



## College of Basic Education Research Journal

<https://berj.uomosul.edu.iq/>



# A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts in Contemporary English Discourse

Qassim Hussein Salman<sup>1</sup>

Afraa Shafeeq Jasim<sup>2</sup>

Sattar J. Hashim<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Samarra University, College of Arts, Department of English Language, Iraq.

<sup>2</sup>Samarra University, College of Administration and Economics, Department of Economics, Iraq.

<sup>3</sup>Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Department of Research and Development, Iraq.

### Article Information

#### Article history:

Received: February 9, 2026

Reviewer: April 5, 2026

Accepted: April 15, 2026

Available online: June, 2026

#### Keywords:

*Pragmatics,*

*Speech Acts,*

*Contemporary English Discourse.*

#### Correspondence:

Sattar J. Hashim

Email: [sattaruna@gmail.com](mailto:sattaruna@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Purpose of this study is to provide a pragmatic view of how speech acts are utilized in today's society. More specifically, it explores speech acts as social actions rather than merely as means of communicating knowledge. It examines how people perform Speech acts of asserting, requesting, promising, and expressing their attitudes through language in real-world communicative events, drawing on speech act theory as proposed by Austin and Searle. To conduct such study, a qualitative discourse analytic methodology was used to analyze a selection of written samples of contemporary English discourse from three different types of source material: media-based texts (such as newspapers and magazines), political speeches, and various face-to-face interactions. Particular attention was put on impact of contextual factors have on illocutionary force of speech acts and frequency with which they occur in form of indirect speech acts in today's world. The findings suggest that a large portion of contemporary English discourse relies upon pragmatic inference (from context of utterance), contextual reference (related to what is understood from texts), and being provided with indirect means of accomplishing communication effectively. Through presenting a description of how language functions within this pragmatic and participatory framework, this study contributes to understand and develop theories within fields of pragmatics and discourse studies, as well as provide information to utilized by applied linguists and those working with languages in educational system.

## تحليل تداولي لأفعال الكلام في الخطاب الإنكليزي المعاصر

ستار جبار هاشم<sup>3</sup>

عفراء شفيق جاسم<sup>2</sup>

قاسم حسين سلمان<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>جامعة سامراء، كلية الآداب، قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، سامراء، العراق.

<sup>2</sup>جامعة سامراء، كلية الإدارة والاقتصاد، قسم الاقتصاد، سامراء، العراق.

<sup>3</sup>وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي، دائرة البحث والتطوير، بغداد، العراق.

### المستخلص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى تقديم رؤية تداولية عن كيفية استخدام أفعال الكلام في مجتمعنا المعاصر. إذ يُسلط هذا البحث، على وجه التحديد، الضوء على استخدام الناس لأفعال الكلام باعتبارها أعمال إجتماعية أكثر من كونها وسيلة لنقل المعرفة. إذ يتناول هذا البحث كيفية استخدام عامة الناس لأفعال الكلام الخاصة بالتأكيد والطلب والوعد والتعبير عن توجهاتهم من خلال اللغة في مناسبات مجتمعية واقعية بالإعتماد على نظرية فعل الكلام المُقدمة من (أوستن) و (سيرل). ولإجراء هذه الدراسة، استُخدمت طريقة التحليل الخطابي النوعي لتحليل مجموعة مُختارة من نماذج مكتوبة للخطاب الإنكليزي المعاصر من ثلاثة أنواع مُختلفة من المصادر: نصوص إعلامية وخطابات سياسية وحوارات وجه لوجه. إذ تم التركيز على العوامل السياقية وتأثيرها على القوة الكلامية لأفعال الكلام والتكرار الذي ترد فيه بصيغة أفعال كلام غير مُباشرة في عالمنا اليوم. وتوصل البحث إلى أن غالبية الخطاب الإنكليزي المعاصر يعتمد على الإستدلال التداولي (من سياق الكلام) والإشارة السياقية (المُتعلقة بما يُفهم من النصوص) وتوفير وسائل غير مُباشرة لإنجاز التواصل بفاعلية. فمن خلال تقديم وصف عن كيفية أداء اللغة ضمن هذا الإطار التداولي التشاركي، يُسهم هذا البحث في فهم تطور النظريات في دراسات حقل التداولية والخطاب، فضلاً عن تقديمه معلومات بإمكان المُختصين في مجال علم اللغة التطبيقي وعلم اللغة التعليمي استخدامها.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** التداولية، أفعال الكلام، الخطاب الإنكليزي المعاصر.

