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ABSTRACT

This study which focused on speech acts of invitation, was conducted in the hope of finding out the similarities and differences between how invitations are made in English and Vietnamese by the people who are speaking these two languages under the light of contrastive analysis and cross-cultural perspective. Data used for analysis in this study were mainly collected through survey questionnaires. Through analysis of forms of inviting provided by two groups of participants, it was deduced that native speakers of English and Vietnamese are quite different in making invitations under three social variables: social distance, relative power, and threats to each other's negative face. One of the prominent results from data analysis is that Vietnamese invitations are more diverse in terms of structural diversity, and Vietnamese speakers are more direct in extending invitations in comparison to English ones. Once, similarities and differences have been identified, implications on teaching this speech were made.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTIONS

This chapter introduces some very first parts of the thesis. It is comprised of seven parts: (1) motivation for the study; (2) aims of the study; (3) research methods; (4) scope of the study; (5) significance of the study; (6) previous related studies and (7) organization of the study.

1.1. Motivation for the study

It is often said that to master a foreign language is difficult because enormous vocabulary and profound understanding in grammar are not enough. Having certain understandings of the culture where that language is spoken is a must. Let take English and Vietnamese as an example. There are differences in the use of language between English and Vietnamese. To immerse into the culture and daily life of the target language is a must in order to comprehend wholly that language. In other words, to learn a language means to learn the culture of the country where that language is spoken. Acquiring a second language demands more than learning new words and another system of grammar (Levine and Adelman, 1982). The goal of learning a language, these days, is to be able to carry out effective communication. Communication, however, may fail to achieve as there is lack of certain understandings of the country where that language is spoken. There are “unwritten rules” are potentially confusing and create misunderstandings even for native speakers (Levine & Adelman, 1982). A deep understanding of culture may benefit students in terms of interacting with people in the native country where their target language is widely spoken. As a result, there should be a stress on the application of combining culture to learning a language.

Language and culture can not be separated from each other. Each country has its own traditions, customs, rituals reflected by the language. Understanding social conventions and attention to such concepts as politeness, and face, which are important to members in a particular culture, will certainly enable us to better
comprehend the different ways of speaking by people from different cultures, thus helping eliminate ethnic stereotypes and misunderstandings. Problems arise as language learners are not competent and fail to understand the cultural-social aspects of communication. Take speech acts of invitation as an example. Vietnamese saying goes: "khách đến nhà không trà thì bánh" (when guests come, either tea or cakes should be served). This saying highlights the importance of inviting in Vietnamese culture, where invitation speech acts make up a high proportion in daily interactions. Inviting undoubtedly plays an important role in communication in all cultures. Wall (1987) indicated that many of our daily social interactions involve making invitations and responding to them. In daily social life, people are sometimes invited to go somewhere or to do something on important occasions such as weddings, birthdays, and graduations, to small ones like movies, eating out, or vendors in the markets invite customers to buy their items. Take these two following sentences as examples:

(1) Alan and I wanted to have a few people over for a dinner party to celebrate finishing my dissertation, and we'd like to invite you especially, since you're chairman. (Tillitt & Bruder, 1999, p.23).

(2) Ăn cho vui. Cô Nga. (Thach Lam, 2000, p.167)

Invitations help to establish, maintain, reinforce and further strengthen social rapports. Americans and Vietnamese share certain similarities in terms of making and responding to invitations in social interactions. However, differences are undoubtedly numerous. Many cases of making invitations are different in Vietnam and American. Mastering how to make appropriate invitations which are suitable to a particular culture should be taken in considerations so as not to cause hurts, shocks, misunderstandings, and misinterpretations. A frequently misunderstood area in American verbal interaction is that of extending, accepting, and refusing invitations (Levine & Adelman, 1982). Moreover, helping Vietnamese learners of English master and use invitation-making effectively is a must.
For the above reasons, the study is carried out to find out the differences of how invitations are made in English and Vietnamese and to help Vietnamese learners keep conversations with foreigners going on. Furthermore, the study is a hope to give some reliable suggestions for teaching making invitations in particular, and raise the importance of applying cross-cultural activities to teaching and learning English to English majors in Dong Thap University in general. As a result the following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the major similarities and differences in the ways native speakers of English and native speakers of Vietnamese making invitations?

2. Do social distance (D), relative power (P), and ranking of impositions (R) affect the choice of inviting forms by native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers?

1.2. Aims of the study

The thesis aims to point out the similarities and differences in the way English and Vietnamese native speakers making invitations. The thesis, in addition, aims to give an insight into making invitations for English majors in Dong Thap University. Moreover, it is intended to provide some reliable implications for teaching invitation-making to English majors in Dong Thap University.

1.3. Research methods

In order to achieve the goals of a cross-cultural study mentioned earlier, the major method to be employed in the study is a quantitative one. Also, contrastive analysis is used. Therefore, the considerations, remarks, consumptions, comments and conclusions in the thesis are mainly based on data analysis.

A number of data relating to making invitations in both English and Vietnamese publications are collected from textbooks, short stories, books on English and Vietnamese languages. They are then analyzed in the light of cross-cultural perspective and analysis.
Survey questionnaire, in addition, is conducted. It is carefully designed to investigate the cross-cultural similarities and differences in making invitations between the Vietnamese and English languages. In order to collect data for contrastive analysis, two types of survey questionnaires are designed: one in English and the other in Vietnamese. They are next delivered thirty native speakers of English in Ho Chi Minh City, where many foreigners live and work and thirty native speakers of Vietnamese as well. Data collected will then be analyzed in order to find out the similarities and differences between inviting in the English and Vietnamese languages.

Furthermore, personal observations are also carried out in different social situations, in which people make invitations. Observation work is taken placed in three different social contexts including university campus, market, park, and family in which the ways interlocutors invite invitations are to be particularly noted down. They are indispensable parts in the study in terms of setting up the hypothesis in the thesis.

1.4. Scope of the study

The study focuses on speech acts of invitations performed by native speakers of English and then compare them to those performed by Vietnamese native speakers in order to investigate the similarities and differences between the two groups of participants under the light of cross-cultural perspective. The theoretical background presented in this thesis concerns with the speech acts theory and politeness strategies. Due to the scope of an B.A thesis, time and experience limitations, the thesis is limited to verbal aspects of making invitations, any feature relating to phonology such as sounds, stress, intonation will be not discussed here in the thesis.

1.5. Significance of the study

The study deals with making invitations speech acts, which set up and promote social rapports among people in a particular culture. As stated in the motivation of the study, invitations speech act is an indispensable part in daily communication.
The study is carried out with the hope to provide common understandings on making invitations for Dong Thap University English-majors to avoid cultural conflicts and effectively carrying out invitation-making in real life situations. In addition, the study’s findings hope to make contributions to raising the importance of studying the cross-culture for English majors in Dong Thap University.

1.6. Previous related studies

In 2005, in his dissertation “Nghi thức lời nói trong tiếng Việt trên cơ sở lý thuyết hành vi ngôn ngữ” (Speech etiquette in Vietnamese based on speech act theory), Nguyen Van Lap has classified categories of invitations as speech etiquette in Vietnamese in terms of speech act theory. The thesis introduced and analyzed two main categories of invitations in Vietnamese including invitations with explicit performative verbs and invitations with implicit performative verbs, which lays a foundation for the data related to making invitations in Vietnamese in this study.

In autumn term 2008, in her study “Politeness strategies in requests and invitations: A comparative study between English and Vietnamese” Le Thi Mai Hong focused and emphasized on politeness strategies used in the speech acts of requests and invitations between English and Vietnamese. The study pointed some major differences between politeness strategies employed in English invitations in comparison with the Vietnamese ones.

The studies mentioned above are helpful to this study in terms of providing the theoretical background for the thesis as they are closely related to making and responding to invitations in English and Vietnamese right in the thesis.

1.7. Organization of the study

The thesis consists of five chapters:

Chapter 1: Introductions, this part presents the overview of the thesis including motivation, aims, scope, research methods, significance, previous related studies as
well as the organization of the study.

**Chapter 2**: Literature review, this chapter provides the theoretical background including speech act theory, politeness strategies, pragmatics and cross-cultural pragmatics, and categories of inviting forms in English and Vietnamese.

**Chapter 3**: Methodology, this chapter focuses on presenting research questions, research participants, research procedure, data collection, as well as methods of analysis.

**Chapter 4**: Results and discussion, this chapter presents the results gained in survey questionnaires and observation and discusses the similarities and differences in how invitations speech acts are made in English and Vietnamese as well as the influence of three variables to the choice of inviting forms of two groups of participants.

**Chapter 5**: Conclusions, this part summaries the major findings recorded during the making of the thesis, presents the limitations of the study, provides some suggestions for further research and give implications on teaching.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is organized into five parts: (1) politeness strategies (2) generalization of speech acts, (3) invitations as speech acts (4) pragmatics and cross-cultural pragmatics, (5) categories of inviting in English and Vietnamese. The first part deals with literature on politeness strategies and their relations with invitations in both languages. The second part aims to review the literature on the definitions, classification of speech acts, as well as the existing theory on direct and indirect speech acts. The next part concerns with invitations in terms of speech act theory which involves the definitions, and categories of inviting in both languages. The fourth part takes a look at pragmatics and cross-cultural pragmatics. Finally, the fourth seeks the literature on inviting in English and Vietnamese.

2. 1. Politeness strategies

Politeness, an issue which has a great impact to human being and deeply influences to human interaction, will be now discussed right in this part because

    Politeness is basic to the production of social order, and a precondition of human cooperation ... any theory which provides an understanding of this phenomenon at the same time goes to the foundation of human social life.

    (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

In language studies, politeness implies the following: "(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" (Richards et al. 1985, p.281). Languages differ in how they express politeness. In English, phrases like It’s hot here. I wonder if I could open the window? can be used to make a request more polite. In other languages, the same effect can be expressed by a word or particle. Politeness markers and the use of address forms convey differences between formal
speech and colloquial speech.

Human communication serves to establish and maintain not only a comfortable relationship between people but also a social harmony. Therefore, in interpersonal communication, in terms of politeness, every participant notes social factors such as age, gender, power and distance among the interlocutors. Moreover, politeness may be described as a form of behaviour which is exercised in order to consolidate and promote relationship between individuals or, at least, to keep it undamaged.

According to Leech (1983), politeness means to minimize the effect of impolite statement or expression (negative politeness) and maximize the effects of polite illocutions (positive politeness) (Leech, 1983). However, the best-known theory is developed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). Their universalistic formulation of politeness theory is problematic in some aspects.

The main issue of politeness is the notion of face. Face is defined as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p.61). "Face" associates with the English idiom to lose face which means “to do something which makes other people stop respecting you; to not maintain your reputation and the respect of others”. Brown and Levinson treats the aspects of face as “basic wants”, and distinguishes between positive face and negative face. Positive face is interpreted as the want of every member to be desirable to, at least, some others, whereas negative face is the want of every “competent adult member” for his actions to be unimpeded by others (1987, p.62).

Moreover, Yule (1996) argues that in most English speaking contexts, the participants in an interaction often have to determine, as they speak, the relative social distance between them, and hence their face wants (1996, p.61)

“In everyday social interactions, people generally behave as if their public self-image, or their face wants, will be respected. If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self-image, it is
described as a *face threatening act*. Alternatively, given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another’s face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat. This is called a *face saving act.*” (Yule 1996, p.61).

Analyzing politeness, the anthropologists Brown and Levinson (1987) distinguishes between positive strategies of politeness, those which show closeness, intimacy, and rapport between the speaker and the hearer, and negative politeness strategies, those which indicate various degrees of social distance between the speaker and hearer. In this sense, politeness varies to show awareness of another person’s face in situations of social distance or closeness. The choice of appropriate politeness strategies in a given context depends on a number of factors. Brown and Levinson (1987) groups these factors into a simple formula consisting of three independent variables, namely the social distance (D) of the speaker and the hearer (a symmetric relation), the relative power (P) of the speaker and the hearer (an asymmetric relation), and the absolute ranking of impositions (R) in the particular culture.

The social distance (D) is a symmetric social dimension of similarity/difference within which the speaker and the hearer stand for the purposes of this act. In some situations, D is based on a evaluation of frequency of interaction and the types of material and non-material goods (embracing face) between S and H. The evaluation will be usually measures of social distance relied on stable social attributes.

