Investigating the Use of the Speech Act of Invitation by Iraqi EFL Non-Departmental Students

Adyan Abdul-Munim Mohammed
General Directorate of Education in Babel
adyanalrubyee@gmail.com

Abstract

   This study is concerned with investigating Iraqi EFL non-departmental students' use of the speech act of invitation at the pragmatic level in terms of recognition and production. First, a theoretical survey is presented about invitation. Then, a model of invitation strategies is adopted for the analysis. The Department of Dentistry, Al-Mustaqbal University College during the academic year 2019-2020 was a representative of the data analyzed in this research. A test is carried out on 20 third stage undergraduate students whose native language is Arabic and the analysis is done afterwards. The study employs multiple choice question and a discourse completion task as instruments for collecting the data. The results show that the performance of the learners on the recognition part is questionable as they are unable to differentiate invitation from other attitudes. On the production part, the learners used some strategies more than others in addition to using a strategy which is not found in the model.

Keywords: Invitation, speech acts, pragmatics, politeness, strategies.

تقصّي استعمال الدعوة فعلاً كلامياً من قبل الطلبة العراقيين دارسي اللغة الإنكليزية لغةً أجنبيةً في غير اقسام اللغة الإنكليزية

اديان عبد المنعم محمد
المديرية العامة للتربية في محافظة بابل

الخلاصة

   تهتم هذه الدراسة بالتحقيق في استخدام الطلاب العراقيين الدارسين للغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لا لغة أجنبية في الأقسام غير الاختصاص لأساليب الدعوات على المستوى التداولي من حيث التمييز والإنتاج. أولاً: يتم تقديم عرض نظري حول الدعوة. ثم يتم اعتماد نموذج لإستراتيجيات الدعوة للتحليل. تم اختيار قسم طب الأسنان، كلية المستقبل الجامعة في العام الدراسي 2019–2020، لتمثيل البيانات التي تم تحليلها في هذا البحث. يتم إجراء اختبار على 20 طالبا من المرحلة الثالثة الذين لغتهم الأم هي العربية ويتم التحليل بعد ذلك. تعتمد الدراسة سؤال الاختيار من متعدد ومهمة إكمال الخطاب بوصفها أدوات لجمع البيانات. تظهر النتائج أن أداء المتعلمين في جزء التمييز قابل للتشكيك إذ إنهم غير قادرين على تمييز الدعوة عن المواقف الأخرى. من الجانب الإنتاجي، استخدم المتعلمون بعض الإستراتيجيات أكثر من غيرها بالإضافة إلى استخدام إستراتيجية غير موجودة في النموذج.

الكلمات الدالة: الدعوات، إستراتيجيات، المستوى التداولي، التمييز والإنتاج.

المجلد 28، العدد 6: 2020. مجلة جامعة بابل للعلوم الإنسانية،

Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities, Vol.(28), No.(6): 2020.

1. Introduction

Most of the previous studies conducted in this regard focused on investigating the speech act of invitation by EFL university students or upper-intermediate leaners of English. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, none of the studies carried out about the speech act under study as well as other speech acts analyzed Iraqi non-departmental students. In an attempt to address the question " what is the socio-linguistic and pragmatic competence of Iraqi non-departmental students?", the following study has set itself to find out these two aspects for providing some useful insights and awareness when it comes to non-departmental students.

Pragmatic competence has been very significant and essential for second language acquisition. Second language learners should not only be able to produce grammatically correct sentences but also pragmatically appropriate to the situations and to the ones produced by native speakers of the language. Being grammatically correct is not enough for convenient communication in the second language. Olshtain and Cohen [1] point out that language learners need to master not only linguistic rules of the language but also its communicative rules because the production of utterances is determined by contextual factors, that vary across countries and cultures, rather than by mere linguistic and grammatical factors.

According to Fraser [2], pragmatic competence represents the knowledge of how an addressee determines what a speaker is saying and recognizes intended illocutionary force conveyed through subtle attitudes

Wolfson [3] defines pragmatic competence as the linguistic knowledge and the ability to understand and produce appropriate utterances in particular contexts. In Leech's theory [4], pragmatics is made up of two components: pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics. The former refers to appropriateness of form while the latter refers to appropriateness of meaning in social context.