## 1.1 Introduction

Language does not only consist of grammatical rules and vocabulary words, but it is also the way that speakers complete an action, create meaning, and develop social relationships. The original fields of linguistics were mainly devoted to the structure and form of a given language; the meaning of a printed sentence was thought to be a concrete feature of that sentence. The abilities of speakers to demonstrate different motivations, feelings/thoughts, and actions cannot be discussed based on the structure and form of the sentence. This led to the emergence of pragmatics, which refers to the study of how meaning is used and how language interacts with the world we live in.

Pragmatics focuses on the role that a speaker's motivation, the context in which they are speaking, how much they know about each other, and how an utterance is interpreted. A main tenet of Pragmatics is Speech Act Theory; through it, language can be looked at as an action rather than just a description of an event since utterances can be performed as someone can request, promise, warn, apologize, or persuade someone using language. In this framework, the meaning of an utterance is dependent not only on its form but also on the way it is used in its context.

In the early 1950s, J.L. Austin created the basis for Speech Act Theory, which divides the acts of speaking into three categories: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Austin argued that an utterance can fulfill multiple functions at one time, including the speaker's intent, the communicative force it carries, and how it will impact the listener.

Later, John Searl tried to expand this classification by classifying and studying language from three perspectives: its social interactions, the purpose behind its use, and the occurrence context. The focus of this classification was the communicative purpose of language use. He categorized speech acts into assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative types, emphasizing the vital role of indirect speech acts, where the literal meaning of an utterance differs from its intended function. For example, a statement may function as a request depending on context (Searle, 1979). Such focus signifies the importance of inferential processes in pragmatic interpretation and has later become a key principle in discourse-based studies.

Focusing on speech acts in the modern body of literature is important to understand the functional nature of language within its communicative environment, particularly when considering its dynamic nature in its context of occurrence. Employing implication, indirectness, and pragmatic inference are habitual in modern modes of communication, such as digital communication and casual conversation, aiming to convey speakers' intended meanings. Additionally, situational factors, power dynamics, and cultural norms shape meaning in addition to explicit linguistic expressions.

As a result, studying speech acts in contemporary English discourse is important to understand the functionality of language in a real communicative environment. The examination of speech acts provides insight into the pragmatic means by which speakers perform social acts and create meaning with modern usage of language.

## **1.2 Literature Review**

Speech act was the core of several studies (Deamer, 2021; Degen, 2022; Diner, 2020; Ludwig, 2020; Saud, 2024; Tanduk, 2023) in the last few years due to its importance in understanding English Linguistics. Speech act theory is a fundamental component of the empirical study of pragmatics and treats all forms of language as forms of human action. While previous theories had been focused primarily on language as a medium for transmitting propositional meanings, the introduction of speech acts reconceptualized the role of language in terms of its performative or action-oriented function. In fact, J. L. Austin's work constitutes one of the earliest and most often referenced contributions to the development of speech act theory; Austin was one of the first scholars to demonstrate that utterances function as actions depending on the context in which they occur. He identified three different kinds of acts that can occur when an utterance is made: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. To understand what an utterance means, Austin asserted that both the speaker's intentions and the contextual conditions must be considered (Austin, 1962). This foundational view shifted linguistic analysis away from abstract sentence meaning toward language use in real communicative situations.

In pragmatic studies of inference and cooperative reasoning, the issue of indirectness has been widely discussed. Clark argues that indirect speech acts rely on shared assumptions between speaker and listener to derive meaning rather than

direct expression. He points out that indirect requests and suggestions depend heavily on context and social norms, making pragmatic competence essential for successful communication (Clark, 1979).

Likewise, Asher (2006) confirms the importance of daily utterances in interpreting their pragmatic functions. Also, such functions significantly contribute to the literal meaning. He adds that many previous studies investigated speech acts in political contexts and modern media, stressing the importance of pragmatic functions in shaping public communications.

Al-Saedi and Jabbar (2020) found that expressive and declarative speech acts were dominant in Iraqi media in a way that contributes to forming clear emotional responses and authoritative narratives. Also, the same findings showed that the implicit speech acts were more frequent than their implicit equivalents in news headlines, which are usually persuasive and concise.