The relative power (P) which is an asymmetric social dimension is the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) at the expense of S’s plans and self-evaluation. Generally, there are two sources of P, either of which may be authorized or unauthorized – material control (over economic distribution and physical force) and metaphysical control (over the actions of others, by virtue of metaphysical forces subscribed to by those others.

The absolute ranking (R) of imposition which is situationally and cuturally
defined is the degree to which there is an interference in the speaker’s wants or self-determination or approval (speaker’s negative and positive wants). There are normally two scales or ranks which are identifiable for negative–face: a ranking of impositions in proportion to the expenditure of services (including the time provision) and good (including non–material goods such as information, regard expression and other face payments). As for positive – face, the, ranking of imposition embraces an assessment of the amount of "pain" given to the hearer’s face, based on the differences between the hearer’s desired self-image and that presented in face threatening acts. Cultural rankings of facets of positive face (like success, niceness, beauty etc.) can be reranked in specific circumstances, so do the negative face rankings. Besides, that there are also personal rankings can explain why some people object to certain kinds of face threatening acts and some do not.

These three factors affect indirectness in human interaction, especially in the choice of politeness strategies which is an essential aspect of inviting. Together with cross-cultural perspective, politeness is an another aspect which are used to create the analytical framework for data analysis.

Basing on the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987), a bank of 6 situations was designed to elicit offers. These situations were grouped according to three variables, namely social distance (D) of the speaker and the hearer, the relative power (P) of the speaker and the hearer (an asymmetric relation), and the absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture. The situations under study were as follows:

The speaker has more power than the hearer; they are unfamiliar with each other.
The speaker has more power than the hearer; they are familiar with each other.
The speaker and the hearer are equal in power; they are unfamiliar with each other.
The speaker and the hearer are equal in power; they are familiar with each other.
The speaker has less power than the hearer; they are unfamiliar with each other.
The speaker has less power than the hearer; they are familiar with each other.
2.2. Generalization of speech acts

2.2.1. Definitions of speech acts

J. Austin (1962) takes the pioneering role in formulating the theory of speech acts. According to him, all utterances should be viewed as actions of the speakers, stating or describing is only one function of language. He points out that the declarative sentences are not only used to say things or describe states of affairs but also used to do things.

Also, in 1962, he defines speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. When people produce utterances, they often perform actions via those utterances. These actions are called speech acts: such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request. A speech act is part of a speech event. The speech act performed by producing an utterance, consists of three related acts including locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. They are listed as follows:

Locutionary act is the basic act of producing a meaningful linguistic expression. The locutionary act is performed with some purposes or functions in mind.

Illocutionary act is an act performed via the communicative force of an utterance. In engaging in locutionary acts we generally also perform illocutionary acts such as informing, advising, offer, promise, etc. In uttering a sentence by virtue of conversational force associated with it.

Perlocutionary act is what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring perlocutionary acts are performed only on the assumption that the hearer will recognize the effect you intended.

Speech acts, since then, developed by many famous philosophers and have been central to the works and further developed by many other philosophers and a great concern of any research paper in terms of doing researches on linguistic fields.
The two other famous linguistic researchers are Schmidt and Richards who reaffirm that: speech act theory has to do with the functions of languages, so in the broader sense we might say that speech acts are all the acts we perform through speaking, all things we do when we speak. The theory of speech acts is partly taxonomic and partly explanatory. It must systematically classify types of speech acts and the ways in which they can succeed or fail. It must reckon with the fact that the relationship between the words being used and the force of their utterance is often oblique.

Paltridge (2000) defines that a speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. Some examples are an apology, greeting, request, complaint, invitation, compliment or refusal. A speech act might contain just one word such as "No" to perform a refusal or several words or sentences such as: "I'm sorry, I can't, I have a prior engagement". It is important to mention that speech acts include real-life interactions and require not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language within a given culture. Socio-cultural variables like authority, social distance, and situational setting influence the appropriateness and effectiveness of politeness strategies used to realize directive speech acts such as requests (p.15).

Yule (1996, p.47), another famous linguist, defines that "in attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, they perform actions via those utterances." According to him, actions performed via utterances are speech acts.

In daily communication, people perform speech acts when they offer an apology, greeting, complaint, invitation, compliment or refusal. Since people often do more things with words than merely convey what words encode, speech acts have to be seen from real-life interactions. For example, in a classroom situation, when a teacher says:

(1) *May I have your attention?*
(1) is a request more than a question. In the same way, when a student talks to his friend,

(2) *We’re having some people over Saturday evening and wanted to know if you’d like to join us.*

(2) is an invitation more than a question. Moreover, speech acts require not only knowledge of any languages but also the culture of the country where this language is use. For examples in Vietnamese when we utter:

(3) *Where are you going?*

(3) means we are greeting the people we meet.

### 2.2.2. Classification of speech acts

According to Yule (1996), there is one general classification system that lists five types of general functions performed by speech acts including declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

**Declarations** are speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The speaker has to have a special institutional role, in a specific context, in order to perform a declaration appropriately. For example, "Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife."

**Representatives** are speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statement of fact, assertions, conclusions and descriptions are examples of the speaker representing the world as he or she believes it is. For example, “The Moon goes round the Earth." or "It is windy today."

**Expressives** are speech acts that state what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy and sorrow. For example, "What a great party!".

**Directives** are speech acts that the speakers use to get the Hearer to do something. They express what the speaker wants. For instance, "Stand up, please!" or "Could you open the door?". 
Commissives are speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. For example: "I'll give one hand." or "I’ll be back."

Yule (1996) also presents a table showing speech acts classification as follows:

**Table 2.2.2: Speech acts classification**

| Speech act types | Direction of fit                  | S = Speaker       
|------------------|----------------------------------|------------------ 
| Declarations     | words change the world           | S causes X       
| Representatives  | makes words fits the world       | S believes X     
| Expressives      | makes words fits the world       | S feels X        
| Directives       | make the world fits words        | S wants X        
| Commissives      | make the world fits words        | S intends X      

The usefulness of speech acts analysis is illustrating the kinds of things we can do with words and identifying some of the conventional utterance forms we use to perform specific actions. However, we need to look at more extended interaction to understand how those actions are carried out and interpreted within speech events.

However, to compare selected speech acts from two languages, the topic is still vast and could not be treated exhaustively in any one work. The cultural norms reflected in speech acts differ not only from one language to another, but also from one regional and social variety to another. So, different cultures find expression in different system of speech acts, and that different speech acts become entrenched, and, to some extent, codified in different languages.

Of these types, the characteristics of invitations can be easily recognised in commissives and directives. In our daily interactions, inviting is one kind of speech act that is commonly used with high frequency.
2.2.3. Direct and indirect speech acts

In the former part, classification of speech acts have been made clear in terms of the speaker's intention of Yule (1996). This part take a look at another way of classifying speech acts.

Another approach to distinguish different types of speech acts is based on the relationship between the structure and the function. Yule (1996) claims that three structural forms (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and three general communicative function (statement, question, command/request) can be combined to create two other types of speech acts: direct and indirect speech acts. The following example illustrates this:

Yule (1996) defines that whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an direct speech act as in the following examples

(4) *Do join me for a coffee?* (Le Huy Lam, 2000)

Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an indirect speech act as in the following examples.

(5) *Would you like to come over for dinner tomorrow?* (Tillitt & Bruder, 1999)

It is not only used as a question but also a request, hence it is considered to be an indirect speech act. He adds that indirect speech acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English than direct speech acts.

2.3. Invitations as speech acts

There are, first, two concepts that are needed to make clear, namely *invite* and *invitation*. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary indicates that *to invite* means to ask somebody to come to a social event or to ask somebody formally to go to somewhere or do something. According to Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, an invitation means a polite request in which a person is asked to come to an event or to perform some task as in the examples below:
(6) I would like to invite you to a party next Friday.

(Tillitt & Bruder, 1999)

According to Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, an invitation means a polite request in which a person is asked to come to an event or to perform some task. As in the following examples:

(7) Would you like to come over my place on Thanksgiving?

(8) I’d love to. Shall I bring anything?

Similarly, Vietnamese dictionary (1994) defines "lời mời" as a wish or a polite request that somebody does something or goes to somewhere. The following examples illustrate this:

(9) Anh Tuế, mời anh vào chơi! (Khai Hung, 1988)

(Mr. Tue, Come in, please!)

(10) Rước cụ ngồi chơi. (Khai Hung, 1988)

(Get - you - sit - play)

In his dissertation, Nguyen Van Lap (2005) points that "Invitations are polite utterances, requesting others to do something together, which satisfies both the speaker and hearer’s benefits.

Le Thi Mai Hong (2009) indicates that invitation is the act of inviting or a requesting to participate, be present or take part in something. Invitation is also a speech act that expresses the speaker’s friendliness, politeness as well as respect and hospitality toward the hearer." In addition, Wolfson (1989) defines invitations as speech acts that contain reference to time and/or mention of place or activity, and most important, a request for response.

2.4. Pragmatics and cross-cultural pragmatics

As the study is centered on the speech act of invitations in terms of cross-cultural perspective. It is, therefore, necessary to look at some basic information on what is called pragmatics and cross-cultural pragmatics.
Pragmatics, since its appearance, has excited great attention from many leading linguists. Enormous efforts have gone into reaching a satisfactory definition of this linguistic phenomenon.

The notion of pragmatics is clarified by Richards, Platt, & Webber (1992, p.284) as follows:

Pragmatics includes the study of:

1. *How the interpretation and use of utterances depend on knowledge of the real world;*
2. *How speakers use and understand speech acts;*
3. *How the structure of sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.*

Of the above issues, the study of speech acts is considered to be of high importance to pragmatics.

Yule (1996, p.3) defines pragmatics as follows:

1. *Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.*
2. *Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.*
3. *Pragmatics is the study of how more get communicated than is said.*
4. *Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.*

As "every culture has its own repertoire of characteristic speech acts" and "different cultures find expression in different system of speech acts and different speech acts become entrenched, and to some extent, codified in different languages" (Wierzbicka 1991, p.25). Nguyen Thien Giap (2007) states that in different cultures, speech acts are performed in different ways through different languages.

Linguists, these days, has studied, contrasted how language is used in different cultures, which is called contrastive pragmatics. Nguyen Thien Giap (2007) adds that in order to master a language successfully, to carry out effective intercultural communication, having the knowledge of the language is by all means insufficient,
but the knowledge of pragmatics is a must. Through what has been discussed so far, the speech act of invitations in English and Vietnamese is not exception. It is about discussed in the study under contrastive analysis. Cross-cultural perspective, certainly, is a great concern during the data collection and analysis.

2.5. Categories of inviting in English and Vietnamese

Invitations can be in the forms of direct or indirect utterances. This paper aims to investigating the similarities and differences in terms of syntactic and cross-cultural features of spoken invitations in English and Vietnamese, in the effort of increasing not only the effectiveness of teaching and learning invitations utterance in English and Vietnamese but the ability to use language for Vietnamese learners of English.

Nevertheless, there is a little proper work on inviting in both languages. The analytic framework of this study has been collected from a number of English and Vietnamese researches as well as practical textbooks to invitations which contains different forms of inviting. These are dissertations by Nguyen Van Lap (2005), Luu Quy Khuong (2004), Tran Yen Bao Tran (2009), and Tillitt and Bruder (1999). In these researches and textbooks, different linguistic forms of invitations are specified and found out. In this study, categories of inviting in English and Vietnamese be respectively discussed.

Tillitt and Bruder (1999) has introduced numerous structures of English invitations used in formal situations to informal ones. In his dissertation, Nguyen Văı̂n Lap (2005) has introduced forms of Vietnamese inviting including invitations in with performative verb (mời) and invitations without performative verb. Luu Quy Khuong (2007), in addition, has introduced different kinds of direct invitations in English and Vietnamese. He indicated similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese through contrastive analysis. Plus, another research goes to Tran Yen Bao Tran (2009) has recorded different structures used to make direct invitations in English and Vietnamese.
These researches and textbook mentioned above is prominent in terms of providing the analytical framework for discussing categories of inviting in English and Vietnamese.

### 2.5.1. Categories of inviting in English

#### 2.5.1.1. Direct invitations in English

Nguyen Thi Kim Quy (2004) defines that direct invitations are used with performative verbs namely mời in Vietnamese and to invite in English or in the forms of requests or of orders.

