العنوان:	Ritual of Politeness: Linguistic Study of Invitation Making in the New Valley Governorate Society
المصدر:	المجلة العلمية لكلية التربية
الناشـر:	جامعة الوادي الجديد - كلية التربية
المؤلف الرئيسي:	Zanquoor, Safe El-Nasr Saleh
المجلد/العدد:	ع7
محكمة:	نعم
التاريخ الميلادي:	2012
الشـهر:	أغسطس
الصفحات:	1 - 50
رقم MD:	1157812
نوع المحتوى:	بحوث ومقالات
اللغة:	Arabic
قواعد المعلومات:	EduSearch
مواضيع:	الأدب العربي، الدراسات اللغوية، اللغة الاجتماعية، اللغة والاجتماع
رابط:	http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1157812

عملية صياغة الدعوة وقبولها هي عملية ليست عشوائية ولكنها عملية تحكمها عوامل
المجتمع وظروفه.

وأخيراً أظهرت هذه الدراسة أن الاستراتيجيات تتقسم إلي استراتيجيات للقبول واستراتيجيات
للرفض. .

أنماط التأدب:

دراسة لغوية - اجتماعية لأساليب صياغة الدعوة إلي المناسبات في مجتمع محافظة الوادي الجديد

ملخص الدراسة :

إن الهدف الرئيسي لهذه الدراسة هو استجلاء الكيفية والأساليب والاستراتيجيات التي يستخدمها المتحدثون في مجتمع محافظة الوادي الجديد في صياغة الدعوة كأحد الممارسات اللغوية بين بعضهم بعضاً . وبالإضافة إلي ذلك تحاول هذه الدراسة البحث عن إجابة للأسئلة التالية:

١) ما الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة من قبل العينة المستطلعة آراؤهم من سكان مجتمع الوادي الجديد الذين أجريت عليهم هذه الدراسة في بعض مواقف صياغة الدعوة وقبولها؟

٢) ما المعايير الحاكمة لاستخدام هذه الأساليب والأنماط والاستراتيجيات في صياغة وقبول الدعوة بين سكان المنطقة موضع الدراسة؟

٣) هل ثمة دور فاعل لبعض العوامل الاجتماعية مثل المرحلة العمرية والمكانة الاجتماعية والعلاقة بين المتحدثين(مثل المماثلة والسلطة وكذلك الثقافة السائدة في المجتمع) في صياغة أساليب واستراتيجيات توجيه الدعوة وقبولها؟

لقد خلصت هذه الدراسة من بين ما خلصت إلي الدور الفاعل الذي تلعبه متغيرات مثل المرحلة العمرية وجنس المتحدث والمخاطب بالإضافة إلي العلاقة الاجتماعية التي تربطهما وكذلك ثقافة المجتمع في اختيار أنماط وأساليب توجيه الدعوة وقبولها بين المتحدثين في المنطقة موضوع الدراسة. بالإضافة إلي ذلك فإن هذه الدراسة أظهرت أن

-*?ana gay ?açzimak.*
Translation : (I come to invite you).

-yareet tišarrafna çala...
Translation : (I wish you do us the honor for....).

- inta (intu) awal ?ilma çzumiin.
Translation :(you are the first one to come).

- ?iħna ?ahl çašan keda lazim tukuun awal wahid ħadir.
Translation : (we are one family so you should be the first one to come).

-billahi çaliikum tišarrafuna.
Translation : (By Allah do us the honor of attending).

- çugbaal çind awladk ?inšalla.
Translation :(it is your sons' turn, Allah willing)

- ?ana jay ?açzimak wi çeeb çaleek tiguul la.
Translation : (I come to invite you, it is shame on you to deny my invitation)..

- mumkin titfadalu witiiju Jawaaz binti yoom ?gommça ?ijjaaya.
Translation : (Could you please come to my daughter's wedding party next Friday?).

-?ana gay açzemek çala ?elçaša fil Nadi .
Translation : (I invite you for dinner in the club).

- *šukran xaliiha marra tanyeh inšaillah.*
Translation : (Thank you, next time Allah willing).
- *maçalaš ?iljayaat ?aktar.*
Translatoion : (It is ok, the coming are more)

- *?inšalla fil?afraaħ.*
Translation : (Allah willing, on other happy occasions).

- *çamar inšalla.*
Translation: (On more happy occasions, Allah willing).

- *yajçaluh çamir ?inshallah.*
translation: (It the inviter's home) is always inhabited by its owners, Allah
willing)

- *?inshallah ?iða manšayalit.*
Translation: (Allah willing, if I were not busy).

- *maqdariš ?awçd bas ha ?açmal kul juhdi.*
Translation: (I cannot promise, but I'll do my best).

- ya Ahmed ?ana çazmak çalaa ?l çašaa.
Translation (Ahmed ! I invite you for dinner.).

- ya Ali beeh ihna taalçiin riħlah bukrah, mumkin tišarrafna.
Translation (Your Excellency Mr. Ali, we are going on a trip, could you
kindly come with us).

- *ya reet ya ?afandim siyadtak tišarrafna witihdar munaqšit risaalit
?ildoktooraah bitaÇti.*
Translation: (Master, I wish Your Honor would attend the defense of my
Ph.D. dissertation).

- *ya beeh hankuun suÇada law hadritak šarraftina filbeit wiXadt
?lÇaša maÇaana.*
Translation : (*beeh*, we'd be delighted if you came and had dinner with
us at home).

Generosity).

- *?alf mabruuk.*
Translation: (A thousand of congratulations).

- *dayman inšhallah.*
 Translation: (It will be always available in your house, Allah willing).

- *yajçaluh çaamir ?inshallah*
translation: (It the inviter's home) is always inhabited by its owners, Allah willing)

- *çala baraket illaah.*
translation: (Allah bless your occasion).

 -*šukran jaziilan, ?aasif wallah.*
 Translation: (Thank you very much, But I am sorry).

- *yeslamu ?ideek wallah ?ana ?aasif yareet ?qdar.*
Translation: (Allah bless your hands, by Allah I wish I could).
- *?ana mašyuul χaalis.*
Translation: (I am so busy).

- *yareet ?ana mašyuul fil ?imtihanaat.*
 translation: (I wish I could, but I am so busy with the exams).

- *samihni maçalaš.*
Translation: (I am sorry , forgive me).

Appendix 5:
Some selected responses used by the participants of the current study:

- *šukran jaziilan.*
translation:(Thank you very much).