The study tries to investigate Iraqi non-departmental students' performance the speech act of invitation. Thus , it addresses the following questions: (a) do Iraqi students have the ability to produce invitations accurately?, (b) do Iraqi students have the capacity to distinguish the speech act of invitation from other related speech acts when they are realized by similar expressions?, (c) What type of strategies are used more by the students? The study aims at investigating the ability of Iraqi students to produce invitation speech acts accurately, and their ability to distinguish it from other related speech acts when they are realized by similar forms or expressions. It also aims at finding the strategies employed by the students as well as identifying the most common form of invitation used by the students. It is hypothesized that (a) Iraqi non-departmental students have the ability to produce invitation utterances, but (b) they cannot differentiate or separate between invitation and other related acts such as offers, requests and others, and (c) their use of invitation is highly restricted, some strategies are more employed than others. The procedures adopted in this study are: Presenting a theoretical survey of invitation and a sample of Iraqi non-departmental students is involved in a form of test to collect the data about their recognition and production of invitation. This study is limited to 20 students at Al-Mustaqbal University College. They are chosen because they are supposed to be more advanced than students in other stages and they are supposed to be more familiar with invitation formulas as they have studied them in their previous stages. It is also hoped that the conclusions and recommendations will be beneficial to syllabus designers as they increase the knowledge about how Iraqi students react to such utterances since they draw attention to weak and strong areas of the student's performance.

2. The Concept of Speech Act

A lot has been said about the theory and concept of speech act, Austin [5], Searle [6], Brown and Levinson [7], Bouwmeester [8] and Thomas [9]. Hymes [10] defines speech act as "the minimal unit of speech that has rules in terms both of where and when they may occur and of what their specific features such as offering, invitation and so on". The speech act theory was introduced by Austin in 1962 then was developed by Searle in 1969 to understand how utterances should be understood in second/foreign language context. Austin [5] argues that when we attempt to convey the intended meaning, we not only create utterances involving grammatical structures and words, we also perform actions by these utterances.

According to Yule [11] the term speech acts is also used in linguistics and the philosophy of language to refer to Pragmatics. This kind of pragmatics is about the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker or the writer and interpreted by the listener or the reader.

One of the major problematic areas for foreign language learners has been speech acts. Blum-Kulka [12] describes speech acts as "one of the most compelling notions in the study of language use". Billmyer [13] states that "a major difficulty faced by non-native speakers in acquiring pragmatic competence is that speech acts are highly complex and variable and require that non-native speakers understand the multiple functions each serves"

Additionally, foreign language learners and teachers must be conscious that speech acts vary in both production and realization across languages and cultures due to differences in cultural conventions and assumption. This study has set itself to address the speech act of invitation.

3. The Speech Act of Invitation

Invitations, according to Searle [14] can be classified as directives, whose illocutionary force is that the hearer does a future action. The future action for the invitation is that the hearer comes to an event. By initiating an invitation, the speaker wants the hearer to come to a future event.

Wolfson [15] differentiates between two types of invitations: ambiguous and an unambiguous. The unambiguous invitation consists of reference to a time and/or place for an activity and a request for a response, as in "Do you want to have lunch tomorrow?". This type is the least frequent in American English. More frequently, participants initiate an ambiguous invitation through a process of negotiation.

Al-Darraji et al [16] defined the act of inviting as an attempt to get the addressee to attend or participate in a given event or carry out the action, which is supposed to be beneficial to him or her. In the same way, Geis [17] argues that invitation interactions enjoy some family resemblances to service encounters. In both cases, he further adds, the initiators act out of desire to cause the responder to perform some action and the responder must be willing and able to perform this action before it will be accepted.

Clark and Isaac [18] propose yet another reflection to speech act of invitation: ostensible invitations, indicating that it is different from that of Wolfson's [3] ambiguous invitations, though they are similar in principle. Ostensible invitations are not intended to be ambiguous. Collaboration is required to confirm mutual belief in the pretense and if possible, to make the off-record purpose mutually understood. Ostensible invitations, they suggest, are distinguishable from other types of invitations in the five ways: (a) pretense, (b) mutual recognition, (c) collusion, (d) ambivalence and (e) off-record purpose.