**Category 1: Direct invitations in form of performative sentences:**

First, take a look at the definitions of the term "performative sentence". Austin (1962) made a great contribution in terms of discovering and developing what is called: performative sentence. Austin (1962) stated that an performative sentence occurs when:

1. A sentence is uttered and an action thereby is performed.
2. The grammatical structure of the sentence makes it look as though the sentence states that it performed that action.

Cao Xuan Hao (1991) defined that a performative sentence is a kind of expressive and declaration. It expresses the actions that contain in the utterance by directly uttering. Such kind of sentence using a verb named performative verb namely "to invite" in English. Following sentences illustrate this:

> It's just that Alan and I wanted to have a few people over for a dinner to celebrate finishing dissertation and we would like to invite you especially, since you're chairman. (Tillitt & Bruder, 1999).

Likewise, Paltrridge (200) indicated that an explicit performative sentence is a statement which contains a performative verb that names the speech act. The patterns of explicit performative sentences usually take the two following types:
Form 1: Performative sentence with a subject

(1) Example: *I would like to invite you to dinner next Sunday at my home.*

Form 2: Performative sentence without a subject

The English invitations in forms of performative sentence without a subject are not existed due to their incorrect syntactic forms. Invitations in the forms of performative sentences appearing in this study take two forms including "would you like" and "want to invite". In addition, in order to reduce the face - threatening act the phrase "would like to" is added. Tran Yen Bao Tran (2009) indicated that explicit performative invitations are employed between the interlocutors who differ in social or status as in the following example:

(2) *I would like you to the final ceremony of our language program next Friday evening at 8:00.* (Tilllitt & Bruder, 1999)

Category 2: Invitations in forms of declarative sentences

Form 3: Invitations in forms of declarative sentences

According to the textbooks, researches above, direct invitations in form of declarative sentence is rarely appeared. Take a look at the following example:

(3) *We just thought it would be nice to have you over for dinner.* (Tilllitt & Bruder, 1999)

Category 3: Direct invitations in forms of imperatives

Form 4: Invitations in forms of imperatives

Another category of direct invitations in English is discussed in this part is *direct invitations in forms of imperatives*. Duong Hai Dang (nd), these forms are often used for people who are in the same rank, social class or inferior to the speakers; for examples, boss uses with employee, teacher with students, friends with friends.

This type of invitations is considered less formal and is widely accepted in daily
life conversations touched by the friendliness and intimacy such as relatives and friends. The following sentences illustrate this:

(4) *Do have a chocolate biscuit!*

(5) *Go out and have a drink!*

(Cobuild, 2001)

The structure of suggestion "Let's + infinitive", similarly, is used to indicate a direct invitation.

For instances:

(6) *Let's go to our place for a beer.* (Tillitt & Bruder, 1999)

(7) *Let's go to our place for dinner.* (Tillitt & Bruder, 1999)

Through materials on invitations in English found in the thesis, direct invitations make up a modest number. This is because, as mentioned in the former part, direct invitations may cause face-threatening.

### 2.5.1.2. Indirect invitations in English

In the above part, we have discussed one aspect of English invitations under syntactic functions. In this part, forms of indirect invitations will respectively be discussed

**Form 5: Invitations in forms of WH-questions**

WH question (including how) is used in making invitation with a highest frequency. In close relationship, people often use this kind of question to invite each other in purpose of increasing friendliness. It also makes listeners feel comfortable and free.

The editor Le Huy Lam (2000) shows us some typical examples in his book.

(8) *Why don't you come on holiday with us?*

(9) *Why don't you come round for a meal one evening next week?*

(10) *How do you fancy going out for a meal at the weekend?*

According to Tilltilt and Bruder (1999) invitations used with *How* appear in situations which is less formal. Let's look at the following examples:
Among them, the WH-question started with "Would you like to…?" often appear in making invitations with high frequency. It has been familiar with both native speakers and foreigners.

**Form 6: Invitations in forms of yes/no questions**

This kind of invitation shows politeness and formality in speakers’ conversation which is shown in the following sentences:

(13) *Can you come over and join us?* (Le Huy Lam, 2000)

(14) *May we have the pleasure of your company at dinner?* (Le Huy Lam, 2000)

Sometimes, many yes/no questions refer to invitation although they mention different issues. For instance, when a person asks "*Are you free next Thursday?*" or "*Are you doing anything next weekend?*", maybe he wants to invite the listener join something with him/her. Before making invitation, he/she would like to know whether if the listener will be free or not next time. It is a way to show the respect and politeness of speaker. It helps the person who is invited has change to accept the invitation or refuse it depending on his or her decision.

**Form 7: Invitations in forms tag questions**

Tag question is rarely used in making invitation. Speakers often use this kind of sentence to remind or repeat their invitation to the invited people. See the following example:

(16) “*You will come to have dinner with us, won’t you?*” (Le Huy Lam, 2000)

2.5.2. Categories of inviting in Vietnamese

2.5.2.1. Direct invitations in Vietnamese

As stated by Nguyen Thi Kim Quy (2004), likewise, direct invitations in Vietnamese are in the forms of performative sentence, as well as in the forms of requests or
orders. They are about to be discussed respectively in this part.

**Category 1: Vietnamese direct invitations in the forms of performative sentence:**

Just like performative invitations in English, Vietnamese performative invitations contain the performative verb, that is, "mờ". See the following example.

(17) Mờ bà cụ cự ngồi chơi. (Khai Hưng, 1988)

(Invite- old woman- naturally- sit- play)

Vietnamese performative invitations can take one of the following forms:

**Form 1: Performative sentence without subject (the inviter)**

Making invitations belonging to this kind of sentence does not contain the person who is speaking out the invitation.

For examples:

(18) Mờ bà cụ cự ngồi chơi. (Khai Hưng, 1988)

(Invite the old woman to sit down.)

(19) Mờ cô ngồi tạm xuống ghế. (Khai Hưng, 1988)

(Invite you sit temporarily down at this chair?)

**Form 2: Performative sentence with a subject**

Being different from the former form, making invitations belonging to this kind contain the person who invites. Let's have a look at the following example:

(20) Tôi lấy làm hân hạnh mời anh lại chơi (Khai Hưng, 1988)

(I honouredly invite you to come here play.)

(21) Thấy em muốn mời các bác hôm nay ở đây xơi rượu. (Khai Hưng, 1988)

(My father would like to invite uncles to be here and dink wine.)

In many cases or situations which social distance is not the not the same between the interlocutors in the conversations, in order to express the respect to the invitee, the invitee usually adds some words or phrases such as kính, hân hạnh,
trân trọng, xin trân trọng, xin trân trọng kính, có nhã ý with the aim to express politeness.

**Category 2: Invitations in forms of declarative sentences**

**Form 3: Invitations in forms of declarative sentences**

(22) Chị xơi chén nước vậy. (Khải Hưng, 1988)
(sister, drink a cup of water.)

**Category 3: Category 4: Invitations in form of imperatives**

**Form 4: Invitations in forms of imperative sentences**

Take a look at the following example:

(23) Ông giáo hút thuốc đi. (Nam Cao, n.d)
(Mr. Giao, Let's smoke!)

Those instances belong to declarative sentence and imperative sentence mentioned above show us that making invitation following these types has the same meaning. Invitations here can be considered as orders. They are just different from containing the word “đi” in imperative sentence and without it in declarative sentence.

**2.5.2.2. Indirect invitations in Vietnamese**

**Category 4: Invitations in forms of questions**

People frequently use interrogative sentence for making invitation indirectly. In other words, it is a reminding saying which contains the meaning of invitation. People use it for expressing their warm and friendly welcome to the invited person.

**Form 5: Invitations in forms of Wh- questions**

(24) Ông Đoàn sao lâu nay không thấy ông lại chơi. (Khai Hung, 1994)
(M. Đoan, Why haven't you come here recently?)

**Form 6: Invitations in forms of Yes/No questions**

(25) Con có muốn uống một ít cà phê không?
(Do you want to drink some coffee?)
Form 7: Invitations in forms of Tag questions

(26) Chiều nay lại nhà tôi chơi, được không?
(You come to my house this evening, don't you)

In some other cases, likewise in English, people use many phrases such as kính, hân hạnh, rất hân hạnh, thân trọng, “xin thân trọng, có nhã ý, etc when giving their invitations to those who are in higher social positions than them. It is also a way to show their respect to the people who are invited.

To be easy for the contrastive analysis in the later part of the thesis, the following table shortly and clearly recorded what have been discussed so far. From the theoretical background for both English and Vietnamese invitations, forms of inviting are grouped together, covering seven forms of inviting in both languages.

Table 5.1: Forms of Invitations in English and Vietnamese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Examples in English</th>
<th>Example in Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Invitations in forms of performative sentence</td>
<td>1. Performative sentences with a subject.</td>
<td>(1) Example: I would like to invite you to dinner next Sunday at my home.</td>
<td>(18) Tôi lấy làm hân hạnh mời anh lại chơi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Performative sentences without a subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19) Mời cô ngồi tấm xuống ghé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invitations in forms of declarative sentences</td>
<td>3. Invitations in forms of declarative sentences</td>
<td>(3) We just thought it would be nice to have you over for dinner.</td>
<td>(22) Chi xơi chén nước vậy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Invitations in forms of imperatives</td>
<td>4. Invitations in forms of imperative sentences.</td>
<td>(4) Do have a chocolate biscuit! (6) Let's go to our place for a beer.</td>
<td>(23) Ông giáo hút thuốc đi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Invitations in forms of questions</td>
<td>5. Invitations in forms of Wh-questions</td>
<td>(9) Why don’t you come on holiday with us?</td>
<td>(24) Ông Đoàn sao lâu nay không thấy ông lại chơi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Invitations in forms of Yes/No questions</td>
<td>(7) “Can you come over and join us?</td>
<td>(16) You will come to have dinner with us, won’t you?</td>
<td>(26) Chiều nay lại nhà tôi chơi, được không?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Invitations in forms of tag questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the theoretical background of inviting in English and Vietnamese, it can be asserted that both direct and indirect invitations in English and Vietnamese, though they are different in the number of categories, both have seven specific forms. Basing on that, in the later part of the thesis, the data collected will be analyzed to see what is the choice of two groups of participants for each of the six situations.

The review of literature dealt with so far holds an significant importance in terms of providing the solid theoretical background for as well as setting up the analytical framework for the data collection procedure in the coming part of thesis.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The previous chapter has established the framework of the theoretical background from which the speech act theory, politeness theory and other issues related to the matter of this thesis have been introduced. This chapter focuses on introducing the methodology of the thesis; in other words, the methods of collecting data for analysis. This second chapter comprises five smaller parts: (1) research questions (2) research participants; (3) research procedure; (4) data collection instruments and (5) data analysis method.

3.1. Research questions

With the aims stated earlier, the following questions were addressed as follows and the thesis is hoped to answer them:

1. What are the major similarities and differences in the ways native speakers of English and native speakers of Vietnamese making invitations?
2. Do social distance (D), relative power (P), and ranking of impositions (R) affect the choice of inviting forms by native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers?

3.2. Research participants

As the thesis was about to find out the similarities and differences between speech acts of invitations in English and Vietnamese, the participants in the thesis were native speakers of English and native speakers of Vietnamese. Sixty survey questionnaires were handed out and sixty survey questionnaires returned were then analyzed. All participants were asked to provide their nationalities, age, occupations, gender, levels of education which were essential to find out the factors leading similarities and differences of making invitations. In order for the data to be reliable, prior to delivering the survey questionnaires, the participants were at first asked to
give their permissions to join the survey.

The number of native English speakers was thirty in all: fifteen males and fifteen females who are now living and working in Ho Chi Minh City, aged from nineteen to thirty eight at the time of the survey. Their jobs were various: professors, teachers, students, businessmen, managers, accountants. Their nationalities were diverse in terms of English speaking countries; in other words, English is their first language including the United States, The United Kingdom, Australia, Canada in order that the results of the survey questionnaires were potentially reliable.

Thirty was the number of native speakers of Vietnamese: fifteen males and fifteen females who are currently living and working in the city of Cao Lanh (Mekong Delta Province of Dong Thap. This group of participants was at the age of twenty one to forty three. These people speak Vietnamese as their first language.