- *šukran baarak allah fiik.*
Translation:(Thank you, may Allah bless you)

- *ʔana waħad minkum wimiš çaawiz çuzuumah.*
Translation:(I am one of you, I need not be invited)

- *ʔilbeet betna*
Translation:(Your home is ours)-(Indicating a great deal of solidarity).

- *da yoom ʔilmona*
    translation: (This is the day we are looking for)-(i.e. Indicating he will
    Accept the invitation)

- *ʔakiid jayya laʔinu ʔana farħana.*
translation: (Sure I am coming, I am so happy for that).

- *Wallah ʔana tayer min-ilfaraħa.*
translation: (By Allah I feel myself flying because I am so happy).

- *ʔinta ʔabu ʔilkaram.*
Translation: (you are very generous).

- *ʔinti ʔom ʔilkaram*
Translation: (you are very generous).

- *ʔinto ʔ ahil ʔilkaram.*
Translation: (You are the people of

4)

Situation 5:

You want to invite your boss to your daughter's wedding
party. What do you say ?

1)

2)

3)

4)

Situation 6:

You want to invite your fiancé to dinner outdoors. What do
you say?

1)

2)

3)

4)

Situation 7:

You want to invite some of your friends to play football. What
do you say?

1)

2)

3)

4)

Situation 8:

You want to invite the dean of the faculty to your defense.
What do you say?

1)

2)

3)

4)

Appendix 4:
Situation 1:
You want to invite some of your friends / neighbors to your
son's / daughter's wedding party next Thursday, what would
you say?
1)
2)
3)
4)

Situation 2:
You want to invite one of your friends / neighbors to dinner at
home. What do you say ?
1)
2)
3)
4)

Situation 3:
You want to invite your boss to your son's / daughter's
graduation day party. What do you say?
1)
2)
3)
4)

Situation 4 :
As a school principal, you want to invite the director of the
educational zone to the school party? What do you say?
1)
2)
3)

تريد توجيه الدعوة لبعض أصدقائك للذهاب إلي النادي للعب كرة القدم، ماذا ستقول ؟

(١

(٢

(٣

(٤

الموقف الثامن :

تريد توجيه الدعوة لعميد الكلية لحضور مناقشة رسالة الدكتوراه الخاصة بك ، ماذا تقول ؟

(١

(٢

(٣

(٤

(١
(٢
(٣
(٤

الموقف الرابع :

أنت مدير / مديرة مدرسة وقررت أن تقيم حفلاً بمناسبة بدء العام الدراسي ، و أردت أن توجه الدعوة إلي مدير الإدارة التعليمية لحضور هذا الحفل. ماذا ستقول ؟

(١
(٢
(٣
(٤

الموقف الخامس:

سيتم عقد قران ابنتك الأسبوع القادم ، وأردت أن توجه الدعوة إلي رئيسك في العمل لحضور عقد القران ، ماذا ستقول ؟

(١
(٢
(٣
(٤

الموقف السادس :

تريد دعوة خطيبك / خطيبتك لتناول العشاء معك خارج المنزل. ماذا ستقول؟

(١
(٢
(٣
(٤

الموقف السابع :

Appendix 3:

استبانة :

استبانة عن استخدام اللغة في توجيه الدعوة.

من فضلك ، تخيل نفسك في المواقف التالية وأجب علي كل موقف من هذه المواقف بإجابة واحدةأو أكثر (سواءً بالقبول أو الرفض أو الاعتذار) في الفراغات التي تلي كل موقف ، ويمكنك ألا تكتب أي إجابة إذا كنت تعتقد أن أياً من هذه المواقف لا يتطلب أية إجابة.

الموقف الأول :

ستقيم حفل زفاف لنجلك / نجلتك يوم الخميس القبل ، وتود توجيه الدعوة إلي عدد من الجيران والأصدقاء ، ماذا تقول ؟ وما هو ردك إذا قام أحد من أصدقائك أو جيرانك بتوجيه هذه الدعوة إليك؟.

(١)

(٢)

(٣)

(٤)

الموقف الثاني :

أردت توجيه دعوة لقريب / صديق لك علي العشاء في منزلك ، ماذا ستقول؟ وما هو ردك إذا وجه هو / وجهت هي إليك هذه الدعوة ؟

(١)

(٢)

(٣)

(٤)

الموقف الثالث :

أردت توجيه الدعوة إلي رئيسك في العمل لحضور حفل تخرج ابنك / ابنتك ، ماذا ستقول ؟ وما هو ردك إذا وجه هو / هي إليك هذه الدعوة؟

/k/ a voiceless velar stop
/l/ a voiced alveolar lateral
/m/ a voiced bilabial nasal
/n/ a voiced alveolar nasal
/h/ a voiceless glottal fricative
/w/ a voiced bilabial round glide
/y/ a voiced palatal glide

Appendix 2:
Number of participants by profession in the current study

Employees	5	5
Profession	Group1	Group2
	Males	Females
Total	50	50
Teachers	15	15
University lecturers	4	4
Graduate Students	6	6
Ungraduate students	8	8
Engineers	2	2
High school graduates	10	10

Wong, S.M.L. (2004). "*Imperatives in Requests: Direct or Impolite – observations from Chinese*". Pragmatics (4),491-515.

Appendix 1:

List of Phonemic Symbols

The IPA symbols are used in transcribing the data collected

Vowels:

/a/ front open

/ɑ/ back open

/i/ front, mid to half-close spread

/e/ front, mid to half-close spread

/u/ back half-close rounded

/o/ back mid to half-close rounded

Consonants:

/ ʔ / a low voiceless glottal stop

/b/ a voiced bilabial stop

/t/ a voiced alveo-dental stop

/j/ a voiced alveo-palatal affricate

/h/ a voiceless pharyngeal fricative

/ χ / a voiceless uvular fricative

/d/ a voiced alveo-dental stop

/r/ a voiced alveolar trill

/z/ a voiced alveolar fricative

/s/ a voiceless alveolar fricative

/ʃ/ a voiceless alveo-palatal fricative

/s̲/ a voiceless emphatic alveolar fricative

/d̲/ a voiced emphatic alveolar fricative

/Ṭ/ a voiceless emphatic dental plosive

/d̲/ a voiced emphatic denti-alveolar

/ʕ/ a voiced pharyngeal fricative

/ɣ/ a voiced uvular fricative

/f/ a voiceless labio-dental fricative

/q/ a voiceless uvular stop

/g/ a voiced velar stop

Salmani-Nodoushan, M.A. (2006*)."A Comparative Socio-
pragmatic Study of Ostensible Invitations in English and
Farsi"'*. Speech Communication 48:903-912.