المجلد 28، العدد 6: 2020. مجلة جامعة بابل للعلوم الإنسانية،

Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities, Vol.(28), No.(6): 2020.

4. Invitation Strategies

Suzuki [19] has classified invitation speech act strategies into four categories, namely the addressee, Head act, preparatory act and supportive move as can be seen the table below:

Table (1):Suzuki's 2009 classification of invitation speech act strategies

No	Type	Strategy	Classification
1	S	Address	(vocatives / interjections /act
2	I 1	Head act	Declarative
3	I 2	Head act	Hypothetical + declarative
4	I 3	Head act	Hypothetical +interrogative
5	I 4	Head act	Imperative
6	I 5	Head act	Interrogative
7	I 6	Head act	Present option
8	P 1	Preparatory act	Query
9	P 2	Preparatory act	Query
10	P 3	Preparatory act	Query on h's wi
11	P 4	Preparatory act	Specification of reason
12	P 5	Preparatory act	s's w
13	P 6	Preparatory act	s's w
14	D 1	Supportive move	Description of event
15	D 2	Supportive move	Directions
16	D 3	Supportive move	Encouragement
17	D 4	Supportive move	Present option
18	D 5	Supportive move	Specify what h can do
19	D 6	Supportive move	s's w

The analysis of the data, however, will be built on the categorization adopted by Al Marrani and Suaih [20] which is based on some earlier studies that looked into ignition strategies (such as Al-Khatib, 2006; Suzuki, 2009; Tillitt & Bruder, 1999). Invitation strategies were divided into two major types as follows:

Direct invitation:
1. *Per formative: e.g., "I would like to invite you to dinner next week at my home."*
2. *Declarative: e.g., "We just thought it would be nice to have you over dinner."*
3. *Imperative (suggestion): e.g., "Let's go to our home for lunch."*
4. *Conditional: e.g.," I'm having a party if you want to come."*
5. *Hoping: e.g., "I hope you can come to my party."*

Indirect invitation:
1. *Invitation in the form of Interrogative WH-questions: e.g., "Why do not you come around for a dinner one evening next week?"*
2. *In the form of Interrogative Yes/ No questions: e.g., "Can you come over and join us?"*
3. *Asking willingness: e.g., "Would you like to come to my birthday party in my house?"*

5. Invitation and Politeness

Politeness has been dealt with differently by different scholars. Since politeness has been seen as both a pragma-linguistic phenomenon and a socio-pragmatic

phenomenon, the definitions of politeness vary accordingly from pure linguistic, pure pragmatic, to social-cultural or socio-cognitive. Goffman [21] points out that the term "Invitation" finds a place in the contexts of "politeness" and "face" which is defined as a "social value" and an "image of self" which people claim for themselves.

Leech [22] proposes a 'Pragmatic Principle' whose role is to preserve the social balance and the friendly relationships which enable us to assume that our conversers are being cooperative.

Richards and Schmidts [23] refer to politeness in language study as "(a) how languages express the social distance between speakers and their different role relationships; (b) how face-work, that is, the attempt to establish, maintain and save face during conversation is carried out in a speech community"

Brown and Levinson [7] present the most known theory on politeness. It is centered on the concept of 'face' in order to illustrate politeness in the broad sense. The concept "face" was defined by Goffman [24] as "an image located in the flow of events in the encounter". Brown and Levinson distinguish between two types of 'face': positive face and negative face. They define 'positive face' as "the positive and consistent image people have of themselves, and their desire for approval. On the other hand, 'negative face' is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction".

Kasper [25] suggests a definition of politeness that is based on the notion that "humans make every effort to make their communication more successful and well-mannered." Therefore, she sees that politeness can be achieved by "means of certain conversational strategies that enable the conversers to eradicate danger and reduce resentment.

In Brown and Levinson's face threatening acts theory [7], an invitation itself may constitute a face-threatening act. Therefore, issuing and accepting an invitation place both the inviter's and the invitee's face at risk.

Generally considered as being for the invitee's benefits, the invitation can make the invitee feel good whether he/she accepts or rejects it. The issuing of an invitation shows the inviters' desire to establish, maintain or strengthen the relationship with the invitee(s), or to show their respect and/or considerations for the invitee(s). Inviting is regarded as a consideration of the invitees' positive face; but at the same time, invitations threaten invitee's negative face because they put pressure on him/her, and to let an inviter pursue a course of action that may place an invitee under the inviter's debt.