The following table presented information on the research participants:

**Table 3.2. Information on the research participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers in total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Between 20 and 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 30 and 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Company manager</th>
<th>Worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3. Research procedure

In order to achieve the goals of the thesis in particular, as well as the thesis in general the process of making the thesis comes through three major stages. Writing the proposal was the very first stage in the process. This stage lasted nearly two months from early October to late December, 2011. Then from early January to half of this month, the survey questionnaire and personal observation were conducted. In the last stage starting from late January to early May, the results from data analysis were analyzed and discussed. This was also the stage when the thesis was finish both in form and content.

#### 3.4. Data collection instruments

To achieved the aims of the study with high reliability the study employed two data collection instruments. These were survey questionnaires and personal observations.

##### 3.4.1. The survey questionnaires

Survey questionnaire was the major data collection instrument employed in this thesis. The thesis aimed to investigate the similarities and differences in producing invitations speech acts by native speakers of English and those of Vietnamese. Therefore, the delivered questionnaires were written in English and Vietnamese with equal values. The questionnaire included two parts. The first part focused on personal information about the participants such as nationality, age, gender, level of
education, and occupation. The second part of the questionnaire provided situations which required the participants’ answers. Each of which consisted of eight open questions equivalent to eight situations in order to collect open answers from the delivered participants. The situations in the questionnaires were designed to reflect real life situations. These eight questions particularly emphasized the situations, relationships, genders, social status in which invitations speech acts were uttered. Each of the question was comprised two main parts: the description of the situation and the question to ask for the answer from the participants. The number of questionnaires delivered was fifteen for each version the participants were asked to write down their answers in the blank right below each question.

The questionnaires were then delivered to the participants. The chosen location to deliver the English version of the survey questionnaires was Ho Chi Minh City, the biggest and most crowded with expats in Vietnam. Twenty foreigners receiving the questionnaires were definitely people coming from English speaking countries such as The United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. Foreigners whose first language was not English were not included. Also, Cao Lanh city was the place in which Vietnamese version were delivered. They were people with Vietnamese as their first language. Nevertheless, those who were Vietnamese overseas were not chosen as the delivered participants. The forms of inviting provided by these participants were analyzed in the light of pragmatics and cross – cultural perspective and politeness strategies. A full version of each questionnaire is provided in the appendices.

In the survey questionnaires, a series of six situations was designed to elicit invitations from two groups of participants: native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers. According to the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987), there are three variables which have an effect on the choice of polite expressions namely: social distance of the speaker (D), the relative power of the speaker and the hearer (P), and the absolute ranking of impositions (R) in the particular culture.
From that, six situations in the survey questionnaires were made into three groups. The six situations are ordered as follows:

(1) The speaker has less power than the hearer; they are unfamiliar with each other.
(2) The speaker has less power than the hearer; they are familiar with each other.
(3) The speaker and the hearer are equal in power; they are familiar with each other.
(4) The speaker and the hearer are equal in power; they are unfamiliar with each other.
(5) The speaker has more power than the hearer; they are familiar with each other.
(6) The speaker has more power than the hearer; they are unfamiliar with each other.

Together with the categories of inviting discussed earlier, data collected from two groups of participants will be analyzed to find out the choice of inviting forms from the participants under the framework of Brown and Levinson’s theory.

The contents of the survey questionnaires are as follows:

Situation 1 was to investigate how invitation is made in the setting where the speaker and the hearer are equal in power and they are unfamiliar with each other, that is between two people sitting near next to each other on the bus and they have not known each other before.

Situation 2 was employed to explore which form is used by two groups of participants in the setting where the speaker and the hearer are equal in power and they are familiar with each other. In this situation, a student invites his or her classmates to have lunch together in the school's cafeteria.

Situation 3 was used to discover which form of inviting is chosen by two groups of participants in the setting where the speaker has more power than the hearer and they are familiar with each other. In this situation, the parents will say something to invite their children to sit down and have breakfast.

Situation 4 is designed to find out how the participant make an invitation in the setting where the speaker has more power than the hearer and they are unfamiliar
with each other. The speaker here in the situation is a manager or a boss of a company who will invite a new applicant a cup of coffee.

Situation 5 was to investigate the way two groups of participants make invitation in the setting where the speaker has lower power than the speaker and they are unfamiliar with each other. The speaker in the situation is the shoe seller who invite the customers to stop by and buy his or her products.

Situation 6 was employed to find out which form will be preferred by two groups of participants in the setting where the speaker has less power than hearer and they are familiar with each other. The students will invite their teacher to come to the class party at the end of the course.

3.4.2. Personal observations

In addition to conducting survey questionnaires, personal observations played a crucial role in terms of supplement data for the analysis. The personal observations were employed with the aim to collect adequate data for analysis. To serve the aims of a comparative analysis, just like the survey questionnaires, native speakers of English as well as Vietnamese native speakers were observed with the focus of their inviting utterances. The locations chosen for the observation work are in Ho Chi Minh city and Cao Lanh city as well. Three public places were Ben Thanh market, Dong Thap University campus, and a family. In these three contexts, the information which made by the interlocutors related to speech acts of invitations are carefully collected. While observing the conversations of the interlocutors, note – taking of the interlocutors’ inviting forms was done with attention. Data collected from personal observations is highly valued as it provides hypothesis for the contrastive analysis.

3.5. Data analysis method

After being collected, the data was statistically analyzed using quantitative method. The findings were mainly based on frequency distribution. The overview of results
in each group of power settings (including two situations) was recorded in table containing numbers of participants choosing this form and the equivalent percentage.

In each situation, the percentage of participants choosing each form of inviting was presented in each chart (each chart was named according to the title of each situation). The answers provided by two groups of participants were presented in appendix 3 and 4 and they were coded from S(1) to S(360).

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
This chapter concerns with the results recorded during the process of data collections which employed two data collection instruments as well as the discussion made basing on the results of the data collection process. In short, this part consists of three parts namely (1) an overview of results; (2) results of data analysis; (3) discussion.

4. 1. An overview of results

After holding the process of data collection, the study will now give the overview of results through survey questionnaires completed by two groups of participants: native speakers of English and native speakers of Vietnamese.

As mentioned in the former part, the survey questionnaire includes six situations. Basing on the theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1987), these six situations were grouped into three groups. The overview of results for three groups are respectively presented as follows:

4.1.1. An overview of results in equal power settings

Overall, the choices of inviting forms in the equal power settings where the speaker and the hearer are in equal power and they can be unfamiliar with each other (situation 1) and familiar with each other (situation 2) made by native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers are quite different. Specifically, in situation 1, English participants prefer the forms of Yes/No questions, whereas most Vietnamese ones make invitations in the forms of imperatives. In situation 2, there is a notable similarity when most participants from two groups prefer choosing imperative forms. The following table presents the overview results in equal power settings:

<p>| Table 4.1.1 An overview of results in equal power settings |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Inviting forms</th>
<th>Native speakers of English</th>
<th>Native speakers of Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2. An overview of results high power settings

Generally, in the setting where the speaker has more power than the hearer, the English and Vietnamese participants share both similarities and differences. First, in situation 1, most Vietnamese and English participants (94% and 97% respectively) choose to extend invitations in the forms of imperatives. By contrast, in situation, most English participants (60%) choose the forms of Yes/No questions, whereas Vietnamese ones invite in the forms of declarative sentences. The overview of results in high power setting is as follows:
Table 4.1.2. An overview of results in high power settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Inviting forms</th>
<th>Native speakers of English</th>
<th>Native speakers of Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4         | Form 1         | 6      | 20%        |        |            |
|           | Form 2         |        |            |        |            |
|           | Form 3         |        |            | 15     | 50%        |
|           | Form 4         | 5      | 17%        |        |            |
|           | Form 5         | 6      | 20%        |        |            |
|           | Form 6         | 18     | 60%        | 10     | 33%        |
|           | Form 7         |        |            |        |            |

4.1.3. An overview of results low power settings

Finally, in the setting where the speaker has lower power than the hearer, Vietnamese and English participants one again share similarities and differences. In situation 5, imperative forms are mostly chosen by 90% English participants and that is also the choice of 67% of Vietnamese participants. In situation 6, Vietnamese participants choose the form of performative sentence without a subject, whereas 50
percents of English participants choose the form of performative sentence with subjects.

What is presented above is the overview of results collected from two groups of participants for three groups of results. To be more specific, the coming part is about to look at the results for each situation. The overview of results in low power settings is presented as follows:

**Table 4.1.3. An overview of results in low power settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Inviting forms</th>
<th>Native speakers of English</th>
<th>Native speakers of Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Results of data analysis
4.2.1. The choice of inviting forms in equal power settings

Situation 1

Figure 4.2.1.a Forms of inviting provided by the English and Vietnamese participants: situation 1

As seen in Figure 2.1.a, most of the English participants (83%) invite in the forms of Yes/No- questions in situation 1 and some of the typical answers are as follows:

(S6) Do you want to eat some cakes?

(S7) Are you keen for a cake?

(S8) Would you like some cakes?

In the same situation, only five Vietnamese participants (equal to 17%) choose this form of the Yes/no questions. Some of the typical examples are:

(S207) Chí có muốn ăn một cái bánh không?

(Do you want to eat a cake?)

(S208) Chí có muốn ăn một ít gì không?

(Do you want to eat something?)

(S210) Em có một vài cái bánh nè! Chí có muốn ăn một ít không?
(I've got some cakes, Do you want to have some?) Moreover, fifteen Vietnamese participants (making up 50%) invite in the forms of imperatives meanwhile just five English participants, accounting for 17%, choose this inviting form. Some of the answers provided by Vietnamese participants are as follows:

(S181) Cô ơi ăn ới con môt cái bánh đi cô!
(Let's eat some cakes together!)
(S182) Cô ăn bánh đi cô!
(Let's eat some cake!).

and English ones are as follows:

(S1) You look hungry, Let's eat some cakes, please!
(S2) Are you hungry? Try these cakes, please!
(S3) You seem hungry, let's try a cake, please!

Moreover, there are six Vietnamese participants (equal to 20%) choosing the forms of performative sentence with a subject and four Vietnamese participants (equivalent to 13%) of the same group invite in the forms of declarative, but these numbers make up a small percentage.

Over situation 1 (the speaker and the hearer are equal in power, they are unfamiliar with each other, English participants make two choices including invitations in forms of imperatives, invitations of Yes/no questions where as Vietnamese got four choices invitations in form of performative sentence with a subject; invitations in the forms of performative sentence without a subject; invitations in form of imperatives; and invitations in form of Yes/no questions. In all, there is a notable difference in the choice of inviting forms in this situation namely: English participants prefer form 6 (using yes/no-questions) while most Vietnamese participants prefer forms 4 (imperative sentences).

Situation 2
As can be seen in figure 2.1.b, native speakers of English make two choices of the inviting forms for situation 2 which the speaker and the hearer are in equal power and they are familiar with each other; likewise, Vietnamese ones choose two forms to inviting in the same situation. First, twenty nine Vietnamese participants (equal to 97%) choose form 4 (using imperatives) to show their friendliness and closeness in situation 2. Some of the typical answers are as follows:

(S211) Ngõi bàn này luôn đi mấy bạn!
    (Guys, let's sit down here at this table!)
(S212) Ẹ, lái đây ngồi ăn cơm luôn đi mấy bạn ơi!
    (Hey, come to sit here and have lunch together)
(S213) Ăn trưa ở đây luôn đi mấy ông!
    (Guys, let's eat lunch here)

In most cases, the English participants add the words *please* in order to make their
imperatives more polite. Likewise, 60% of English participants (equivalent to 18 participants) invite in this forms. Take a look at some of the typical answers:

(S31) Please join me at this table,
(S32) Come here, please!
(S38) Join us for a drink.

In this situation, also, twelve English participants (40%) choose the forms of Yes/No questions to extend their invitations. The following sentences illustrate this:

(S34) Do you want to join me at this table?
(S35) Are you care for this table?

In this situation, whereas, there are only three Vietnamese participants (equivalent to 10%) deciding to choose this form. The following introduces some typical answers:

(S214) Mây ông ngồi đây ăn cơm luôn đi hà?
(Can you guys sit here and eat lunch together?)
(S215) Ông đây luôn được hôn?
(Can you sit here to eat?).