Similarly, Abid (2023) analyzed CNN headlines about the Russia–Ukraine war and found that assertive speech acts dominate, presenting information as factual while subtly guiding audience interpretation. The study also found that explicit statements were employed to increase credibility and authority in international news coverage. Such findings justify the institutional goals and the discourse context in modern media for adopting this type of speech act.

Some linguists, theorists, and researchers applied Speech Act Theory to political discourses. Such an application was clearly found in Dylgjeri (2017), in which he analyzed a political victory speech and showed that commitment and promise reform were built on commissive and directive speech acts.

Furthermore, Muhsen and Smeer (2022) investigated the vital role that assertive speech acts play in political rhetoric, as they are considered a basis for future directives and promises. It found that modern pragmatic studies, in general, stress the importance of social interaction, discourse sequencing, and contextual factors in interpreting speech acts.

Additionally, Culpeper and Archer (2008) stressed the importance of analyzing speech acts within a broader interactional context, where meaning is formed as a result of cultural knowledge, context, and linguistic form interaction. Such a

viewpoint is consistent with other modern studies that consider language as a dynamic and socially formed outcome.

Despite the huge body of literature related to speech acts, limited studies have focused on a single mode of discourse or specific datasets. In addition, despite indirectness being acknowledged, there is still a lack of systematic analysis of indirectness with inferential mechanisms and contextual limits. As a result, a total pragmatic analysis of speech acts in modern discourse is vital for understanding how meaning, purpose, and social action interact.

### **1.3 The Problem Statement**

Many analyses of the discourse produced by English speakers still prefer to use structural, semantic, or both approaches to discourse, rather than examining how communicative context constructs meaning, even with the increasing amount of study in pragmatics. As a result, there is insufficient study on how key pragmatic features such as indirectness (implying one thing while saying another) and context-dependent interpretation are constructed through interaction.

English discourse overwhelmingly contains complex pragmatically constructed speech acts in media, politics, and everyday interaction. Many speakers regularly perform speech acts indirectly (saying something other than the grammatical form of their utterance), which makes it difficult to determine intended meaning based solely on the utterance itself. Contextual factors such as (a) social relationships, (b) power and hierarchy, and (c) cultural conventions or norms play a crucial role in determining illocutionary force or meaning. However, existing studies have not sufficiently emphasized the role of context in constructing meaning.

The purpose of this study is to address the need for a more focused study of how speech acts function in contemporary English, particularly through understanding indirectness and the influence of contextual factors on meaning.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. Which speech acts are most prevalent in contemporary English?
2. How do contextual factors affect the interpretation of the illocutionary force of speech acts in contemporary English communication?

3. What is the degree of indirectness in the use of indirect speech acts in modern English?
4. What are the pragmatic functions of speech acts in various contemporary discourse (i.e., media, political, and everyday interactions)?
5. How do speech acts facilitate the construction of meaning and social action in contemporary English discourse?

### **1.5 Aims of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to provide a pragmatic approach to the analysis of how speech acts occur in English today, both from a practical point of view and theoretical point of view.

(i.e., actual use in situations) and theoretically/continue to exist (e.g., defining how language performs social actions). The study will focus primarily on function and interaction rather than just form.

The aims of the current study are:

- To identify and classify the range of speech acts in current spoken English using existing pragmatic frameworks.
- To investigate the role of context in establishing the meaning (Discovering the illocutionary objects created by) of different communicative occasions.
- To determine how frequently indirect speech acts are being used in today's English.
- To examine how speech acts contribute to the pragmatic purpose of various discourse types, including political discourse, media discourse, and everyday conversation.
- To define the relationship between language, intention, and social action in daily English communication.

By meeting these objectives, this study will add clarity to what is involved (conceptually) in how practical meaning is constructed pragmatically, and will expand on other areas of study related to pragmatics, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics.

## **1.6 Significance of the Study**

This study is significant for the field of pragmatics because it analyses contemporary English discourse through a focused study of speech acts. The study's examination of the way in which the function of language (as social action) extends the existing body of work that has typically concentrated on structural or semantic aspects of language.