Saville-Trokie, Muriel (1997). *"The Ethnography of
Communication: An Introduction"*. Oxford: Blackwell
Publishing.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.(2008) *"Intercultural
Communication: A discourse approach"*. Oxford:Blackwell
Publishing.

Searle, J. (1965). *"What is a speech act?"*. In P.P. Gigloli (Ed.),
Language and Social Context (PP. 136-154) Harmonds worth,
England: Penguin Books.

Searle , J. (1969). *"Speech Acts: An essay in the philosophy of
language"*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.

Searle, J. (1975). *"Indirect Speech Acts"*. In P.Cole & J.
Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Vol.3: Speech acts (PP.
59-82). New York.

Smith, G. (2000). *"Women in Charge : Politeness and
Directives in the Speech of Japanese Women"*. Language in
Society, "21,59-82".

Tseng, M.F.(1999) . *"An examination of Chinese Invitational
Discourse : How Chinese Accept an Invitation"*. Studies in the
Linguistic Sciences, 26(1-2)341-356.

Wierzbicka, A. (2001)." *Different Cultures, Different
Languages, Different speech act: Polish vs. English"*. Journal
of Pragmatics, (9), 145-178.

Wolfson, N., D'Amico-Reisner, L. & Hubber, L. (1983). "*How
to Arrange for Social Commitments in American English:
The Invitation"*. In Wolfson, Nessa & Judd, Elliot (eds.)
Sociolinguistics and language Acquisition. PP-116-128.
Cambridge Newbury House Publishers.

Garcia, C.(1999). "*The Three Stages of Venzuelan Invitation
and Responses*". Multingua 18(4), 391-433.
Grice, H.P. (1975) "*Logic and Conversation*". In A.J.
Hatch, E. M. (1978). "*Discourse Analysis And Second
Language Acquisition*". in Second Language Acquisition. ed.
E. M. Hatch, pp. 401-435. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Holmes, Gannet (1990). "*Apologies in New Zealand English*"
.Language in Society (19)155-199.
Holmes, G. (1993)." *New Zealand women are good to talk to:
An Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Interaction*". Journal
of pragmatics "20:191-116".
Isaacs, E.A.& Clarck, H.H.(1990). "*Ostensible Invitations*".
Language in Society,19, -493-509.
Kachru, Yamuna (1997). "*Cultural meaning and Rhetorical
styles : Toward a Framework for Contrastive Rhetoric*". In
G. Cook Principle & practice in Applied Linguistics, pp 101-
185. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Murni .M. (2008). "*Politeness in Bugies*". A Ph.D. Thesis.
Canberra: The Austeralian National University.
Nelson, G, el-Bakary, W. & Albatal, M. (1993). "*Egyptian and
American Compliments : Across-cultural study*".
International Journal of Intercultural relations, 17(3), 293-
313.
Reiter, R. M. (2003)." *Linguistic politeness in Britain and
Uruguay : A contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies*".
Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin publishing
company.

generation (among other sectors in the area in question) which may not be revealed in this study.

In conclusion, the results of this study cannot be generalized because of the socio-linguistic nature of the area in question, Moreover, the sample of this study is small and taken from one sector of the concerned society. (i.e. the educated speakers of the New Valley governorate society).

References

Austin, J.L.(1962). *"How to do things with words"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G.(1989). *"Cross-Cultural Pragmatics : Requests and apologies"*. Norwood, N.J., Ablex.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.(1978). *"Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena"*. In E.N. Goody (Ed.), Qustions and Politeness: Strategies in Social interactions (PP.56-289) Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Brown, P. and Levinson L. (1987). *"Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use"*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. (2003*) "Speech Acts"*. In S.L. Mckay & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.) Sociolinguistics and Language teaching (PP. 383-420). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

El-Khatib, M.A.(2009). *"The Pragmatics of Invitation Making, and Acceptance in Jordanian society"*. Journal of Language and Linguistics 5(2):272-294.

Farghal, M. & El-Khatib, M. (2001)." *Jordanian students' responses to compliments: A pilot study"*; Journal of Pragmatics 33:1485-1502.

- ya Ali beeh ihna taalɛiin riħlah bukrah, mumkin tišarrafna.
Translation (Your Excellency Mr. Ali, we are going on a trip,
could you kindly come with us).

This result (i.e. the impact of power and solidarity on the
selection of invitation making, declining, and accepting
strategies) is consistent with the findings of some previous
studies (e.g. Reiter (2003), Smith (2000), and Brown &
Levinson (1987).

Conclusion :

In the current study, an attempt has been made to shed light
on the major strategies in invitation making, declining, and
accepting used by a sample of 100 educated participants in the
New Valley governorate society.

Also, an attempt has been made in this study to explore the
crucial conventions which determine the use of these
strategies in this concerned society. The results of this study
show the fundamental impact of Islamic teachings, age,
gender of the speakers in this area, power, and solidarity in
determining the choice of the strategies of invitation making,
declining and acceptance.

The findings of this study are consistent with previous studies
such as (e.g. Reiter (2003), Smith (2000), and Brown &
Levinson (1987), which emphasize the outstanding role of
many variables such as gender, age, power and solidarity in
determining the choice and application of strategies of some
speech acts such as apology, greetings, and invitation making.

In light of the results of this study , one may argue that future
research is still required to detect the other factors that may
affect invitation making and acceptance in this new

or even rejecting the invitation. In using almost every strategy of accepting, declining, or rejecting an invitation, the females group recorded a higher percentage than that of the males group (e.g. thanking and appreciating strategy recorded 44% for females group while it is 34% for males group) , (and recorded 24%for females group but 17% for males group in the choice of asking for forgiveness strategy). This may validate Holmes' suggestion (1993) that women accept more invitations, but reject and decline ones less than men do. Also, the researcher of the current study observed that older people of this sample (males and females) are less likely to reject an invitation than the younger ones did. This could be interpreted in light of the fact that older people in this society are quite aware of their role as guardians of their society's values and cultural norms. Consider this example:

a) ?ana waħad minkum wimiš çaawiz çuzuumah.
Translation:(I am one of you, I need not be invited)

Also, the analysis of the results of this study shows that social distance, and social power seem to play an influential role in determining the choice of the invitation strategies among the sample of this study. When both speakers and hearers have equal status and share high familiarity, they tend to use more solidarity strategies. On the contrary, when the hearers are of a higher social status than the speakers, the latter use more deference politeness strategies which reflect the social power of the hearers. Consider these examples:
- ya Ahmed ?ana çazmak çalaa ?l çašaa.
Translation (Ahmed ! I invite you for dinner.).

invitation is socially and culturally seen as an improper act, or can be seen as a face threatening act for the inviters.