In a study by Suzuki [26] on "How Politeness Is Controlled in Invitations", she suggests that what the linguists in this field should address is not just whether the language uses of "lay people" are "polite or impolite", nor whether they are "formal or informal" , rather, What should be focused on is in what ways S's consideration is represented differently towards superiors and companions, in connection with politeness and formality.

6. Data Collection & Analysis

Here, an investigation of Iraqi non-departmental students' performance in realizing invitation at both the recognition and production levels is conducted. Also, this investigation involves their abilities to distinguish invitation from other related speech acts such as offers, requests and suggestions. The students' performance is analyzed and discussed as an attempt to come up with findings that are related to the aims and hypotheses of this study.

6.1. Data analysis
6.1.1. Subjects
The subjects involved in this study are twenty students. They are randomly chosen from Department of Dentistry (Third Year, Al-Mustaqbal University College), during the academic year 2019-2020. The age of the subjects ranges between 21-24 years. They are native speakers of Iraqi Arabic. The reason behind choosing the third-year students to be the sample of this study is that they have been exposed on a variety of English topics in their school and university study.

6.1.2. The test
The test consists of two questions. The first question is designed to test the recognition of the students, while the second one is designed to test their production. The items of the test are chosen carefully from different sources. The first question which tests their recognition ability takes the form of multiple-choice items in which the subjects are required to choose the correct choice from a variety of options. The second question which tests the production ability of the students requires them to provide some inviting utterances. In addition to the evaluation role of the production ability of the students, this question will show which type(s) of invitation strategy is/are used more frequently than others.

6.2. Methods of Analysis
6.2.1. Analysis of Part One
Part one of the test can be described as an objective one since its scoring scheme neither depends on the subject himself / herself, nor on the subjective judgment of the scorer. To ensure an objective scoring of the test, a scoring scheme has been adopted. Each participant, in part one, is required to choose only one correct option. However, each test paper is scored out of 100. Scores are equally distributed over the items of part one i.e. the recognition level. Five marks are given to each correct answer and zero mark for the incorrect one. The items that are left without answers by the subjects are also given zero mark because they give the impression that the subjects fail to give the appropriate answer.

Table (2): Distribution of the scores of the test

Number of the Test	Number of the Items	Scores	Percentages
Part One	20	100	100%
Total	20	100	100%

In order to measure the central tendency of subjects, the mean score has been adopted as a statistical device. In this respect, Butler [27] mentions that the mean score is the average subject response to an item. It is formed by adding up the number of the point earned by all subjects for the item, and dividing the total by number of the subjects.

In addition to the scheme which is mentioned in table 2, a rating scale of the candidates' performance at part 1 has been adopted. This scale is based on Al-Hindawy's [28] modified version of Carroll's 1980 scale.

المجلد 28، العدد 6: 2020. مجلة جامعة بابل للعلوم الإنسانية،

Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities, Vol.(28), No.(6): 2020.

Table (3): Assessment Scale of Learners' Recognition Ability
(Al-Hindawy's [25], Modified version)

Band	Learners recognition ability
90-100	Expert User. Accurately understands English system.
80-89	Very Good User. Often approaches bilingual competence.
70-79	Good User. Would cope in most situations in English.
60-69	Competent User. Can cope well with most situations but will have occasional misunderstanding.
50-59	Modest User. Manages in general to communicate but often has inaccurate understandings.
40-49	Marginal User. Is not easy to communicate with.
30-39	Extremely Limited User. Receptive skills do not allow continuous communication.
20-29	Intermittent User. Understanding occurs only sporadically.
0-19	Non-User. Uncertain recognition of which type of language is being used.

The results of the subjects at this level are rendered into percentages which are then compared with each other.

6.2.2. Analysis of Part Two

The model of strategies of invitation in page (9) is used for analyzing the type of strategies adopted by the subjects in their utterances. The results of the performance of the learners are then rendered into percentages.