In general, from situation 2 (the speaker and the hearer are in equal power; they are familiar with each other, English participants choose two forms including, invitations in form of imperatives and invitations in form of Yes/no questions; likewise, Vietnamese participants make two choices: invitations in form of imperatives and invitations in form of Yes/no questions. Generally, under situation 2, most Vietnamese and English participants share in choosing the forms of imperative sentences for making invitations in the situation where the hearer and the speaker are in equal power and they are familiar with each other.

4.2.2. The choice of inviting forms in high power settings

Situation 3

Figure 4.2.2.a. Forms of inviting provided by the English and Vietnamese participants: situation 3
Looking at Chart 5, it is apparent that American participants and Vietnamese ones share in the choice of inviting forms for situation 3 in the setting where the speaker has more power than the hearer and they are familiar with each other. That is, most of the participants invite in the form of imperatives including 29 participants of English (making up 97%), some typical answers provided as:

(S61) Come down and enjoy breakfast!

(S62) Kids, sit down and have breakfast together!

Likewise, twenty eight Vietnamese participants (accounting for 94%) choose this form. See some of the following typical answers:

(S260) Ngồi xuống ăn sáng luôn đi con trai ơi!

(S243) Mây đưa ra đây ăn sáng với ba mẹ luôn nè!

In addition, only one English participant (equal to 3%) chooses one more form of inviting (form 6 using Yes/no questions). For example,

(S63) Are you ready for breakfast?.

Moreover, one Vietnamese participant (accounting for 3%) chooses the form of tag question in this situation like:
Furthermore, one Vietnamese participant (equivalent to 1%) choose to invite in the form of declarative sentence. See the following answer:

(S242) Mây đi ra ăn sáng vậy!
(Come out and have breakfast)

Overall, in situation 3, English participants make two choices of inviting forms including, invitations in form of imperatives and invitations in form of Yes/no questions, whereas Vietnamese got three choices namely: invitation in form of declarative sentence; invitations in form of imperatives; and invitations in form of tag question. Overall, in situation 3, there is a notable similarity between two groups of participants which most Vietnamese and English participants prefer form 4 (using imperatives) to make their invitations.

Situation 4

Figure 4.2.2.b. Forms of inviting provided by the English and Vietnamese participants: situation 4

As can be clearly seen that Vietnamese and English participants differ in choosing
inviting form for situation where the speaker has more power than the hearer and they are unfamiliar with each other. English participants make three choices in this situation: six participants make invitations in form of performative sentence with A subject (20%); some of the answers are as follows:

(S91) I would like to invite you a cup of tea.
(S92) I would like to invite you a drink,

Six invitations in form of Wh-questions (20%), see the following answers:

(S95) How about a cup of tea?
(S96) Why don't you try a cup of tea?

and eighteen choose to extend invitations in the form of Yes/No questions (60%). See three following answers:

(S101) Are you keen for a cup of tea?
(S102) Do you want to try a cup of tea?
(S103) Would you like a cup of tea?

Vietnamese participants choices are quite different, in contrast. Fifteen Vietnamese ones invite in the form of declarative sentences such as:

(S271) Uống một tách trà dở nhe!
(Drink a cup of tea!)
(S272) Bạn uống dở một tách trà cho dở khát nhe!
(Let's drink a cup of tea for being less thirsty).

Ten Vietnamese participants (accounting for 33%) decided to invite in the form of Yes/ No questions such as

(S275) Bạn muốn uống một tách trà cho dở khát không?
(Would you like to drink a cup of tea for being less thirsty?)
(S276) Uống một tách trà nhe?
(A cup of tea).

Finally, the rest of Vietnamese participants (equal to 17%) extend their invitations in the form of imperatives such as

(S277) Uống một tách trà đi bạn!
(Let's drink a cup of tea!)

(S278) Dùng một tách trà cho đỡ khát đi bạn!

(Let's drink a cup of tea to be less thirsty).

In short, two groups of participants choose differently the forms of inviting for situation 4. English participants got three forms: performative sentence with a subject, WH-questions and Yes/no questions; Vietnamese participants invite in three forms: declarative sentences, imperatives and Yes/no questions. However, English participants prefer form 6 (using Yes/no questions) whereas Vietnamese ones prefer form 3 (using declarative sentences).

4.2.3. The choice of inviting forms in low power settings

Situation 5

Figure 4.2.3.a. Forms of inviting provided by the English and Vietnamese participants: situation 5

As appears in figure 2.3.a that native speakers of English make two choices and Vietnamese native speakers make three choices in the situation where the speaker has less power than the hearer. First, 90 % of English participants choose the form of imperatives with please added in most cases such as
(S121) Please drop by and try these new shoes!
(S122) Come in please, very nice shoes inside!

whereas ten out of thirty Vietnamese participants (33%) choose this form such as the following:

(S313) Ghé vô lữa giày mới bố về đi chị!
    (Let’s drop by and select new shoes)
(S330) Mua giày ghé vô lừa đi anh ơi!
    (Buying shoes, drop by to select).

Moreover, nineteen Vietnamese participants (equal to 64%) choose to extend their invitations in the form of performative sentence without a subject. The following examples are some typical ones:

(S301) Mời anh chị ghé vô lừa giày!
    (Invite you come to select shoes)
(S302) Hàng mới về, mời anh chị quẹo lừa!
    (New items here, invite you drop by and select).

Only one Vietnamese participant invite in the form of performative sentence with a subject. This invitation is as follows:

(S303) Giày mới đây, em mời anh chị!
    (New shoes here, I’d like you to select).

There are three English participants (equal to 10%) choosing the form of Yes/No questions. Take a look at some typical answers:

(S123) Do you want to try these new items?
(S127) Would you like to try these new shoes?

Generally, two groups of participants differ much in choosing the forms of inviting in situation 5 where English participants choose imperatives and Yes/No questions: and Vietnamese ones invite in the forms of performative sentence without subject and declarative sentences. Over these choices, most English participants prefer form 4 while Vietnamese ones prefer 2.
Figure 4.2.3.b. Forms of inviting provided by the English and Vietnamese participants: situation 6

Figure 2.3.b shows that English and Vietnamese participants greatly differ in choosing the inviting forms for situation 6 where the speaker has less power than the hearer. Fifteen English participants (accounting for 50%) choose the forms of performative sentences with a subject to express their respect to the teacher. Some of the typical answers are as follows:

(S151) *We would like to invite you to join our class's party this weekend.*

(158) *Our class' d like to invite you to our party next Sunday.*

whereas five Vietnamese participants (making up 17%) invite in this form. See some of the answers:

(S331) *Dạ lớp em mời có đến dự bữa tiệc liên hoan với lớp em chứ nhất này!*  
(Our class would like to invite you to attend our class's party this Sunday)

(S332) *Lớp em mời có đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em!*  
(Our class would like to invite you to attend the party with us).

No English participants choose form 2, whereas nineteen Vietnamese participants
(accounting for 63%) choose form 2 (performative sentence without a subject) such as:

\[(S333) \text{Mời quý thầy cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em!} \]
(Invite dear teachers to attend the party with our class.)

\[(S334) \text{Mời thầy cô đến chơi với lớp em nhe cô!} \]
(Invite teachers come to join our class)

In addition, six out of thirty Vietnamese participants (about 20%) choose the forms of imperatives to make invitations in this situation. Some answers provided by them are as follows:

\[(S335) \text{Cô đ{ê}n chơi với lớp em cho vui nha cô!} \]
(Dear teacher, join and have fun with our class!)

\[(S336) \text{Cô hãy đêน chung vui với lớp em nghen cô!} \]
(Let's come and have fun with our class!).

Ten English participants (accounting for 33%) choose the form of imperatives to extend the invitation. See the following answers as examples:

\[(S152) \text{Come and celebrate with us!} \]

\[(S180) \text{We are having a party this Sunday morning, please come and join us.} \]

Five English participants (equivalent to 17%) make their invitations for situation 6 using Yes/No-questions like:

\[(S153) \text{Would you like to join us in the class' s party next weekend?} \]
\[(S154) \text{Are you care for a drink with our class this weekend?} \]

In general, in situation 6 belonging to low power setting, English and Vietnamese participants expressed diffidently their preference of inviting forms which English participants prefer form 1 (using performative sentence a subject, 4 (using imperative sentences) while Vietnamese participants prefer form 2 (using performative sentence without a subject, and form 4 (using imperative sentences).

4.3. Discussion

As mentioned in chapter three, there were two research questions raised during the
process of data analysis.

1. What are similarities and differences between the ways English native speakers and Vietnamese speakers making invitations?

2. Do (social distance), relative power (P), and ranking of impositions (R) affect the choice of inviting forms by native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers?

In this part, after the results from survey questionnaires were introduced, the discussion of these two research question was about to be made:

4.3.1. Research question 1: What are similarities and differences between the ways English native speakers and Vietnamese speakers making invitations?

The data analysis above provides some interesting information about the ways native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers making and choosing the suitable forms of invitations over three groups of settings: equal power settings, high power settings and low power settings, covering six situations.

From the data analysis, a lot of similarities and differences can be seen in the ways of making invitations between Vietnamese and English participants.

4.3.1.1. Similarities

The very first similarity shared by invitations made in both languages is that the performative verb *invite* and *mời* is used in some forms of inviting. The verb *invite* occurs in the English data twenty one times and *mời* appears in Vietnamese data fifty times; however, they are are used in different forms. In English data, the performative verb mainly appears in the form of performative sentence with subjects such as *I would like to invite you to our party this weekend*. By contrast, the word *mời* is mostly used in the form of performative sentence without a subject such as *Mời cô đến chung vui với lớp em!* (Invite you to come and have fun with our class!)

In order to reduce face-threatening, and to pay respect to the invitee, *please* in
English, *xin trân trọng*, *kinh mòi* in Vietnamese were added, which appear in imperative forms or performative sentences provided by two groups of participants. The following answers provided by English participants illustrate this:

(S1) You look hungry, Let's eat some cakes, please!  
(S2) Are you hungry? Try these cakes, please!

or some answers provided by Vietnamese participants as follows:

(S340) *Kính mòi cô thấy đến dự tiệc liên hoan với chúng em!*

(Respectfully invite teachers come to attend the party with our class)

(S341) *Thây ơi, cô ơi! Lớp chúng em có tổ chức một buổi liên hoan nhỏ, em kính mòi thấy cô đến dự cùng lớp chúng em!*

(Dear teachers, our class is going to have a party, we respectfully invite you to attend it with us)

The ways English and Vietnamese native speakers conduct invitation-making speech act are both affected by three variables: social distance (intimacy), power relations (social status or age) between the speaker and the hearer, and impositions (threats to each other's negative face).

### 4.3.3.2. Differences

Beside all common features discussed above, there are various dissimilarities in making invitations in English and Vietnamese.

First, from results of survey questionnaires, it is apparent that direct inviting in Vietnamese employs more structures than that of English namely invitations in form of performative sentence with or without a subject, declarative sentences, and imperatives, while Vietnamese indirect invitations goes around just performative sentence with subject, and imperatives.

In terms of directness and indirectness, through survey statistics, Vietnamese tends to be more direct when extending invitations. As a matter of fact, the proportion of direct forms chosen by Vietnamese participants are quite larger than
those of English ones namely in situation 1, 4, and 6. The difference is due to indirect invitations in English can cause face-threatening to the hearer.

In some cases appeared in the answers of English participants, elliptical yes/no questions are used in situation 3 such as *Have a drink here?* or *This table?*, but they do not appear in Vietnamese participants' answers.

### 4.3.2. Research question 2: Do (social distance), relative power (P), and ranking of impositions affect the choice of inviting forms native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers?

In the former part, similarities and differences in the ways English native speakers and Vietnamese native speakers making invitations. This part is about to discuss the influences of three social variables to the choice of inviting forms by two groups of participants in each situation.

**Situation 1**

In situation 1 (the speaker invites a woman that he or she doesn't know to enjoy a cake) where the speaker and the hearer are the same in power and they don't know each other, Vietnamese prefer form 4 (in form of imperatives) while English participants use type 6 (in the forms of Yes/No questions. The choice of of English participants is due to the effect of R (threats to each other's negative face). Take a look at some answers provided by English native speakers:

1. *Do you want to eat a cake?*
2. *I have some cake Would you like to try one?*

and some provided by Vietnamese participants as follows:

3. *Chị ơi chị ăn chút gì đi!*  
   (Sister, Let's eat something!)
4. *Cô ơi cô ăn một chút đi!*  
   (Aunt, Eat a little bit!)