Related to the question whether or not age, gender of speakers , power and solidarity determine the choice of strategies in invitation making, declining or accepting, the results of this study show that solidarity plays a vital role in determining the choice and even the phraseology of invitation making among the speakers of this area. Mostly, the speakers of this area prefer to invite others , accept or even decline the invitations by using more implicit strategies which signal rapport through similarity and closeness. The use of this solidarity politeness strategies emphasizes and strengthens the bonds of friendship. One may argue that solidarity is one of the features characteristic of the New Valley governorate society culture. Being a request, the speech act of inviting serves to imply closeness. Consider these examples:

- ?iħna ?ahl wi miš ħanitçizim.

Translation: (we are like one family and need not an invitation).
the speaker here is just a friend and this indicates that he / she accepts the invitation.

-?ilbeet betna.
Translation: (Your home is ours).

Moreover, just like in many speech communities and societies, the gender of the speakers in the sample of this study seems to be a crucial convention in accepting, declining,

- translation : (Allah willing, on other happy occasions).

- b) çaamar inšalla.
- Translation: (On more happy occasions, Allah willing).

f) Miscellaneous. The percentage for this strategy recorded (30%, males group 12%, females group 18%). Consider these examples:

- ?inshallah ?iða manšayalit.
- Translation: (Allah willing, if I were not busy).

- maqdariš ?awçid bas ha ?açmal kul juhdi.
- Translation: (I cannot promise, but I'll do my best).

In addition, the Islamic teachings and Islamic social culture seem to play a vital role in giving and accepting invitations in this area in question. Influenced by Islamic teachings the speakers in the New Valley governorate give and accept invitations because this is part of the Islamic culture which favors this process as a duty. The Islamic culture values accepting invitations as a way of maintaining solidarity. Therefore, it is recommended that Muslims should give and accept invitations to and from other people especially close neighbors and relatives. This fact is evident, in two of some of the prophet's Traditions when he says : *(?iða duçiitum falabbu)*. Translation (if you are invited, you have to accept), and in his saying *"tahaadu tahaabbu"* .(Exchange gifts exchange love). Socially speaking, the act of refusing an

b)   Justification. The percentage for this strategy
       recorded (20%, males group 8%, and females
       group 12%). Consider these examples:

- *?ana mašγuul χaalis.*
- Translation: (I am so busy).

- *γareet ?ana mašγuul fil ?imtiħanat.*

- Translation: (I wish I could, but I am so busy with
  the exams).

c)   Asking for forgiveness. The percentage for this
       strategy recorded (41%, males group 17%,
       Females group 24%). Consider this examples:
- *samiħni maçalaš.*
- Translation: (I am sorry , forgive me).

d)   Promise of compensation. The percentage for this
       strategy recorded (38%, males group 13%,
       females group 25%). Consider these examples:
- *šukran xaliiha marra tanyeh inšaallh.*
- Translation : (Thank you, next time Allah willing).

- *maçalaš ?iljayyat ?aktar.*
- translatoion : (It's ok, the coming occasions will be
  more).

e)   Offering good wishes and declining. The
       percentage for this strategy recorded (52%, males
       group 20%, females group 32%). Consider these
       examples:
- *a) inšalla fil?afraaħ.*

- *daymen inšhallah.*
- Translation: (It will be always available in your house, Allah willing).

f. Miscellaneous. The percentage for this strategy recorded (80%, male group 34%, female group 46%).

Consider this example:
- *çala baraket illaah.*
- translation: (May Allah bless your occasions).

2) As is seen in Table (2): The next strategies used by the subjects of this study are the declining ones, which include:

    a)   Explicit conventional apology. The percentage for this strategy recorded (36%, male group 16% , and Female group 20%). Consider these examples:

- *šukran jaziilan, ?aasif wallah.*
- Translation: (Thank you very much, But I am sorry).

- *yeslamu ?ideek wallah ?ana ?aasif yareet ?qdar.*

- Translation: (May Allah bless your hands, by Allah I wish I could).

- *Ɂilbeet betna*
- Translation:(Your home is ours).

c. Expressing gladness. The percentage for this strategy recorded (86%, male group 39%, Female group 45%). Consider these examples:

- *da yoom Ɂilmona*
- Translation: (This is the day we are looking for).

- *Ɂ akiid jaya laɁinnu Ɂana farħaana.*
- Translation: (Sure I am coming, I am so happy for that).

d. Complimenting. The percentage for this strategy recorded (89%, male group 41%, female group 48%). Consider these examples:

- *Ɂinta Ɂabu Ɂilkaram.*
- Translation: (you are very generous).

- *Ɂinti Ɂom Ɂilkaram*
- Translation: (you are very generous).

e. Offering good wishes. The percentage for this strategy recorded (84%, males group 38%, females group 46%). Consider these examples:
- *Ɂalf mabruuk.*
- Translation: (A thousand of congratulations).

Discussion:
The main theme of this current study is to explore how the people of the New Valley governorate society (who are rich with their traditional, religious and social systems) apply one of their speech acts and politeness practices (i.e. invitation making and acceptance). Moreover, this paper seeks to answer the questions raised by the study.

Throughout the analysis of the collected data of this study, the following patterns can be established:

1. As for the strategies in invitation making and acceptance, as is seen in Table (1), the participants in this study are found to favor the acceptance strategies more frequently. These acceptance strategies include:

   a. Thanking and appreciation. The percentage for this strategy recorded (78%, male group 34% , and Female group 44%). Consider these two examples:

   - *šukran jaziilan.*
   - translation:(Thank you very much).

   - *šukran baarak allah fiik.*
   - Translation:(Thank you, Allah bless you).

   b. Stressing common ground. The percentage for this strategy recorded (87%, male group 40%, and female group 47%). Consider these two examples:

   - *ʔana waaħad minkum wimiš çaawiz çuzuumah.*
   - Translation:(I am one of you, I need not be invited)

					Translation: (Allah willing, if I were not busy). *b) maqdariš ?awçd bas ha ?açmal kul juhdi.* Translation: (I cannot promise, but I'll do my best).