6.3. Data Analysis

6.3.1. Analysis of Part One: Subject's Recognition of invitation

Table (4) shows how the subjects recognize invitation which is expressed by the model of the eight strategies (types) which is mentioned in page (9). Recognizing the intended meaning of invitation requires full understanding of the contextual factors.

Table (4): Subjects' performance at the recognition Level

Item No.	No. of correct item	Percentage	No. of incorrect item	Percentage
1	11	37 %	19	63 %
2	11	37 %	19	63 %
3	3	10 %	27	90 %
4	10	34 %	20	66 %
5	9	30 %	21	70 %
6	6	20 %	24	80 %
7	10	34 %	20	66 %
8	21	70 %	9	30 %
9	14	46 %	16	54 %
10	12	40 %	18	60 %
Total	107	35,8 %	193	64,2 %

In the item (3), the percentage of the correct answers are between 10%. Therefore, they are non-users as found in the scale of learners' recognition ability. This percentage is too low, the reason might be because they could not differentiate between this kind of invitation from other related speech acts.

In items (9) and (10) which are expressed by the imperative, the percentage was between 40-46%, so they are marginal user as the scale shows. They might recognize invitation from the situation and its features.

In items (1), (2), (4), (5) and (7) the percentage was 30-37%. This percentage is low which means that they are extremely limited users. The reason might be because the utterances have been introduced without any facial expressions, tone and laughing. 20% of students answered the utterance in the item (6) correctly. This percentage is very low; they are intermittent users because they didn't realize this strategy of expressing invitation. While in item (8), the percentage was 70 % which means that they are good users.

The overall performance of the subjects in the recognition part is 35.8% and that puts them under the heading of extremely limited users. This means that the second hypothesis is confirmed which says that they do not differentiate between invitation and other related speech acts.

6.3.2. Analysis of Part Two: Subjects Production of invitation

The data obtained by part two reveal that a wide range of strategies is employed by the learners in their attempt to issue inviting utterances. Subjects tend to use specific types of strategies than others.

Table (5): Subjects' Percentage of Using Strategies of Invitation

Sit. No.	Per.	Dec.	Imp.	Con.	Hop.	Wh.Q.	Yes/No Q.	Willingness	Other stra.
1	2%	4%	42%	0%	0%	4%	23%	23%	2%
2	0%	2%	75%	2%	0%	2%	14	4%	1%
3	1%	0%	81%	2%	0%	0%	12%	2%	2%
4	4%	0%	25	2%	0%	15%	27%	26%	0%
5	1%	1%	48%	4%	0%	8%	25%	13%	0%
6	8%	2%	30%	2%	2%	10%	30%	12%	4%
7	4%	13%	25%	0%	0%	7%	29%	22%	2%
8	10%	16%	35%	4%	0%	0%	20%	14%	1%
9	27%	5%	35%	6%	0%	0%	17%	10%	0%
10	9%	18%	26%	2%	0%	0%	35%	10%	0%
Total	6.6%	6.1%	42.2%	2.4%	0.2%	4.6%	23.2%	13.6%	0.7%

The model mentioned in page (9) is used for analyzing the types of strategies adopted by the subjects as follow:

Sit (1): in this situation, (42%) of the participants preferred to invite others in the form of Yes/ No questions, which is the highest percentage in this situation. The reason might be because they use such strategy in the Iraqi Arabic language.

However, the yes/no question and willingness are used by only 23% of subjects and only 4% of subjects chose the strategies of declarative and Wh-questions, while only 2% of the participants favored the form of performative using some politeness markers, such as "please".

In addition, 2% of learners used a new strategy which depends on a comparison with other people or things. The researcher names it "comparative invitation".

Sit (2): Here 75% of the subjects used the imperative in inviting people of equal status, while the percentage of using yes/no question is 14% and 4% for willingness. Declarative, conditional and Wh-questions strategies were equally used by the participants (2%) for each. These are very low percentages because the learners rarely use such strategies in their native language. On the other side, 5% of the subjects use the new strategy (comparative strategy).

In Iraqi community, people are known for their generosity especially when it comes to sharing something to eat, they prefer to be direct to show strong relationships and familiarity. This might be a sufficient justification for preferring the imperative.