Generally, in the equal settings, Vietnamese participants tend to be direct and
imperative while English ones tend to be indirect. Despite of these differences, it can not be drawn a conclusion that Vietnamese is more polite than English in making invitation or vise verse. We can only conclude that it is matter of culture and habit and language as a mean of communication.

**Situation 2**

The data presented in figure 2.1.b (situation 2) shows that Vietnamese participants and English participants prefer type 4 (invitations in form of imperatives) in their invitations made in the setting when the speaker and the hearer are in equal power and they are familiar with each other (a friend invites their classmates to eat lunch together) in order to show their friendliness. Social distance (D) has an effect to the choice of inviting forms by Vietnamese and English participants. This is because there is an intimacy between interlocutors. Look at the following answers provided by English participants:

(5) *Please join me at this table!*

(6) *The meal is ready, come out and enjoy together!*

or some make by Vietnamese participants as follows:

(7) *Các bạn lại ngồi cùng mình!*

(Guys, come here and sit with me!)

(8) *Ngồi chung bàn này luôn đi mấy ông!*

(Guys, sit together here at this table!)

**Situation 3**

Both two groups of participants, in situation 3 where the speaker has more power than the hearer; they are familiar with each other, tend to be imperative when most of the participants from two groups prefer using form 4 (imperatives), specifically to family members in situation 3. The reason why that form is preferred is that the speaker and the hearer are in close relationship (affected by social distance - D) and the speaker (a mother or a father) is in higher power or position (relative power-P)
than the hearer (the children). Here are some imperative provided by English native speakers and Vietnamese ones respectively:

(9) Sit down, kids breakfast is soon!
(10) Come here, breakfast will be served soon!

or some answers by Vietnamese participants as follows:

(11) Các con xuống ăn sáng đi!
    (My kids, come down to have breakfast!)
(12) Ngồi xuống ăn sáng đi máy địa!
    (Sit down and have breakfast!)

**Situation 4**

It appears in situation 4 where the speaker has more power than the hearer (a boss or a manger invites a new applicant a cup of tea) that most Vietnamese speakers were not influenced by social distance (D) but relative power (P), form 3 (declarative sentences) were employed. Some of typical answer are as follows:

(13) Uống một tách trà cho đỡ khát vậy!
    (Drink a cup of tea for being less thirsty!)
(14) Uống đỡ một tách trà vậy!
    (Drink a cup of tea!)

However, in the same situation, most English ones prefer type 6 (in form of Yes/No questions). No English participants choose to invite in the form of imperatives. These choice are strongly affected by R (threat to each other negative face) and relative power (P). This is because the inviter (the boss) don't want to go to the content of invitation directly. Take a look at some examples:

(15) Would you mind for a cup of tea?
(16) Are you keen for a drink?

**Situation 5**

Statistics shows in situation 5 that to invite the customers to stop by and choose the
items (in the setting where the speaker has less power than the hearer and they are strangers each others), Vietnamese speakers use performative sentences without subjects to show be more respective to the customers. This choice of inviting form by the shoe vendor was affected by social distance (D) and relative power (P). For examples:

(17) Mời anh chỉ ghé vào gian hàng!
(Invite you to visit my store!)
(18) Mời anh chỉ ghé vào coi đi, đôi nào thích được thì lấy!
(Invite you to to drop by to see the items, take any pair of shoes that you like).

While native speakers of English use imperative sentences for that situation to establish friendliness with the word please accompanied. R and P did not express their influence to the choice of English native speaker in this situation. See the following answer below:

(19) Come in please!
(20) Please choose our new shoes!

Situation 6

In the setting where the speaker has lower power than the hearer; they are familiar with each other (situation 6), performative sentences were mostly used both two groups of participants in order to show respect to the person invited. Both of the participants were influence by social distance and relative power. As a matter of fact the students were in lower position than the teacher and they are in close relationship, so performative sentence with a subject was preferred as in the following answer:

(21) We are having a party to celebrate finishing our course, we’d like to invite you.
(22) We are having a barbecue next Sunday morning, we would like to invite you since you have been such a nice teacher.

or some typical answers from Vietnamese participants as follows:

(23) Dạ em kính mời cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em tốt thứ bây này!
(I would like to invite you to attend our class's party this Saturday evening!)

(24) Đạ thưa cô, lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan, em mời cô đến dự với chúng em!

(Dear teacher, my class is having a party, I would like to invite you!)

However, in some cases, mòi in Vietnamese appears in form of performative sentence without a subject as this choice was influenced by social distance (D). Take some typical answers as examples:

(25) Mòi cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em! cho vui nhe cô!

(Invite you to attend the party with our class to have fun!)

(26) Cô ơi! Mòi cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan cuối tuần này với lớp chúng em!

(Dear teacher, invite you to attend the party this weekend with our class)

Finally, the choice of inviting forms make by English and Vietnamese participants is both similar and different. Social status, intimacy and threats to each other's negative face express their different influences to the choice of the speakers from both languages.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Finally, chapter five of the thesis is about shortly to take a look at what are presented in the thesis as well as give additional information related to the study. It is comprised of two smaller parts: (1) summary, major findings, implications on teaching and (2) limitations of the study and suggestions for further studies.

5.1. Summary, major findings and implications on teaching

5.1.1. Summary

The focus of this study was on the differences and similarities in English and Vietnamese invitations. The literature review of the thesis is based on the theoretical background of speech acts, politeness strategies, the existing theory on pragmatics and cross-cultural pragmatics, categories of inviting in English and Vietnamese through previous researches as well as books on linguistics and English learning.

The data for analysis was provided by two groups of participants: thirty English native speakers and thirty Vietnamese native speakers. The study employs two data collection instruments: survey questionnaires and personal observation, which survey questionnaire is the major one. The survey questionnaires consisting six situations were delivered to thirty Vietnamese and thirty English participants.

The study aims to find out the similarities and differences between the ways English and Vietnamese making invitations. As a result, two research questions are addressed: (1) What are the major similarities and differences in the ways native speakers of English and native speakers of Vietnamese making invitations? (2) Do social distance (D), relative power (P), and ranking of impositions (R) affect the choice of inviting forms by native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers?

Data analysis method in this study are statistics, comparing and contrasting. The invitations provided by two groups of participants were classified according to forms
of inviting existed in the invitation utterance to find how much percentage of English participants and Vietnamese participants use a particular form in each situation.

After the results was presented, the discussion to answer two research questions were made, and some implications on teaching was introduced.

5.1.2. Major findings

Basing on the data analysis of invitation speech acts provided by English and Vietnamese participants as well as the discussion of similarities and differences the ways two groups of participants making invitations and the influence of three variables to the choice of inviting forms by English and Vietnamese participants, the study now comes to review the major findings recorded from the study.

In terms of syntactic analysis, Vietnamese participants employed more invitations structures than those of English participants. Specifically, Vietnamese speakers used seven forms of inviting including performative sentence with a subject; performative sentence without a subject; declarative sentences; imperatives, Wh-questions; Yes/no questions; and tag questions whereas English ones got five forms including performative sentence with a subject; imperatives, Wh-questions; Yes/no questions; and tag questions. Another major finding is that Vietnamese participants are more direct than English in terms of using more direct forms of inviting (161 out of 180 invitation utterances by Vietnamese participants are in direct forms in comparison to 116 out of 180 by English ones). The reason is that direct invitations in English are face-threatening.

In each situation provided, two groups of participants share similarities and express differences in choosing the forms of inviting through three groups of settings. The choices of inviting forms in the equal power settings where the speaker and the hearer are in equal power and they can be unfamiliar with each other (situation 1) and familiar with each other (situation 2) made by native speakers of English and Vietnamese native speakers are quite different. Specifically, in situation
1, most English participants prefer the forms of Yes/No questions (83%), whereas most Vietnamese ones make invitations in the forms of imperatives (50%). In situation 2, there is a notable similarity when most participants from two groups prefer choosing imperative forms. In the setting where the speaker has more power than the hearer, the English and Vietnamese participants share both similarities and differences. In situation 3, most Vietnamese and English participants (94% and 97% respectively) choose to extend invitations in the forms of imperatives. As a result, from situation 3, English and Vietnamese participants are found similar in choosing the same form of inviting. By contrast, in situation 4, most English participants (60%) choose the forms of Yes/No questions, whereas most Vietnamese ones invite in the forms of declarative sentences (50%). Finally, in the setting where the speaker has lower power than the hearer, Vietnamese and English participants once again share similarities and differences. In situation 5, imperative forms are mostly chosen by 90% English participants and that is also the choice of 67% of Vietnamese participants. In situation 6, Vietnamese participants choose the form of performative sentences without subjects, whereas 50 percents of English participants choose the form of performative sentence with subjects.

The way English and Vietnamese people conduct inviting is affected by three factors: social distance (or intimacy), power relations (i.e. social status or age) between the speakers, and impositions (i.e. threats to each other’s negative face) negotiated by interlocutors. In addition, the most popular forms of inviting in Vietnamese are imperatives and performative sentence with a subject. Moreover, English participants sound more polite in their invitations in comparison with Vietnamese ones tend to be imperative in order to establish friendliness. In some settings like in situation 2 (between classmates), situation 3 (between the parents and children), English and Vietnamese participants found to be nearly similar in the choice of inviting forms.

5.1.3. Implications on teaching

As mentioned in the former part, perceiving the similarities and differences about
invitation-making speech act is a must in terms of helping teachers design tasks for students. Under some aspects of contrastive view into making invitations both in English and Vietnamese, the study is about to discuss some implications for Vietnamese learners of English.

It is, first, essential for teachers to make students aware of cultural similarities and differences of making invitations in Vietnamese culture and the cultures where the target language is spoken. Teacher should distinguish and highlight which forms of invitations, in other words, when and they are used in informal situations as well as formal ones. Through that, students can get to know clearly the functions of this speech act in order to use it effectively in daily interactions. It drives the students to be more confident when they make and keep the conversations with other people, especially those who come from English speaking countries. This is important because teachers themselves are making every effort to qualify our students for using English for communication.

Teachers, secondly, should provide their students any input that is necessary for students to enrich their understandings on the way invitations made both languages as well as to enhance students' language and communicative competence. The input can be provided in various ways. For example, modern technology in language teaching today offers a great help for teachers to provide students with many sources of invitations such as Internet, television, videos, and many others. From that teachers can provide students with many options for choosing suitable conversations that are close to real life situations. These are quite different to what are presented in the textbooks in order to bring authentic materials into the classroom.

Last but not least, teachers should also provide their students with as many as communicative opportunities as possible. Teachers should transform the class into a small society, or a neighborhood or an office where students can practice some activities as role play or mapped dialogue. These activities can stimulate students' enthusiasm, creativity in making invitations in English.
5.2. Limitations of the study and suggestions for further studies

5.2.1. Limitations of the study

The study contains some limitations that should be noted. Firstly, there was a limitation regarding the participants of the study. The Vietnamese participants are mostly students, whereas, due to contact condition constraints, the native speakers of English come from various backgrounds. They have different jobs and consequently, in general, they have different social status. Some are university lecturers. This difference does not ensure a parallel data for the comparison of the strategy use of the two language groups. For example, a lecturer’s response might be more formal than that of a student.

5.2.2. Suggestions for further studies

Although similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese invitations in terms of cross-cultural perspective have been investigated so far in the thesis, it cannot cover all the aspects relating to such broad cultural and linguistic convention like inviting and its related issues. As a result, further researches can further find out more about this topic. Here are some suggestions:

A comparative study on accepting an invitation in English and Vietnamese in terms of cross-cultural perspective.

A comparative study on refusing an invitation in English and Vietnamese in terms of politeness strategies.

A comparative study on hedges in declining an invitation in English and Vietnamese in terms of cross-cultural perspectives.

The thesis has been completed with greatest efforts. However, during the making of the thesis, shortcomings and mistakes are inevitably unavoidable. Therefore, sympathetic comments and suggestions are highly appreciated.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (IN ENGLISH)

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out what you would naturally say in the situations listed below. Your assistance in completing the following items is highly appreciated. You can be confident that this questionnaire is for research purposes only and that you will not be identified in any discussion of the data.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Part I

Please fill in your personal information.

| 1. Your nationality:                      |
| 2. Your age:                            |
| 3. Your gender: Male □ Female □         |
| 4. Level of education: High school □    |
|                                           College or University □ |
| 5. Your occupation:                      |

Could you please read the situations below? After each situation please write down exactly what you would say in the normal conversation.