In addition, as is seen in Table (2), the declining strategies which are used by the participants in this study in invitation making and acceptance include:

Acceptance strategies, and declining ones.

Acceptance strategies include:

a) Explicit conventional apology (36%, male group 16% , and Female group 20%).

b) Justification (20%, male group 8%, and female group 12%).

c) Asking for forgiveness (41%, male group 17%, Female group 24%).

d) Promise of compensation (38%, male group 13%, female group 25%).

e) Offering good wishes and declining (52%, male group 20%, female group 32%).

f) Miscellaneous (30%, male group 12%, female group 18%).

Asking for forgiveness	17	24	41%

a) *samiħni maçalaš.*
Translation: (I am sorry , forgive me).

Promise of compensation	13	25	38%

a) *šukran xaliiha marra tanyeh inšaillah.*
Translation : (Thank you, next time Allah willing).

Table 2 cont.

b) *maçalaš ?iljayaat ?aktar.*
translatoion : (It is ok, the coming are more).

Offering good Wishes and declining	20	32	52%

a) *?inšalla fil?afraaħ.*
translation : (Allah willing, on other happy occasions).

b) *çamar inšalla.*
Translation: (On more happy occasions, Allah willing).

c) *yajçaluh çamir ?inshallah.*
translation: (It the inviter's home) is always inhabited by its owners, Allah willing)

Miscellaneous	12	18	30%

a) *?inshallah ?iða manšayalit.*

f) Miscellaneous (80%, male group 34%, female group
   46%).

Table 2:

Declining strategies used by the participants in this study

declining strategies	Group1 (number50) Males	Group2 (number50) Females	Total Number of Frequencies %	Examples
Conventional apology (explicit)	16	20	36%	a) *šukran jaziilan, ?aasif wallah.* Translation: (Thank you very much, But I am sorry). b) *yeslamu ?ideek wallah ?ana ?aasif yareet ?qdar.* Translation: (Allah bless your hands, by Allah I wish I could).
Justification	8	12	20%	a) *?ana mašyuul xaalis.* Translation: (I am so busy). b) *yareet ?ana mašyuul fil ?imtihanaat.* translation: (I wish I could, but I am so busy with the exams).

				translation: (It the inviter's home) is always inhabited by its owners, Allah willing)
	Table 1 cont.			
Miscellaneous	34	46	80%	
				a) çala baraket illaah. translation: (Allah bless your occasion).

Examining the results of this study as seen in Table (1) , it has been detected that the main strategies of invitation making and acceptance used by the participants of this study can be listed in two main categories:

Acceptance strategies, and declining ones.

Acceptance strategies include:

 a) Thanking and appreciation (78%, male group 34% , and Female group 44%).

 b) Stressing common ground (87%, male group 40%, and female group 47%).

 c) Expressing gladness (86%, male group 39%, Female group 45%).

 d) Complimenting (89%, male group 41%, female group 48%).

 e) Offering good wishes (84%, male group 38%, female group 46%).

				translation: (By Allah I feel myself flying because I am so happy).
Complimenting	41	48	89%	a) *?inta ?abu ?ilkaram.* Translation: (you are very generous). b)*?inti ?om ?ilkaram* Translation: (you are very generous). c)*?into ? ahil ?ilkaram.* Translation: (You are the people of Generosity).
Offering good wishes	38	46	84%	a) *?alf mabruuk.* Translation: (A thousand of congratulations). b) *dayman inšhallah.* Translation: (It will be always available in your house, Allah willing). c) *yajçaluh çaamir ?inshallah*

appreciating	34	44	78%	a) šukran jaziilan. translation:(Thank you very much). b) šukran baarak allah fiik. Translation:(Thank you, may Allah bless you)
Stressing common ground	40	47	87%	a) ?ana waħad minkum wimiš çaawiz çuzuumah. Translation:(I am one of you, I need not be invited) d) ?ilbeet betna Translation:(Your home is ours)-(Indicating a great deal of solidarity).
Expressing gladness	39	45	86%	a) da yoom ?ilmona translation: (This is the day we are looking for)-(i.e. Indicating he will Accept the invitation) b) ?akiid jayya la?inu ?ana farħana. translation: (Sure I am coming, I am so happy for that). c) Wallah ?ana tayer min-ilfaraħa.

Table 1 cont.

(for example, El-Khatib (2009), Cohen (2003), Farghal and El-Khatib (2001), Holmes (1990) , among other).

(2) to state that data collecting method of this study is based upon the assumption that the observable differences in the choice and variation of politeness strategies, as used by the participants of the current studies -as is the case in many societies- "may minimally originate from the degree of solidarity between the inviter and invitee in relation to other sociological factors such as age, sex, and social context..." (El-Khatib: 2009:276).

On the whole, one may argue that the results of this study cannot be generalized to groups other than the groups who participated in it, that is, people other than the concerned ones may respond differently at different times and settings when they are in different moods. Moreover, the sample of this study is rather small and taken from one sector of the concerned society (i.e. the educated people in the New Valley governorate society).

Major Findings and Discussion:
Table (1):
Acceptance strategies used by the participants in this study

Acceptance strategies	Group1 total number50 Males	Group2 total number50 females	Total number of frequencies%	Examples
Thanking and				

many utterances as they think are proper to be used in responding to each situation (see Appendix 3). Before moving on any further, it is worth mentioning that the researcher will present some responses of the subjects which he thought will better serve the goals of this study (see Appendix 5). Although the researcher is well aware of the limitations of this method of data collection (i.e. ethnography of communication), since it is a "difficult method for cross-cultural studies due to the problem of comparability and a lack of ethnographers who belong to speech communities other than English speaking ones" (House and Kasper 1989:13, cited in Nelson et al. 1993). Two reasons explain why this method (i.e. ethnography approach for data collection) was used in this study: 1) the researcher of this study believes that ethnographic data are natural, and natural data are good, since they represent natural speech, 2) the researcher belongs to the speech community of the area in question.

Aspects like age and social status were examined in both groups (males and females).

Due to some social restrictions in the area in question, it was not an easy task (in some settings) to make the female participants take part in the procedure of recording their conversations. This could be caused by their feeling of suspicion of having their conversations recorded by someone with whom they are not acquainted or have known before. Luckily, all of them agreed to share at last.