In conclusion, this study's contribution to the field of Speech Act Theory is two-fold: (1) it provides empirically based real-world examples of the use of this theory to understand speech acts, and (2) by giving insights into contextual factors. Thus, this study suggests that a higher level of study within the category of pragmatics will lead to a greater appreciation for pragmatics as an essential part of language analysis.

From an applied perspective, the scope of this study can be used by teachers of English learners to provide them with greater pragmatic knowledge regarding the use of speech acts that occurred in natural contexts. Additionally, this study will provide teachers with a greater basis for improving the teaching and assessment of spoken and written English. Results may be utilized in the fields of studying media discourse and political discourse, both of which are characterized by indirect and/or pragmatic strategies.

Overall, an individual's understanding of pragmatics will play a vital role in their ability to interpret both contemporary discourse and future studies regarding the use of language, social interaction, and the social construction of meaning.

## **1.7 Theoretical Framework: Speech Act Theory**

This study utilizes Speech Act Theory as its theoretical basis for examining how people use language in today's English discourse. Speech Act Theory enables us to understand how utterances are actions, rather than merely an example of a medium to convey information. Speech Act Theory defines how we may understand how someone conveys a message based on the social and contextual conditions in which an utterance occurs.

The founder of Speech Act Theory, J.L. Austin, was the first to challenge the idea that the primary function of language is to describe a state of affairs. Austin

asserted that performative utterances exist and that performatives are inherently different from just stating facts, based upon Austin (1962).

Austin defined performatives between three distinct types of language: 1. Locutionary act: The act of producing an utterance; 2. Illocutionary act: The speaker's comprehended intention or communicative force of the utterance; 3. Perlocutionary act: The impact that the utterance has on the listener, such as persuading, frightening, convincing, and so on.

The distinction between illocutionary and perlocutionary force is significant for pragmatic analysis because it emphasizes that meaning is not inherent to an utterance but instead depends on its context and intention. For instance, a statement made in a declarative tone can serve various purposes, such as warning, requesting, complaining, or dictating, depending on the situation in which that statement was made. This is one way Speech Act Theory is relevant to modern analysis of discourse, in which we see so much indirect and implied meaning.

Building on Austin's original work, John Searle developed an elaborate explanation of speech acts through his own theory of speech act classification by communicative function. He classified speech acts into 5 such categories: 1. Assertive Speech Acts (where an individual is representing something as true), 2. Directive Speech Acts (where the speaker is trying to influence the behaviour of the individual), 3. Committal Speech Acts (where the speaker is committing to do something in the future), 4. Expressive Speech Acts (where the speaker expresses his or her mental state), and 5. Declaring Speech Acts (where the speaker makes a change in social or institutional reality simply by speaking it) (Searle, 1979).

This classification system is a valuable analytical tool for identifying and classifying speech acts within discourse. Searle's contribution to this field lay in his proposed definition of indirect speech acts. He stated that "viewed as an extension of illocutionary acts, speakers often perform one illocutionary act by means of performing another illocutionary act (e.g., making a request in the form of a question, or criticising someone in the form of an assertion). In these situations, the literal meaning of the utterance made by the speaker differs from its function as a method of communicating an illocutionary act; thus, when attempting to identify the intending explanatory meaning of the utterance, the hearer identifies the intending explanatory force of an utterance according to the shared background of both speaker and hearer, and also by contextual clues in the

speech situation and by pragmatic inference (Searle, 1979). The recognition of indirect speech act performance is extremely important in today's English-speaking world because the type of social norms that are established by politeness strategies or by exercising social power make the use of indirect forms of expression common.

According to Speech Act Theory, contextual factors play a significant role in determining the illocutionary force associated with an utterance. Contextual factors may include temporo-spatial factors, the type of social relationship between the participants, the cultural conventions at play, and the institutional nature of the context in which an utterance is produced. Without considering the aforementioned contextual factors, it is impossible to accurately understand an utterance, because these contextual factors have a direct effect on both the production and interpretation of illocutionary acts. These contextual factors correlate with today's perspectives of discourse analysis, as they view meaning as being dynamic through simultaneous interaction rather than static.

Speech acts are the basic units used to help us understand the function of language in common communication situations. Utilizing Speech Act Theory, this study investigates present-day English dialogue by looking at the ways in which people communicate through language to execute social acts, generate meaning, and meet their desired outcomes in communication. The theoretical model serves as a reliable foundation for evaluating the connection between language, intent, and context in the way English is used today.