Part II

Situation 1: You are sitting and eating some cakes in the bus. The woman sitting near you seems so hungry. You want to invite her a cake. What would you say? .......

Situation 2: You are eating lunch in a school cafeteria. Some of your classmates are coming. To invite your friends to eat together. What would you say? ..............

Situation 3: Suppose you are mother or father. You want to ask your children to sit
down and have breakfast. What would you say? ..............................................................
........................................................................................................................................

**Situation 4:** You are a boss or a manager. An applicant comes to your company for an interview. He/she looks very thirsty. You want to invite him/her a cup of coffee? What would you say? ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

**Situation 5:** You are a shoe seller in a market. You want to invite the customers to stop by and choose your items. What would you say? ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

**Situation 6:** At the end of the course, your class holds a party. You would like to invite your teacher to join it. What would you say? ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

*Thank you very much for your co-operation!*
PHIÊN ĐIỀU TRA

Mục đích của phiếu điều tra này là nhằm tìm hiểu xem quỹ phát biểu như thế nào trong các tình huống dưới đây. Rất cảm ơn và trân trọng sự nhiệt tình của quỹ vị cho việc hoàn thành phiếu điều tra này. Quỹ vị hãy yên tâm vì phiếu khảo sát này chỉ phục vụ cho quá trình nghiên cứu và thông tin cá nhân của quỹ vị sẽ không được bàn luận trong bất kỳ tham luận này.

Xin cảm ơn chân thành vì sự giúp đỡ của quỹ vị

Phần 1:
Xin quỹ vị hãy điền vào những thông tin dưới đây:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quốc tịch:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuổi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giới tính: Nam ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nữ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trình độ học vấn:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nghề nghiệp:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phần 2

Quỹ vị hãy đọc những tình huống dưới đây. Sau đó xin quỹ vị hãy viết câu trả lời đúng với suy nghĩ của mình vào khoảng trống bên dưới mỗi câu hỏi:

Tình huống 1: Quỹ vị đang ăn một ít bánh trên xe buýt. Người phụ nữ ngồi kế bên quỹ vị trong cổ vét rắt dài. Bạn có ý muốn mọi cô ấy ăn một cái bánh, quỹ vị sẽ nói gì?

Tình huống 2: Quỹ vị đang ngồi ăn trưa trong căn tình trường. Một vài người bạn cùng lớp đang đi đến. Quỹ vị sẽ nói gì để rủ các bạn cùng ngồi ăn chung?

Tình huống 3: Giả sử quý vị là ba hay là mẹ. Bữa sáng đã xong rồi. Quý vị thường nói gì để kêu các con mình ngồi xuống ăn sáng? ..............................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
Tình huống 4: Giả sử quý vị là quản lý hay giám đốc của một công ty. Một ứng viên đến công ty bạn xin việc, trong anh ta có ta có vẻ rất khác nước, quý vị sẽ nói gì để mời anh ta hay chỉ ta uống một tách trà? ..............................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
Tình huống 5: Giả sử quý vị là một người bán giày dép tại một khu chợ. Quý vị thường nói gì để mời khách hàng ghé vào và chọn giày? ..............................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
Tình huống 6: Vào lúc kết thúc một học kỳ, lớp quý vị có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoàn. Quý vị sẽ nói gì để mời giáo viên của bạn dự buổi tiệc đó? ..............................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................

Xin chân thành cảm ơn sự giúp đỡ của quý vị.
APPENDIX 3: OBSERVATION SHEET

OBSERVATION SHEET

Part I. Observation information
Time of: ..........................................................Date of observing:.................................
Place of observing:..............................................................................................................
Group of participants:........................................................................................................
Nationalities..........................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Part II. Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: INVITATIONS PROVIDED BY ENGLISH PARTICIPANTS

(S1) You look hungry, Let's eat some cakes, please!
(S2) Are you hungry? Try these cakes, please!
(S3) You seem hungry, let's try a cake, please!
(S4) Please try these ones!
(S5) Let's eat a cake, please!
(S6) Do you want to eat some cakes?
(S7) Are you keen for a cake?
(S8) Would you like some cakes?
(S9) Are you care for a cake?
(S10) Are you keen for a cake?
(S11) Would you like to try some cakes?
(S12) Would you like to try these cakes?
(S13) Do you want to eat some cakes?
(S14) Would you like to eat some cakes?
(S15) Would you like to try these cakes?
(S16) Cakes?
(S17) Can you please eat a cake?
(S18) Do you want some cakes?
(S19) You seem hungry. Are you care for a cake?
(S20) Would you like to try some cakes?
(S21) You sound hungry. Would you like some cakes?
(S22) Would you like to eat some cakes?
(S23) Are you keen for a cake?
(S24) You look hungry. Would you like some thing to eat?
(S25) Do you want to eat a cake?
(S26) I have some cake Would you like to try one?
(S27) Would you like to try some cakes?
(S28) Would you like to eat some cakes?
(S29) Would you please eat a cake?. I have some.
(S30) Would you like to have some cakes?
Situation 2:

(S31) Please join me at this table,
(S32) Come here, please!
(S33) Come over, please!
(S34) Do you want to join me at this table?
(S35) Are you care for this table?
(S36) Come on guys!
(S37) Do you want to drink something!
(S38) Join us for a drink.
(S39) Join me at this table.
(S40) Come here guys!
(S41) Come on over! please!
(S42) Let's have a drink, this table
(S43) Do you want to eat something?
(S44) Care for a drink?
(S45) Come here guys, and have lunch together!
(S46) Please join me here!
(S47) Come over here!
(S48) Join me for lunch!
(S49) Guys! Sit down and have lunch together
(S50) Come on girls!
(S51) Come over here and have a drink!
(S52) Hello! Come here, please.
(S53) Alright guys! Let's go and have a drink
(S54) Do you want to join us for lunch?
(S55) Come on over here.
(S56) Are you keen for a drink?
(S57) Can you guys sit here at this table?
(S58) Is this table alright?
(S59) Will you come here for a drink?
(S60) Do you want to join me here?
Situation 3:

(S61) Come down and enjoy breakfast!
(S62) Kids! Sit down and have breakfast together!
(S63) Are you ready for breakfast?
(S64) Sit down please, we are having breakfast now.
(S65) Child come here please, breakfast is ready.
(S66) Wash your face; be quite; come to the table and have you tea, porridge, and congee.
(S67) Please join me at this table!
(S68) Breakfast is ready, please come down!
(S69) Sit down and enjoy the meal!
(S70) Sit down, kids breakfast is soon!
(S71) The meal is ready! Kids, sit down and enjoy it!
(S72) Sit down for breakfast!
(S73) The meal is ready, come out and enjoy together!
(S74) Come here, breakfast will be served soon!
(S75) Let's enjoy!
(S76) Come to the table, please! Breakfast is ready
(S77) Let's enjoy your dish!
(S78) Come to the table, we are having breakfast!
(S79) Marc, breakfast is ready, let's come out!
(S80) Wash you hands, please! breakfast is ready!
(S81) Louis, come to the table and enjoy together!
(S82) Kids, Stop watching TV, come to the table, we are having breakfast now!
(S83) John, Stop studying, come to the kitchen for breakfast!
(S84) Oh! You are back! let's have breakfast together!
(S85) Sit down and enjoy the meal!
(S86) Breakfast is ready! Let's sit down!
(S87)Joan, sit down! Breakfast is ready!
(S88) Please stop playing Bob, come to the table and have breakfast now!
(S89) Please sit down, the meal is ready!
(S90) Sit down and enjoy breakfast!
Situation 4:

(S91) I would like to invite you a cup of tea.
(S92) I would like to invite you a drink
(S93) I'd like to invite you a cup of tea.
(S94) Sit here and relax, I' like invite you a drink.
(S95) How about a cup of tea?
(S96) Why don’t you try a cup of tea?
(S97) What about a cup of tea?
(S98) How about tea?
(S99) What about tea?
(S100) How about a cup of tea?
(S101) Are you keen for a cup of tea?
(S102) Do you want to try a cup of tea?
(S103) Would you like a cup of tea?
(S104) Would you like to drink a cup of tea?
(S105) Care for a drink?
(S106) Would you like some tea or coffee?
(S107) Would you mind for a cup of tea?
(S108) Are you keen for a drink?
(S109) Would you like some tea?
(S110) Do you want to try some tea?
(S111) Would you like something to drink?
(S112) Would you like a coffee?
(S113) Coffee?
(S114) A cup of tea?
(S115) Would you like some coffee?
(S116) You seem thirsty! Would you like some tea?
(S117) Care for a drink?
(S118) Are you keen for a cup of tea?
(S119) I would like to invite you a drink.
(S120) Let’s take a short break. I'd like invite you a tea.
Situation 5:

(S121) Please drop by and try these new shoes!
(S122) Come in! Very nice shoes inside.
(S123) Do you want to try these new items?
(S124) Care to try these ones?
(S125) We have nice shoes. Please come and try them on.
(S126) Hello! come to try our new items.
(S127) Would you like to try these new shoes?
(S128) Please drop by for a few minutes!
(S129) Have a look at our new items and choose that you like!
(S130) Very nice shoes, com and try them on!
(S131) New shoes here, drop by and choose!
(S132) Have a look and choose a pair of shoes you like!
(S133) Please come in!
(S134) Let's try our new items!
(S135) Let's drop by and select new shoes
(S136) New shoes here! Let's have look!
(S137) Come in please!
(S138) Please choose our new shoes!
(S139) Please go inside, new items here!
(S140) Please stop here, let's have a look at our new items!
(S141) New items here! Let's choose the ones you like!
(S142) Please come in, try on our new products!
(S143) Please stop by, our new shoes here!
(S144) Please drop by and try our new shoes!
(S145) New shoes here! Come in and try these ones!
(S146) Please drop by here for a moment!
(S147) New shoes here, welcome!
(S148) Let's choose our new items!
(S149) Come in please!
(S150) Very nice shoes, com and try them on!
Situation 6

(151) We would like to invite you to join our class's party this weekend.
(152) We have a lovely party and since you have you have been such a nice teacher, please come and celebrate with us!
(S153) Would you like to join us in the class’ party next weekend?
(S154) Are you care for a drink with our class this weekend?
(S155) Our class would like to invite you to our party this Sunday.
(S156) Mr. Smith, you have been such a nice teacher, we'd like to invite you our class' party this Saturday.
(S157) Professor James, we are happy to invite you to our party this Sunday evening.
(S158) Our class’ d like to invite you to our party next Sunday.
(S159) We are having a party to celebrate finishing our course, we’d like to invite you.
(S160) We are having a barbecue next Sunday morning, we would like to invite you since you have been such a nice teacher.
(S161) We are having a party. Would you like to join us?. We are happy to have you.
(S162) Could you join us in our class party this Sunday evening?
(S163) Would you like to join us in the class party this Saturday evening?
(S164) We would like to invite you to our party this Sunday evening, we are happy to have you!
(S165) To celebrate finishing the term, we would like to invite you since you have been so nice with our class!
(S166) Our class would like to invite you to our class party this weekend, come and have fun!
(S167) We are having a party this weekend, so we’d like to invite you professor Brown!
(S168) Our class is having a party this Sunday evening, and we especially invite you Mr. Thomson.
(S169) We’d love to invite you to our party this weekend!
(S170) We are having a barbecue this Saturday morning, we would like to invite you.
(S171) We are having a class party to celebrate finishing the semester, please come and have fun with us!
(S172) We are celebrating finishing the term, so please come and join us for the party next
Sunday morning!

(S173) We are going to hold a party this Saturday evening, so please come and have fun with us!

(S174) Madame Jenifer, our class is having a party this Monday evening, please come and join us!

(S175) We are having a party this Sunday evening, please come and join us, Mr. Johnson

(S176) Our class is having a barbecue next Sunday morning, let’s come and join our party, please!

(S177) This Sunday morning we are having a barbecue to celebrate finishing the course, please come and join our party if you have free time!

(S178) Next Saturday evening, we are having class party, please come and have fun with us!

(S179) Join us if you have free time.