However, two points are noteworthy mentioning (1) to state that the invitation making in the society of the New Valley will be analyzed according to a categorization of strategies in light of the work of earlier studies on similar politeness formulae

community depending on some socio-cultural variables (such as age, gender , educational background, power and solidarity) which may affect its practice in this speech community.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data of this study were obtained from a sample of 100 educated participants living in four different communities in the New Valley governorate (two urban communities: El-Kharga and Mout cities, and two rural ones: Al-Qasr and Balat villages). The gender of the participants in this study was equally split (i.e. 50 males, and 50 females). They range in age from 19 to 55 years old. This sample included teachers, housewives, graduate and undergraduate university students, staff members, and other officials (see Appendix 2) . Data of this study were conducted in April, May, and June 2012. In order to obtain the data of this study and elicit some information on the various ways an invitation is made, accepted, or turned down, the researcher of this study employed a mixed approach of data collection: First, an ethnography of communication, using some strategies such as participants' observation, informal interviews, and recording conversations is adopted. Conversations were recorded in three contexts: single sex settings (male and male or female and female), and mixed sex settings (female and male) in a variety of settings such as: family settings, neighborhood settings , daily interactions between dyads in workplaces, and other real settings of every day communication between intimates(e.g. at schools, offices, home, etc). Second, the researcher of the current study designed a questionnaire containing eight situations of interaction and distributed it to the participants. The participants were asked to write down as

The influence of social factors on linguistic politeness has also been studied among speakers of the Chinese language. A study by Tseng (1999) indicated that choice of the invitation strategies used by the participants in his study varies according to context. Tseng's study explored the interaction features of Chinese individual discourse. Results of Tseng's study show that choice of invitation depends on three factors: the context of situation, the degree of familiarity, and the age of the participants.

Murni (2008) has discussed rituals of politeness as practiced in Bugis community, South Sulawesi. He attempted to explore how the Bugis people apply their politeness practices through the use of speech acts such as greetings, thanks, apologies, and invitations. Murni concluded that some speech acts, such as greetings, thanks, and apologies "may have extended functions and can be used in different ways by Bugis speakers".

El-Khatib (2009) examined the nature of invitation making and acceptance in the Jordanian society from a pragmatic point of view. He reported that the strategies utilized by Jordanian people for the purpose of inviting, accepting an invitation, and rejecting it are "culturally shaped by interactive elements and that they could be understood and appreciated by people sharing the same cultural background".

On the whole, this review of literature indicates-to the researcher's best knowledge- that no one has yet investigated invitation making as practiced among the speakers of the area in question (i.e. New Valley society.). The current study will attempt to shed light on this speech act or politeness formula (i.e. invitation making) as practiced by the speakers of this

not right to describe this invitation as insincere. It is not like a
lie. A lie is an insincere assertion primarily meant to deceive
the hearer. Mary's invitation, however, is not insincere
because both Mary and Justin mutually believe that they both
"recognize it for what it is (only ostensibly an invitation and
actually something else)." In other words, there is a kind
of mutually recognized pretense in this type of invitation.

In order to pinpoint the defining properties and the
characteristic features of ostensible invitations, Isaacs and
Clark (1990) 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 one insincere invitation or offer they witnessed.
Forty other examples were gathered from face-to-face
interviews with ten undergraduates who would remember
two sincere and two 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.

Garcia (1999) has also examined the positive-negative
dilemma of invitation. In an investigation of the politeness
strategies used by Venezuelan Spanish speakers in two role-
play situations issuing and responding to invitations, Garcia
argues that "making an invitation is like other requests ; it is
an imposition on the hearer requiring a deferential tone from
the speaker " (1999:425). The results of Garcia's study,
however, show that while the participants express difference
they express solidarity to an even greater extent, imposing on
both themselves and the interlocutor .

In brief, a lead has one of the following four functions:
a) Expressing the speaker's feelings;
b) Determining the availability of the addressee;
c) Referring to a past tie;
d) Reaffirming a relationship by suggesting a future meeting.

In any case, a lead will normally contain at least one of the components of an unambiguous invitation (i.e. reference to time and/or mention of place, mention of activity, and a request for response).

Isaacs and Clark(1990) carried out a research project on the so-called 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 invitations is not to establish invitations but to accomplish some other unstated purpose. The term "ostensible acceptance" has been used by these scholars to define the positive response of the invitee to such invitations. 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 acceptances. Isaacs and Clark(1990) believe that ostensible invitations belong in a category of speech acts which they call ostensible speech acts.

Traditional theories of speech acts are not flawless in that they define invitations as a speaker's (S) inviting a hearer (H) to an event (E) only if S requests H's presence and promises acceptance of his or her presence . By this analysis, Mary's invitation is insincere because she does not really want Justin to come to lunch. According to Isaacs and Clark (1990), it is

engagements, according to their data, are arrived at by a process of negotiation whereby the interlocutors move turn by turn until a social commitment has been reached. They use the term *lead* to refer to the statement or question which signals that an invitation will follow if the addressee makes the appropriate response.

Based on their function, leads are categorized into three categories:

1) The first type of lead is the most obvious in terms of letting the addressee know what can be expected to follow. The function of this beginning to a sequence is to establish the availability of the addressee. This lead type may appear in the form of a question/statement which is meant to elicit not only the desired information but also information about the addressee's availability at a particular time.

2) The second type of lead is much less obviously the beginning of an invitation sequence. It is referred to as *expressive* because it usually seeks to convey the feelings of the speaker without any specific commitment. The vagueness of this lead type stimulates some native speakers to refrain from considering it as a lead at all. However, this type of lead is quite frequent and usually ends in a definite invitation.

3) The third type of lead is referred to as the *past tie*. This lead type is related to some shared knowledge of past attempt to negotiate a social arrangement by the interlocutors, or by someone closely associated who is not present at the moment of speaking. This type of lead usually makes it possible for interlocutors to refer to some previous discussion which did not end in a complete invitation, while still leaving the matter open for further negotiation and a possible refusal by the addressee.