Sit (3): According to Table 5, it appears that the maximum number of participants (81%) favored to invite in the form of imperative. Moreover, only 12% of participants used the form of Yes/No questions when they invite others of lower social status. In this situation only 1% preferred to invite in the form of performative and also 2% for used conditional and willingness strategies.

This situation shows that the speaker is socially higher than the listener but they are familiar to each other. Iraqi students favored the form of imperative in which is understood as an order. Once again, the students exhibit a negative transfer of their mother language.

Sit (4): The use of the strategies varies with the imperative, yes/no questions, wh-questions and willingness. The percentage of employing these structures is as follows: the imperative (25 %), the wh-question scores (15 %), the yes/no question score (27 %), the willingness score (26 %), performative score (4 %), and (2%) for the declarative.

It should be noted that the speaker has more power than the listener and they are not familiar to each other. The students demonstrate a kind of negative mother language transfer when addressing a low unfamiliar person.

Sit (5): Here, 48% of the subjects used the imperative strategy which means that they use this strategy with people whom they know well. 25% used the yes/no question and 13% used the willingness strategy. The wh-question got a high percentage (8%) in comparison with other situations. 4% of the participants preferred the conditional strategy while the performative and declarative got 1% each.

According to the answers given, it can be seen that Iraqi students tend to use a variety of strategies when they are familiar with each other, in time the direct invitation strategy is still dominant.

Sit (6): A variety of strategies have been used in this situation. The highest percentages were recorded with the imperative and the yes/no question strategies with 30% for each. The lowest one, however, was noticed in the declarative, conditional and hoping with 2 % for each. The hoping strategy has been used for the first time in this situation which means that some students are aware of such very uncommon strategy. Other strategies have also been employed by the students (4 %), which is the highest percentage as far as this type is concerned. In addition to the comparative strategy observed in their responses, another one has been noticed which is based on showing bad sides of something else.

Sit (7): The number and percentage of the students' responses to the situations they were given could be distributed between almost the majority of the strategies: 29 % of the students used the yes/no question and 25 % of them used the imperative, whereas 22 % of the students used the willingness strategy. The use of the remaining strategies has been distributed as follows: 13 % for the declarative, 7 % for the wh-question, 4 % for the performative and 2 % for other strategies.

Sit (8) As shown in Table 5, 35% of the participants favored to make invitation in the form of imperative. In addition, 20% of them used the form of Yes/No questions to invite their friends. It appears also that 16 % of the participants preferred the declarative strategy to invite their classmates. Iraqi EFL students tend to use the strategy of performative with 10% of their responses and 14% decided to choose the form of asking willingness. In this situation, as with others before, the speaker and the

المجلد 28، العدد 6: 2020. مجلة جامعة بابل للعلوم الإنسانية،

Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities, Vol.(28), No.(6): 2020.

hearer are equal and familiar to each other. Again, the participant preferred to be direct when inviting others of the same social status.

Sit (9): different invitation strategies were used by Iraqi EFL students as seen in table (5) above. It looks that 35 % of the students preferred to invite in the form of imperative and 27 % in the form of performative. Only 17 % of the participants chose the form of Yes/No questions in this situation. The form of asking willingness to invite has been used by only 10% of the participants. The rest of the partakers chose the form of declarative 5%.

Sit (10) The yes/no question got the highest percentage 35 %, whereas the conditional scored 2 % which is the lowest percentage in this situation. As observed in table (9), 18 % of Iraqi students chose the declarative when inviting their teacher. The imperative strategy on the other hand, has been used by 26 % of the participants. The use of the politeness marker "please" has been used a lot in this situation. The participants also made use of willingness and the performative with 10% and 9 % respectively.

It seems that Iraqi non-departmental students used a variety of strategies in their attempt to issue invitation, though some are not appropriate pragmatically and linguistically. They think that using the interrogative form of making an invitation without any politeness marker is enough to soften the force of the utterance. This is in line with the first hypothesis which has been confirmed.

7. Conclusions

Iraqi EFL students have exhibited a pragma-linguistic lack because they use more direct strategies in performing invitation which call for conventional indirectness. Therefore, Iraqi EFL students should be taught the socio-pragmatic and pragma-linguistic rules and differences between English and Arabic in order to avoid the rules of their mother tongue when expressing intention in the other culture. Students have to be aware that being direct with native speakers of English may cause misunderstanding. The conclusions introduced in the next two sections are related to the students' performance in part(recognition) and part two (production).