## **2. Methodology:**

### **2.1 Study Design and Data Analysis Procedures**

The study design of the study is qualitative descriptive/analytical, which is consistent with the aims of a pragmatic or discourse-based study project. Qualitative methodology enables the exploration of the contextual meaning of speech acts by providing a more thorough evaluation of linguistic cues and their usage contexts than does simply counting the frequency of occurrence. This study aims to explore how speech acts are currently being utilized in spoken English. As a result, qualitative methodology was used to provide the researcher with the latitude to interpret the pragmatic characteristics of speech acts in terms of how they relate to their contextual use.

The data collected for this study were selected samples of contemporary English language discourse from real-life communication settings. These sources included media, political speeches, and everyday communication examples. The samples were selected based on their relevance to the study's objectives and because they represent examples of various types of speech acts. All of the selected examples represent different discourse settings in which the speaker has used language as a means of achieving social goals, as a means of negotiating meaning, and as a means of influencing an audience.

The analysis of the data is based on Speech Act Theory through a pragmatic discourse-analytical approach. For each selected text, each utterance is identified based on its speech act type. The analysis follows Searle's classification of speech acts, and thus each utterance is categorized as either assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, or declarative; this classification is the primary analytical structure in which to organize and interpret the data.

In addition to identifying speech act categories, the analysis will also focus on how to interpret the illocutionary force of each utterance; in particular, cases of indirect speech acts will be of concern to the researcher. Indirect speech acts are those cases in which the intended communicative function differs from the literal grammatical form. I will be looking at indirect speech acts, using the context of social relationships between participants, the situation of the interaction, and the broader context, to understand how meaning is created and communicated. I will use this information to accurately determine how meaning has been established when the interactions between the participants are analyzed in real-time and in real-life situations.

I will also analyze speech acts by examining the functional aspects of the speech act in discussions rather than simply treating them as single speech acts. An analysis of speech acts in regard to the contexts before and after them shows that they function in a dynamic, interactive fashion and reflect the way that meaning is developed physically through interaction (i.e., through conversational exchanges) rather than simply through the use of sentences.

To ensure that the analysis was more accurate and consistent, all examples were interpreted using proven principles of pragmatics. A qualitative analysis was used rather than a quantitative analysis because the goal of the study was to understand functional usage of language rather than make generalizations based on frequency

counts. This study provides a methodologically sound and theoretically justified analysis of speech acts in present-day English conversation.

## 2.2 Data Analysis: Applied Examples

Applied pragmatic analyses of selected examples from current English discourse provide examples of the function of speech acts in actual communication. This analysis is based on Speech Act Theory and will show how speech acts can be analyzed together with the illocutionary force of those acts and contextual factors in the construction of the meaning of an utterance. The examples selected represent a variety of contexts in which people use English in contemporary society. This includes examples of media discourse, political speeches, and informal conversations publicized from 2020 to 2025.

In media discourse, assertive speech acts are often used to convey information as being factual and authoritative.

For example, a headline that states:

“The government has announced new economic measures.”

This is an example of an assertive speech act because the speaker or institution issuing the statement has committed themselves to the propositional truth of the statement. Although the headline appears to be simply providing factual information, its value extends beyond merely reporting facts. The use of the verb **has announced** creates a heightened sense of credibility and institutional authority, leading readers to believe that the information is credible. The illocutionary force of the act of assertion is further enhanced by the institutional contexts (e.g., news reporting) in which assertions take place, where a high expectation for both objectivity and factuality exists.

Media discourse frequently features directive speech acts where the speaker attempts to persuade or advise others to take action.

For example:

*“Experts diagnose a need to reduce energy consumption.”*

This sentence includes an implicit directive speech act meant to try to persuade citizens to reduce their consumption of energy. The use of the verb increase is a weakened version of an implication of a directive action; thus, it conforms to social

norms regarding politeness and responsibility. The indirectness of the directive speech act indicates that consideration has been given to the audience's autonomy while the speech act is still providing a clear action-related purpose.

Commissive speech acts are also used extensively within political discourse, where political speakers make a commitment to perform an activity in the future.