" ... such a speech act ... contains reference to time and/or mention of place or activity, and, most important, a request for response." (cited in Wolfson, 1983: 119)

The request for response can come before or after the mention of time or activity. Like many other conversational interactions, context frequently substitutes for words in giving some of the information to be communicated. The request for response could also be signaled by question intonation alone. All these points enable the speaker to extend invitations which are, even though no longer than a single word, perfectly understood. For example, the word "Saturday?", uttered by a woman as part of a leave-taking sequence, could be interpreted as a perfect invitation on the grounds that it is well known to both participants in this interaction that this single utterance refers to the fact that the two women and their husbands are in the habit of spending most Saturday evenings together.

The context, the shared knowledge of the interactants, and the question intonation are three important factors that affect most, if not all, invitation exchanges. Among intimates, where a great deal of contextual knowledge is shared, one-word invitations, like the above example are not uncommon. Even though they contain all the information necessary to perform the function intended, non-native speakers of the language treat such speech acts as "truncated" ones which may, on the surface, seem hardly to qualify as speech acts. The utterances are referred to as minimal invitation forms.

Wolfson, et al. (1983) provide a pattern for invitations they collected through the observation of middle-class American behavior. The vast majority of social

as much information as possible concerning the so-called dependent variables such as the age, sex, occupation, and the relationship of interlocutors involved in these invitation exchanges. Relationship of interlocutors has been shown in study after study to be significantly critical to what is said and how it is said and responded to. However, it is not clear what is meant by interlocutors' relationship. In order to quantify this point, these scholars have found it most useful to begin by viewing the relationship of interlocutors on a continuum of social distance from intimates to strangers. In order to quantify the term intimacy, they draw on membership in a "nuclear family" as a possible feature. They, however, are not heedless of the point that the type of relationship between husband and wife, for instance, differs greatly from that of parents and children or even siblings. This reveals the fact that the social distance continuum should be seen in terms of ranges and not of discrete points. It must also be recognized that social distance, being a cover term, interacts with such factors as age, sex, ethnic background, relative status, etc. Asymmetrical status relationships pertain to the minimum range of social distance continuum. Service encounters, however, are examples of situations in which one could find the maximum range of social distance.

With this picture in mind, Wolfson, et al(1983) . started the analysis of the data on invitations. They believe that social commitments, according to popular wisdom, are normally arrived at by unambiguous invitations. In their operational definition of the term invitation, they assert:

Review of Related Literature:

Work on invitations has been mainly the focus of those who
sought to study native speakers lack of recognition of their
own speech patterns. According to Wolfson (1979), and
Wolfson, et al. (1983), the knowledge of how to give, interpret,
and respond to invitations is an aspect of communicative
competence which is critical to those who wish to interact
socially. This knowledge is particularly significant to non-
native EFL learners in the host speech community. Hatch
(1978) argues that the language learner is most likely to do
best when s/he is provided with frequent opportunities to
interact with the native speakers of the target language.

In order for any interaction, even the most frequent, formal,
and superficial one to take place, social arrangements of one
sort or another need to be made somehow. This goal is
accomplished by middle-class Americans, mainly through
extending invitations (cf. Wolfson,1989). 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 its rules. In this case, the rules
for the appropriate management of invitations are well below
the conscious awareness of speakers. Based on these points,
they conclude that the only way that the rules for giving and
responding to invitations among speakers of American
English can be analyzed and made available to language
learners is through the empirically-based descriptive analysis.

In their study of invitations, Wolfson, et al. (Wolfson et al,
1989) drew on observation as the naturalistic method of
collecting data. They recorded their observations and gathered

inviting/offering. When two people engage in an encounter, the one who offers should insist on offering and the one who is being invited should fully reject the offer but in reality intends to accept it later. To invite without insistence could be interpreted as a sign of lack of seriousness about the invitation.

The Enquiries of this Study:

Speech acts (such as greetings, thanks, apology, and invitation) have been claimed by some linguists to operate by universal pragmatic principles (Austin,1962); Searle (1969,1975); Brown and Levinson (1978). Other linguists have shown them to vary in conceptualization and verbalization across cultures and languages (Wong 2004; Wierzbicka , 2001). With this in mind, the main purpose of this study is to explore how the people of The New Valley society (who are rich with their religious, traditional, and social systems) apply one of their politeness practices through the use of invitation making. In addition, this study seeks to answer the following questions :

1- What are the main interactional strategies of making invitation used among the participants of this study in some of their conversational situations?

2- What are the crucial conventions which govern the use of invitation making strategies in the area in question (i.e. The New Valley society)?

3- Do the culture of this community, social power and social distance determine the selection of invitation making strategies used by the participants of this area in their daily interaction? Do social power and social distance determine the selection of invitation making strategies used by the participants of this area in their daily interaction?

tentatively the speech community to be studied, attempt to gain some understanding of its social organization and other salient aspects of the culture, and formulate possible hypotheses concerning the diverse ways the socio-cultural phenomena might relate to patterns of communication.

The New Valley society has undergone drastic changes during the last three decades. Due to modernization which took place in this area, the life style of the whole population has changed. These socio-cultural changes have affected the culture of the whole community. Consequently, the values, rules, and norms are passing by a drastic change. The culture of this society is becoming less and less a collective, contact culture. It is moving gradually towards the individualistic , low contact culture.

Just like many other societies in the Arab world in general, social life in this area is centered on the family and the attitude of the individual toward the family. Although the traditional family, which was extended in the nature of the family in this community, has become part of the past. The great majority of people in this area still identify themselves with their individual families, as the role and influence of the family in supporting an individual morally, and in some cases financially, is still the norm.

Hence, in the traditional family loyalty is still an influential force in this society. However, just like many other societies, one way through which the people of this area tend to express their feeling toward each other is by inviting one another. Upon invitation, the inviter has to be a real provider of hospitality (For example by offering some more food, or keeping on offering the invitee to eat just a bit more). Moreover, just like in many other societies in the Arab World, the New Valley society has a special pattern of

"hinges upon politeness principles at work within and across societies".

With this in mind, one argues that Austin's speech act theory (1962), as well as Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) model, could provide an insightful account of the various ways in which linguistic politeness (including invitation making) can be conveyed.

According to Austin's theory (1962), what is said has three kinds of meanings: a) propositional meaning (i.e. the literal meaning of what is said) , b) illocutionary meaning (i.e. the social function of what is said), c) perlocutionary meaning (i.e. the effect of what is said).

Based on Austin's (1962), and Searle's (1969) theory, in his work on this theory, Cohen (2003) identifies five categories of speech acts based on the functions assigned to them.