7.1. Recognition

1) Iraqi non-departmental students managed to recognize direct strategies better than the indirect ones. That is why realizing speech acts is thought to be an essential component of language learners' grammatical and social knowledge

2) Most of students could identify some types of invitation easily such as imperative, yes/no questions and willingness, but they could not detect some other types such as hoping and conditionals because they don't have such types in their mother language.

3) Most of the students failed to separate between invitations, offers and requests when they are produced by interrelated strategies. Context plays a crucial role in differentiating similar speech acts.

4) Regarding Al-Hindawy's scale of learners' recognition ability, as a total range the learners are considered very weak since they could not reach even the level of the modest user. Therefore, the second hypothesis is confirmed that they cannot differentiate between invitation and its neighbors.

7.2. Production

The learners' performance at this level leads to the following conclusions:

1) The Iraqi non-departmental students preferred to be direct in issuing invitation in using the strategies of imperative and yes/no questions more than the others because they already have such strategies in their own mother language, the thing

that is taken as acceptable in Iraqi society. Yet, the other strategies are also less frequently used by them. It can be said that the first hypothesis is confirmed as they have done good performance regarding the production level

2) Some of the students used a strategy which does not exist in the model. The researcher adopts this strategy as a new one and names it the **comparative strategy**, the participants used this strategy to produce invitation utterances by comparing the thing that he invites the hearer for with other things.

3) The students preferred to use some strategies more than others as the percentage of using the imperative is 42 % and the yes-no question percentage is 23%. These are considered high percentages in relation to others. Therefore, the third hypothesis is confirmed.

4) It has also been noted that some participants tried to translate the utterances in their mother tongue into the target language without thinking of the sentence pattern and word order differences between the two languages. This often leads to miscommunication in the target language because of the negligence of the foreign culture.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS
There are no conflicts of interest

References

[1] E. Olshtain and A.D. Cohen, "Apology: A Speech Act Set", in N. Wolfson E. Judd(eds). *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition'*, pp.18-35. Rowley, MA: Newbury,1983.

[2] B. Fraser, "The Domain of Pragmatic", in J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 29-59). New York: Longman,1983

[3] N. Wolfson, "Invitations, Compliments, and the Competence of the Native Speaker", *International Journal f Psycholinguistics*, vol.24, no. 5, pp. 7-22, 1981.

[4] G. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1983.

[5] J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: University Press Oxford,1962

[6] J. Searle, *An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969

[7] P. Brown, and L. Stephen, *Politeness: SomeUniversals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press, 1987.

[8] O. Boumeester, *Economic Advice and Rhetoric: Why do Consultants Perform Better than Academic Advisors*? Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2010.

[9] J. Thomas, *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1995

[10] D. Hymes, "*On Communicative Competence*", in J. Pride, and J. Holmes(eds) *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

[11] G. Yule, *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press,1996.

[12] S. Blum-Kulka,"Learning How to Say What You Yean in Second Language: A Study of Speech Act Performance of Learners of Hebrew as a Second Language". *Applied Linguistics* vol.3, no. 1, pp. 29 -59, 1982.

[13] K. Billmyer, "I Really Like Your Lifestyle: ESL Learners Learning How to Compliment", *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics,* vol. 6, no.2, pp. 31-48, 1990.

[14] J. Searle, *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

[15] N. Wolfson, "An Empirically Based Analysis of Complimenting Behavior in American English". In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 82-95, 1983.

[16] H. Al-Darraji et al, "Cultural Values Underlying Speech Act of Inviting: The Case of Iraqi EFL Speakers", *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, vol.4, no. 8, pp.1051-1057, 2013.

[17] M. Geis, *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849805117[18] H. Clark and E. Isaacs, "Ostensible Invitations", *Language in Society, vol.* 19, no. 4, pp. 493-509, Dec. 1990.

[19] T. Suzuki, (2009) "How do American University Students Invite Others? A Corpus-Based Study of Linguistic Strategies for the Speech Act of Invitation", *11ᵗʰ Annual Conference of Pragmatics Society in Japan*, 2008.