(S180) We are having a party this Sunday morning, please come and join us.
APPENDIX 5: INVITATIONS PROVIDED BY VIETNAMESE PARTICIPANTS

Situation 1:
(S181) Cô ơi ăn với con một cái bánh đi cô!
(S182) Cô ăn bánh đi cô!
(S183) Cô ơi cô ăn một chút gì đi!
(S184) Chỉ ơi ăn với em một cái bánh đi!
(S185) Chỉ ơi ăn với em một cái bánh đi!
(S186) Chỉ ơi ăn để một cái bánh đi chỉ!
(S187) Đã chỉ ơi ăn với em một cái bánh đi chỉ!
(S188) Chỉ ơi! Em có một cái bánh này! Chỉ ẩn với em một cái bánh đi!
(S189) Chỉ ơi chỉ ăn chút gì đi!
(S190) Chỉ ơi cô ăn một chút đi!
(S191) Ăn một cái bánh đi chỉ!
(S192) Bánh của em nè! Chỉ ăn một cái đi!
(S193) Chỉ ơi cô ăn một chút gì đi!
(S194) Chỉ ơi em có một cái bánh này chỉ ẩn với em một cái đi!
(S195) Bánh của em nè! Chỉ ăn một cái gì đi!
(S196) Chỉ ơi, đã con mờ cô ăn bánh!
(S197) Chỉ ơi! Con mờ cô ăn một cái bánh!
(S198) Đã con mì cô ăn bánh!
(S200) Chỉ có đói không! Chỉ mì cô ăn với con một cái bánh!
(S201) Con mì cô ăn bánh!
(S202) Chỉ ơi cô có có đói không? Con mì cô ăn với con một cái bánh!
(S203) Chỉ ơi ăn để một cái bánh vậy!
(S204) Chỉ ơi ăn để một cái bánh vậy!
(S205) Chỉ ăn với em một cái bánh cho vui chỉ!
(S206) Ăn với em một cái bánh vậy!
(S207) Chỉ có muốn ăn một cái bánh không?
(S208) Chỉ có muốn ăn một ít gì không?
(S209) Chỉ ơi chỉ có muốn ăn bánh không?
(S210) Em có một vài cái bánh nè! Chỉ có muốn ăn một ít không?

**Situation 2**

(S211) Ngôi bàn này luôn đi máy bàn!
(S212) É, lại đây ngồi ăn cơm luôn đi máy bàn ơi!
(S213) Ăn trưa ở đây luôn đi máy ông!
(S214) Máy ông ngồi đây ăn cơm luôn đi hà?
(S215) Ngồi đây luôn được hôm?
(S216) Cảm bạn cùng đi ăn trưa đó à! Hay là chúng ta ngồi chung cho vui nhé!
(S217) Máy bàn ngồi vào bàn ăn trưa chung luôn đi!
(S218) Ăn trưa chưa? Ngồi ăn chung cho vui nhé!
(S219) É ăn chưa nhé bạn!
(S220) É ăn cơm với tui này đi cho vui!
(S221) É ngồi đây nè!
(S222) Nè mọi người lại đây ngồi chung cho vui nhé!
(S223) Các bạn lại ngồi cùng mình!
(S224) Ngồi chung bàn này luôn đi máy ông!
(S225) Ngồi chung nhé!
(S226) É qua đây ngồi chung cho vui nhé!
(S227) Ngồi chung nè!
(S228) É lại đây ngồi cho vui này!
(S229) Ăn cơm trưa luôn nè máy bạn!
(S230) Ghế vô đây ăn luôn cho vui máy bạn ơi!
(S231) É lại đây ngồi ăn cơm luôn nè!
(S232) Máy ông ghế vô ăn cơm luôn đi!
(S233) Ô đây nè! Các bạn ngồi chung với mình nhé!
(S234) Ăn ở đây luôn cho vui mà ông ơi!
(S235) Ngồi đây cũng ăn nhé!
(S236) Máy bạn ghế vô ăn chung đi!
(S237) Ngồi bàn này ăn chung cho vui!
(S238) Ăn trưa luôn nhé!
(S239) É vô đây ăn luôn nè!
(S240) Ê ơi đây còn chỗ nè lại đây ngồi chung cho vui đi!

**Situation 3**

(S241) Máy con ăn sáng bây giờ luôn hén?
(S242) Máy đưa ra ăn sáng vậy!
(S243) Máy đưa ra đây ăn sáng với ba mẹ luôn nè!
(S244) Máy con ngồi xuống ăn sáng nè!
(S245) Các con hãy ăn sáng trước khi đi học!
(S246) Xong rồi, ăn sáng đi máy con! Chúc cả nhà ăn sáng ngon miệng!
(S247) Lại đây ăn sáng cùng ba mẹ nè con!
(S248) Bưa sáng xong rồi đó, các con xuống ăn nhanh để ngủ!
(S249) Các con xuống ăn sáng đi!
(S250) Các con xuống ăn sáng còn đi học nữa!
(S251) Gia đình mình cùng nhau ăn sáng nha!
(S252) Người ăn cơm luôn nè hai đứa!
(S253) Ăn sáng đi các con!
(S254) Máy đưa xuống ăn sáng nè!
(S255) Bưa sáng đã xong rồi, các con vào ăn đi!
(S256) Con trai ăn sáng nè, mẹ chuẩn bị xong rồi đây!
(S257) Ăn sáng luôn nè hai đứa!
(S258) Người xuống ăn sáng đi máy đưa!
(S259) Võ ăn cơm nè con!
(S260) Người xuống ăn sáng đi con trai ơi!
(S261) Các con, ăn sáng nè các con!
(S260) Hai đứa ngồi xuống ăn sáng nè!
(S261) Ăn cơm nè con!
(S262) Các con ra ăn sáng nè!
(S263) Ăn cơm nè máy đưa!
(S264) Ăn cơm luôn đi hai đứa!
(S265) Người xuống ăn sáng luôn đi hai đứa!
(S266) Ăn sáng đi con!
(S267) Hai đứa ra ăn sáng luôn nè!
Hai con ra ăn sáng luôn nhe!
Hai con nhanh ra ăn sáng đi!
Nhanh ra ăn sáng nè hai đưa!

**Situation 4**

Uống một tách trà để nhe!
Ban uống đã một tách trà cho để khát nhe!
Ban muốn uống một tách trà cho để khát không?
Uống một tách trà nhe?
Ban muốn uống một tách trà cho để khát không?
Uống một tách trà nhe?
Uống một tách trà đi bạn!
Dùng một tách trà cho để khát đi bạn!
Uống một tách trà nhe?
Uống một tách trà cho để khát vậy!
Uống một tách trà vậy!
Uống một tách trà đi bạn!
Ban có muốn uống một chức gì đó không?
Một tách trà nhe?
Uống với tôi một tách trà nhe?
Dùng một tách trà nhe!
Dùng một tách trà nhe?
Uống để một tách trà vậy!
Uống để một tách trà vậy!
Thói nghỉ một lát và uống đỏ một tách trà vậy!
Trong bạn có vẻ khát nước, uống đỏ một tách trà vậy!
Dùng một tách trà cho để khát vậy!
Uống đỏ một tách trà đi bạn!
Nghỉ một lát, dùng một tách trà vậy!
Trong bạn khát đây, uống đỏ một tách trà vậy!
(S298) Dùng đồ một trà rồi ta nói tiếp!
(S299) Uống đồ một tách trà vậy!
(S300) Thôi nghỉ một lát và uống đồ một tách trà cho đờ khát vậy!

**Situation 5**

(S301) Mời anh chị ghé vào lựa giày!
(S302) Hàng mới về, mời anh chị quẹo lựa!
(S303) Giày mới đây, em mời anh chị!
(S304) Dép đẹp, lại bèn đây. Ghé xem đi bạn ơi!
(S305) Anh chị ghé vào lựa giày đi, ở đây giày đẹp không hề!
(S306) Mời anh chị ghé vào xem thử hàng mới về đây!
(S307) Vào lựa đi anh chị, có nhiều hàng mới về đẹp lắm!
(S308) Anh ơi anh! Chị ơi chị! Xin vào đây! Xin vào đây mua giày dép, ở đây vừa real vừa đẹp a!
(S309) Giày mới, giày đẹp đây!
(S310) Anh chị vào chọn đi, có nhiều hàng mới về lắm!
(S311) Quý khách có mua giày dép không không? Vào đây xem hàng mới về này, vừa đẹp, rất lại bèn!
(S312) Xin mời quý khách xem qua đi a!
(S313) Ghế về lựa giày mới bổ về đi anh chị!
(S314) Mời quý vị ghé về cửa hàng em đi a!
(S315) Giày mới về đây! Mời bầu con cỏ bác, anh chị ghé về xem. Không mua thì xem cho vui!
(S316) Mời quý khách mua hàng, màu mới không hề!
(S317) Mời quý vị ghé vào lựa giày!
(S318) Hàng mới về, hàng mới về, vào xem đi các anh chị ơi!
(S319) Anh chị mua gì quẹo lựa đi!
(S320) Mua giày, dép đi chị, hàng mới về nè!
(S321) Mời anh chị ghé vào mua hàng mới!
(S322) Anh/ chị giày ở đây rất đẹp và bèn, anh chị thử một đôi nhé!
(S323) Mời anh chị ghé vào xem hàng!
(S324) Anh chị ghé vào lựa giày đẹp đi!
Mời anh chị ghé vào gian hàng!
Mua giày đi anh chị!
Mua giày dép ghé vào quèo lụa đi anh chị!
Mời anh chị ghé vào cổi đi, đôi nào thấy được thì lấy!
Mua giày dép ghé vào lụa đi anh chị oi!

Situation 6
Đã lớp em mở cố đến dự buổi tiệc liên hoan với lớp em chú nhất này!
Lớp em mở cố đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em!
Mỗi dự thảy cố đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em!
Mỗi thảy cố đến chơi với lớp em nhe cố!
Có đến chơi với lớp em cho vui nha cố!
Có hãy đến chung vui với lớp em nghe nức!
Nhận đip kết thúc học kỳ này để tổng kết và chia sẻ lớp chúng em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc nhỏ. Mỗi thảy cố đến chung vui cùng tự em nhé!
Đã em kính mở cố đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em tới thứ bảy này!
Đã thưa cố, lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan, em mở cố đến dự với chúng em!
Kính mở cố thảy đến dự tiệc liên hoan với chúng em!
Thưa rồi cố ơi! Lớp chúng em có tổ chức một buổi liên hoan nhỏ, em kính mở thảy cố đến dự cùng lớp chúng em!
Cố ơi lớp em có tổ chức tiệc liên hoan. Tui em mở cố đến dự và chúng vui với chúng em ạ!
Thưa thảy, lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan vào.... Em dài dien lớp mở thảy cố đến dự với lớp!
Hôm nay lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc cuối học kỳ, lớp em kính mở thảy cố đến chung vui!
Chúng em rất vui được mở cố đến dự liên hoan với lớp!
Lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan cuối tuần này! Cố đến chung vui với chúng em!
Rất vui được mở cố đến dự tiệc liên hoan cuối tuần này với lớp chúng em!
Nhân dịp kết thúc học kỳ, lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan, kính mời thầy cô đến chung vui!

Mỗi cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan cùng lớp chúng em cho vui nhe cô!

Đã lớp em kính mời cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em!

Thầy ơi! Tuần này lớp em có một buổi liên hoan! Mời thầy cô đến chung vui với tụi em à!

Đã lớp em kính mời thầy đến dự tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em à!

Ngày mai lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan, em mời thầy cô đến dự và chung vui với lớp chúng em à!

Thưa cô sắp tới lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan, nếu không có gì bàn, lớp em kính mời thầy cô đến dự chung với lớp chúng em!

Đã lớp em có tổ chức một buổi liên hoan nhỏ, em mời thầy cô đến chới với lớp em nhe à!

Cô ơi! Mỗi cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan cuối tuần này với lớp chúng em!

Em xin mời quý thầy cô cùng dự buổi tiệc liên hoan với lớp chúng em!

Cuối tuần này lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan! Mời thầy đến chung vui với lớp em!

Cô đến dự tiệc liên hoan cuối tuần này với lớp chúng em nhe cô!

Cuối tuần này lớp em có tổ chức một buổi tiệc liên hoan. Cô đến dự với lớp em cho vui nhe cô!