(1) Representative such as (assertions, claims, and reports).
(2) Directives such as (suggestions, requests, and commands).
(3) Expressives such as (apologies, complaints, and thanks).
(4) Comissives such as (promises, threats, and offers).
(5) Declaritives such as (decrees, and declarations).

The New Valley Society:

Before moving on any further in this study, it is worth giving a brief idea about the socio-cultural background of the society of this area in question (i.e. The New Valley Society).

Speaking of the importance of providing the reader with such important information in any ethnographic analysis of communicative events, Saville-Trokie (1997, quoted in El-Khatib 2009:273) states that:

> **In understanding an ethnography of communication in a particular locale, the first task is to define at least**

as (offers, threats and promises) and Declaratives such as (decelerations and decrees).

Brown and Levinson (1978,1987) developed what they called the notion of face as a crucial element within which invitation making and acceptance can be successfully explained.

Scollon and Scollon (2008:45) define the notion of face as "the negotiated public image, mutually granted to each other by participants in a communicative event". Brown and Levinson(1987), assert that face in a favorable public image consists of two different kinds of desires or face wants, the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions , and the desire to be approved of.

The former is labeled by Brown and Levinson(1987) as "negative face", and the latter as "positive face". Brown and Levinson(1987) believe that while conducting a speech event, speakers are motivated by two main wants of face: 1) the desire of the participants that his action will be approved by another participant, and this is labeled as "positive face wants", and 2) the desire of a participant that his action be "unimpeded", and this is termed as "negative face wants". Brown and Levinson (1987) believe that some acts by their nature are "face threatening acts (F.T.A.)", hence, they require softening.

With this in mind, one argues that making invitation can be seen as one of "face threatening acts (F.T.A.) " Since people attempt to win the social approval of each other, they address the participant positive face once they wish to have their invitations appreciated. On the contrary, declining an invitation may put the inviter's positive face at risk and preserve the invitee's own. Brown and Levinson (1987) were well aware of this dilemma, they stated that its solution

According to Austin (1962), A speech act is a minimal functional unit in human communication. Speech act theory attempts to explain how speakers use language to accomplish intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning from what is said[2].

Philosophers like Austin (1962), Grice (1975), and Searle (1965, 1969, 1975) offered basic insight into this new theory of linguistic communication based on the assumption that "(...)the minimal units of human communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving directions, apologizing, thanking, invitation, and so on". (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989,p.2). Austin (1962) defines the performance of uttering words with a consequential purpose as the performance of a locutionary act, and the study of utterances thus far and in these respects the study of locutions, or of the full units of speech(p. 69). These units of speech are not tokens of the symbol or word or sentence but rather units of linguistic communication and it is "(...)the production of the token in the performance of the speech act that constitutes the basic unit of linguistic communication". (Searle,1965,p.136). According to Austin's theory, these functional units of communication have propositional or locutionary meaning (the literal meaning of the utterances), illocutionary meaning (the social function of the utterance), and perlocutionary force (the effect produced by the utterance in a given context).(Cohen,2003, p.384).

---

(2) Based on Austin's ,(1962), and Searle's (1969) theory, Cohen (2003) identifies five categories of speech acts based on the functions assigned to them: Representatives such as (assertions, claims and reports) , Directives such as (requests, suggestions and commands), Expressive such as (thanks, compliments and apologies), comissives such

determine the choice of invitation making and acceptance strategies among the participants of the current study.

The sample of this study is composed of one hundred participants who live in two urban centers and two rural centers in the New Valley governorate society . Data was collected during April, May, and June 2012 . The gender of the participants was equally split (i.e. 50 males and 50 females). They range in age from 22 to 55 years. To collect data the researcher employed an ethnography of communication using some strategies such as participants' observation, informal interviews, and recording conversations. In addition, a questionnaire containing some actual situations such as inviting friends and neighbors to some social occasions was administrated to the participants. Those participants were asked to write down as many utterances as they think are proper to be used in invitation making in each situation.

The results of this study show that speaker-hearer's age, gender, social power, and social distance are crucial conventions in determining the choice of invitation making among the participants in this study. Moreover, the results of this study show that the process of invitation making and acceptance in this area (just as in many other societies) can function to encode politeness and is a well-governed process.

Theoretical Background:

In an attempt to better understand and tackle invitation making in the New Valley society, two principles are going to be adopted. These principles are: Austin's speech act theory (1962), and the notion of politeness as developed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987).

Ritual of Politeness:
A Socio-linguistic Study of Invitation Making in the New Valley Governorate Society

Abstract :

The main theme of this study is to explore how the
people of the New Valley governorate society (who are rich
with their religious, traditional, and social systems) apply one
of their speech acts and politeness practices through the use of
invitation making and acceptance[1]. Moreover, this study
seeks to answer the following questions:

1) What are the main strategies of invitation making and
acceptance used by a sample of the speakers of the area in
question (i.e. the New Valley governorate society) in some of
their actual conversational situations?

2) What are the crucial conventions which govern the use of
the strategies of invitation making and acceptance among the
speakers of this area?

3) Unlike some of the previous studies that investigated the
speech act of inviting and ignored the impact of some social
variants such as age, gender, social power and social distance
in determining the choice of invitation making strategies and

(1) According to Salmani-Nodousham (2006:6) invitation is (a
communicative act addressed to the invitee's face needs and intended
to enhance and strengthen good and healthy relations between the
inviter and the invitee. For the purpose of this study , this definition
is adopted .

acceptance(e.g. Garcia, 1999, Wolfson, D'Amico-Reisner &
Huber,1983) , this study seeks to explore whether or not the
speaker-hearer's   age, social power, and social distance

Ritual of Politeness:A Socio-linguistic Study of Invitation Making in the New Valley Governorate Society
Dr. Safe El-Nasr Saleh Zanquoor

__Key words :__

- Invitation.
- Invitation making.
- Strategies.
- Face threatening acts.

Ritual of Politeness:
A Socio-linguistic Study of Invitation Making in the New Valley Governorate Society

By:
Dr. Safe El-Nasr Saleh Zanquoor
Lecturer at Dept. of English, the New Valley Faculty of
Education, Assiut University, Egypt

2012

Ritual of Politeness:
A Socio-linguistic Study of Invitation Making in the New Valley Governorate Society

By:
Dr. Safe El-Nasr Saleh Zanquoor
Lecturer at Dept. of English, the New Valley Faculty of
Education, Assiut University, Egypt

2012