their extending ostensible invitations as their English counterparts do?

Regarding the second and third research questions, the contents of tables should be taken into consideration. Tables show that Persian native speakers apply all the defining properties of English ostensible invitations and extend the same strategies in their interactions.

Based on Table 1, Persian speakers use preparatory conditions in extending ostensible and genuine invitations as their English counterpart do. As data show, there is no significant relationship between preparatory conditions that affect ostensible and genuine invitations in English and Persian.

Table 2 indicates that both Persian and English native speakers solicit invitations through the context or directly. But this feature is not a strong discriminating factor

between Persian and English ostensible and genuine invitations. And the results show there is no significant difference between ostensible and genuine invitations according to solicitation.

Referring to Table 3, Persian and English inviters take advantage of motivation in their interactions. Moreover, this feature is a strong criterion for distinguishing the type of invitations in English, whereas it may not be a strong feature in terms of recognizing ostensible and genuine invitations in Persian. Meanwhile, the results show that there are significant relationships between Persian and English ostensible and genuine invitations.

According to Table 4, persistence is another feature extended by Persian and English native speakers in their interpersonal interactions. But the degree of persistence is important. Since, there are more refusals or hesitations in two types of invitations in Persian. The results reveal that there are significant relationships between the degree of persistence for ostensible and genuine invitations in English and Persian.

Table 5 indicates that Persian and English inviters make arrangements vague or specific. Based on the results there is a significant difference between the ways inviters make arrangements vague in Persian and English genuine invitations but there is not such a relationship in terms of ostensible invitations in Persian and English. On the contrary, there is no significant relationship between the ways inviters make arrangements specific in relation with Persian and English genuine invitations but there is a significant relationship between Persian and English ostensible invitations.

According to Table 6 the Persian speakers use expressions such as "well," "I guess," or "I mean," etc. for hedging as their English counterpart do. And the results show that there are no significant relationships between Persian and English genuine and ostensible invitations.

Those who are ambivalent might be expected to hesitate, avoid eye gaze, mumble, speak rapidly, and evince other nonverbal signs that they weren't fully committed to the invitation. Actually, insincere invitations were reconstructed with many of these features. These nonverbal signals are defined as instances of inappropriate cues and they are mostly found in ostensible invitations in comparison with genuine ones. As the data collected were either tape-recorded or transcribed after the event, an analysis of nonverbal data is not included.

CONCLUSION

The results of the data analysis indicate that the answers to all the questions raised in introduction are positive. This is to say that Persian and English speakers' invitations show politeness and all the defining properties of Persian ostensible invitations are similar to those of English ones. Also, Persian inviters take advantage of the same strategies in their extending ostensible invitations

as their English counterparts do. The difference is only a matter of degree. Based on the results the features of ostensible invitations in English can't completely distinguish ostensible and genuine invitations in Persian. Persian native speakers use a large number of ostensible invitations in their daily activities to reveal ritual politeness (ta'arof). Initiations in Persian may appear imposing and hypocritical to the cultural outsiders. In other words, they may involve in fake invitations and fake refusal. Ostensible invitations are part of ritual politeness and polite interaction (ta'arof) in Persian discourse; thus, they should be characterized as face-saving acts. This kind of interaction helps participants to realize its shared purpose of establishing their social character and interlocutor's positive face.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford, Claredon Press.

Dehkhoda, Ali Akbar (1966). *Dehkhoda Persian Dictionary*. Tehran: Dehkhoda Foundation.

Beeman, William O. (1986). *Language, Status, and Power in Iran.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., and E. Olshtain (1984 a). Pragmatics and second Language Learning: Preface. *Applied Linguistics, 5*, 3.

Blum-Kalkaa, S., and E. Olshtain (1984 b). Request and Apologies: A Cross Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns. *Applied Linguistics, 4* (3), 196-23.

Brown, R., and S. Levinson.(1978). Universals in Language Usage Politeness Phenomena. *Questions and Politeness,* (Eds.), E. N. Goody. (pp. 56-289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1992). *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and Responses. *Language in Society, 5*(3), 257-313.

Grice, Herbert P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan. *Syntax and Semantics3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. 41-58

Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of Language and Social Setting. Journal of Social Issues, 23, 8-28.

Keshavarz, M.H. (1988). Forms of Address in Post Revolutionary Iranian in Persian: A Sociolinguistics Analysis Language in Society, 7, 565-575.

Isaacs, Ellen A., and Herbert H. Clark.(1990). Ostensible Invitations.Language in Society, 19, 493-509.

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

Levinson, S.C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. (1981). Language and Linguistics.Cambridge University Press.228-229.

Searle, J.R. (1975). "What is Speech Act?" in Philosophy in America, (Eds.) M. Black, Ithaca. NY: Cornell University Press.

Stern, H.H. (1983). Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford University Press. 227-231

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure."Applied Linguistics. 4 (2), 91-109.

Verschueren, Jef. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.22-34.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). Teaching Language as Communication. London: Oxford.

Wolfson, N., (1983 b). Rules of Speaking. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and Communication (pp. 61-87). London: Longman.

Wolfson, Nessa. (1989). Perspectives: Socio-linguistics and TESOL. Cambridge/New York: Newbury House.

Zhang, Yun, (2005). Pragmalinguistic and English Language Teaching.Tianjin University of Commerce. Sino-US English Teaching, 2, 9.