[20] Y. Al Marraniand N. Suraih, "Invitation Strategies as Produced by Yemeni EFL Learners", *Applied Linguistics Research Journal ALR Journal*, vol.3, no. 2, pp.15–34 , 2019.

[21] E. Goffman, *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

[22] G. Leech, *Prinsip-PrinsipPragmatik*. (terjemahan) M.D.D. Oka. Jakarta: PenerbitUniversitas Indonesia, 1993.

[23] J. RichardsandR. Schmidt, *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman, 2010.

[24] E. Goffman, *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

[25] G. Kasper, "Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues",*Journal of Pragmatics*, vol.14, no.2, pp. 193-217, 1990.

[26] T. Suzuki, "How Politeness Is Controlled in Invitations, Their Acceptances and Refusals in English: A Case Study in the U.K", *The Cultural Review (Waseda Commercial Studies Association)*, no.47, pp. 69-87, 2015.

[27] C. Butler, *Statistics in Linguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995.

[28] F. AL-Hindawi, "Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of the Speech Acts of Commands and Requests". *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. Baghdad: University of Baghdad, 1999.

Appendix
Part One: Recognition
Read the following situations carefully and choose what you believe to be the intended meaning by the given utterances.

Situation	Utterance	meaning
A friend of yours is very desperate about his daily routine. You wanted to take him out of this mood, you said:	Would you like to come over and watch a movie?	a. Suggestion b. Request c. Invitation
You meet one of your classmates at the bus stop. You are talking about your birthday party. You say to your friend:	Amanda, I am having a Birthday party next weekend	a. Invitation b. Warning c. Suggestion
You are talking to you cousin on the phone. You said:	My graduation is this Saturday at three o'clock.	a. Advice b. Invitation c. Suggestion
You are talking to your teacher after the class. You said:	It is my pleasure to invite you to join us in our party.	a. Promising b. Offering c Invitation
A lovely director who is having a party tonight addresses his secretary:	Lisa, do you want to come and stay at my home tonight?	a. Questioning b. Suggestion c. Invitation
You and your friends are playing tennis and feel very exhausted. The shop next to you sells very tasty and cold drink. You address the group:	Come and have drinks with me.	a. Commanding b. Invitation c. Offering
You see the instructor working in the library very late in the evening. The instructor looks hungry. You say:	Can you go with me to get a lunch at a restaurant?	a. Invitation b. Offering c. Questioning
You have a big party next week. You accidently see your boss at the supermarket. You say:	I hope you can come to my party.	a. Promising b. Invitation c. Requesting
You are having a group video call with you friends. You say:	How about watching the match at my home?	a. Questioning b. Requesting c. Inviting
You are writing an email your old professor at Baghdad University. You say:	We would be honored if you came and spoke at our event.	a. Requesting b. Offering c. Inviting

Part Two: Production
Imagine that you are in real life and you would give suggestions in the following situations. Read these situations carefully and write down what you would say in English. (Please try to use different expressions).
Situation 1
You are sitting and eating some cakes in the bus. A man/woman sitting next to you seems so hungry. You want to invite him/her for a cake. What would you say?
Situation 2
You are eating lunch in a college cafeteria. Some of your classmates are coming. What would you say to invite your friends to eat together?

Situation 3

Suppose you are mother/father. You want to ask your children to sit down and have breakfast. What would you say?

Situation 4

You are a boss. An applicant comes to your company for an interview. S/he looks very thirsty. You want to invite him/her for cup of drink. What would you say?

Situation 5

You and your colleagues are sitting in front of the English Department. You are sharing a speech. One of your colleague's students is coming. You want to invite him to share you. What would you say?

Situation 6

You and your male neighbor have a short conversation about the game you watched last night on TV. You want to invite him to come over sometime and watch a game with you. What would you say?

Situation 7

You are preparing to go on a trip to Aden. You want to invite your friend to join you. What would you say?

You have a birthday party with a specific time. You want to invite your close friend to join it. What would you say?

Situation 9

You are the boss of a big company. You want to invite the staff to get a lunch at a restaurant. What would you say?

Situation 10

At the end of the course, your class holds a party. You would like to invite your teacher to join your party. What would you say?