For instance:

*"We will improve the quality of services and create new job opportunities."*

This is an example of an explicit commitment by the political speaker to act in the future. Political speakers often make use of such committal speech acts to enhance their credibility and build trust with the audience.

Moreover, speech acts of commitment are generally made in conjunction with larger rhetorical strategies, including assertive statements that are being used to report on current conditions and expressive statements that aim to elicit values that are common to both the speaker and the audience. The illocutionary force of the act of commitment is closely connected to what is normative in political discourse, where promises form an important basis for persuasion.

Expressive types of speech acts are often produced in a type of political discourse as well as everyday conversation. As an example:

*"We truly regret the suffering caused by these occurrences."*

This sentence conveys the emotional disposition of the speaker with respect to an event. Expressive acts will not directly change external reality. However, they are important for managing interpersonal relationships and establishing one's moral orientation within that context. In political discourse, one can often observe an instance of an expressive type of utterance, such as an expression of regret or sympathy, that serves a strategic purpose of restoring legitimacy and/or providing support for the speaker's actions.

Though less frequently represented in the literature, indirect types of speech acts are nonetheless quite common in everyday interaction, where speakers prefer to use indirect forms of dialogue to limit or eliminate direct impositions.

For example, a speaker may produce the interrogative question "Could you close the window?" However, the question is used pragmatically as a request for action. To understand the illocutionary force of requesting, the recipient engages in pragmatic inferences based upon the situational context and their common understandings of shared conventions and cooperating with others. This example reveals that the literal meaning of an utterance is not necessarily equivalent to its communicative function, thus underscoring the importance of pragmatic inference as a means of establishing meaning within the interpretations of speech acts.

From these examples, one can see that present-day spoken use of English occurs mostly as a function of context rather than as a result of being able to speak. That is to say, the way conversations between people happen is determined largely by where they are, who is having the conversation, and the cultural view of both the speaker and hearer. What can be noted from this analysis, therefore, is that directness, pragmatic inferences, and functional versatility are integral characteristics of how English speakers communicate with each other today. With the application of Speech Act Theory to naturally occurring situations, this study demonstrates the ways in which all forms of language function as instruments for social acts and meaning negotiation in everyday society.

### **3. Discussion:**

#### **3.1 Interpretation of Findings**

Contemporary analyses of speech acts suggest that the primary function of language is to perform social actions rather than to convey information. Specifically, speakers make use of pragmatic strategies such as indirectness or contextual inference in order to accomplish their communicative goals. This finding concurs with the key assumptions of Speech Act Theory, which proposes that the most important components of the meaning are the illocutionary force and the speaker's intentions (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1979).

According to the findings of the present study, a major observational trend that appeared in this study is that assertive and directive speech acts are the two most prevalent types of speech acts found across all forms of discourse (including newspaper articles, television broadcasts). Within the media context, assertive speech acts are used to convey information as being factual and authoritative, thereby establishing an identifiable position within the media institution itself, while simultaneously impacting how the audience interprets that information. This

result is consistent with a prior study indicating that assertive speech acts are key components used to create a societal perception based on data presented in the form of news media. Despite being presented as neutral, these assertives often carry an unspoken evaluative meaning; thus, appearing to be neutral statements are loaded with pragmatic significance.

In Contemporary discourse contexts, there is evidence of the presence of indirect forms of request. The high usage of mitigated requests relates to the speaker's consideration of social norms, politeness strategies, and power dynamics. Thus, to achieve their communicative intentions, speakers will be less likely to explicitly give a direct command and more likely to structure their requests as questions or suggestions, which allows them to influence the behaviour of others without overpowering them. This finding supports Searle's theory of indirect speech acts, where one is completed via another (Searle, 1979). It further corroborates Clark's assertion that the use of indirectness is reliant on shared background knowledge and cooperative inferences (Clark, 1979).

With the prevalence of commissives in political contexts, such as promises and commitments, accompanying persuasive techniques will be employed when attempting to persuade. Analysis shows that, within the context of the political discourse relies on sequential organization of assertive and expressive, commissive speech acts to create cohesive rhetorical structures, aimed at establishing credibility and mobilizing support. This sequencing conforms to previous literature that describes the strategic use of commissives within political communication (Dylgjeri, 2017; Muhsen and Smeer, 2022). The evident sequencing outlined above demonstrates that speech acts are enacted within the constructs of discursive structures, rather than as independent units.

There are relatively few expressive speech acts; however, they significantly affect how we interact with other people and what type of identity we create for ourselves as speakers. Expressive speech acts (e.g., expressing remorse, expressing sympathy, and expressing gratitude) are an important means by which to establish one's moral and emotional position within the various discourses ongoing within our society. Strategically, within institutional environments, expressive forms of speech can serve as a means for emotional expression or serve a strategic function to assign blame or align oneself with the opinions of others. This suggests that the

strategic use of expressives in public speaking is based on a sensitivity to context or the pragmatics of the language in addition to its overall purpose.

A review of the existing data on expressive language reveals that the larger social context is an important influence on the illocutionary force of any given act of speech. The different illocutionary force of the same grammatical structure used in different contexts, i.e., different spoken acts, will also rely heavily on how that structure is modified by the situational, social, and/or institutional elements surrounding it. A critical implication of the findings from this study suggests that the pragmatic meaning of spoken language should not be evaluated solely on the grammatical form of the expression, but also needs to be evaluated based on consideration of the contextual constraints imposed by the speech of a given individual. That said, the work of Culpeper and Archer (2008) would further support this perspective that the analysis of speech acts should be conducted via interactional/discourse analyses as opposed to performing isolated analyses of a given statement by analysing the illocutionary force of a given performance based on the inclusion of all possible illocutions of those forms of performance.

The findings reveal that the contemporary use of English includes a range of meanings within the context of each language; therefore, there is an interrelationship between all three aspects of the language's fluidity, precision, and functionality in its various forms when conveying meaning. Speech acts, in particular, are central to how individuals produce meanings, exert influence over others, and control their social networks through the process of communication. The use of Speech Act Theory has demonstrated even further just how significant it is to employ process-based methods of pragmatic analysis to provide a more complete understanding of how language functions today, and therefore, language functions as an idiom of communication between people. Lastly, speech act methods provide us with both a functionally-based and empirically-based framework for examining contemporary uses of the English language.

#### **4. Conclusion and Recommendations**

The study project aims to explore how speech acts can be studied via a pragmatic approach to understand how language acts as a social behavior in actual communication situations. This study uses the Speech Act theory developed by Austin and Searle as a means of analyzing selected examples of media discourse, political speeches, and daily conversations to identify speech act types, interpret

illocutionary force, and examine the role context has in meaning construction. The findings of this study show that meaning in modern English discourse is generally not conveyed through only the literal linguistic form of language, but that the emergent meanings come from pragmatic inference, contextual interpretation, and speaker intent.

Contemporary English discourse (in institutional contexts such as media and political communications) includes assertive and directive speech acts at a higher rate than other speech acts. Within the context of these two speech acts, assertive speech acts are typically used to present information as both factual and reliable; whereas directive speech acts (frequently used in indirect forms) are intended to affect how the audience behaves without imposing their will overtly onto them. Promises and commitments (commissive speech acts) serve as major strategies of persuasion in political discourse. Expressive speech acts, although not as frequently used, are still extremely significant for the management of interpersonal relationships and the construction of the speaker's identity. All types of discourse samples indicate the common usage of indirect speech acts by speakers because they exhibit sensitivity to social norms, politeness, and power differential between speakers.

The results of this study support the main claims of Speech Act Theory due to the applicability of the theory to the study of discourse in contemporary contexts. Illocutionary force cannot be determined completely through concepts based on grammatical form, and must be determined in relation to contextual variables/models such as social roles, institutional context, and shared cultural knowledge. By using authentic data from spoken or written discourse to further demonstrate the applicability of Speech Act Theory, this study aids in our understanding of pragmatics as a progressive discipline that concerns itself with how language is used and not the abstract form of linguistic items.

There are some important real-world implications for people who work in the field of Applied Linguistics (such as education) and for study done in discourse analysis and language education. Understanding how speech acts work in everyday life enables learners to improve their pragmatic consciousness, i.e., their understanding of pragmatics as part of communicative competence; that means pragmatic competence extends beyond simply being grammatically correct. Further, the findings of this study present ways to analyze political/media discourse; i.e., how pragmatic approximative, normative, and potentially

constructive strategies help develop public opinion and/or provide cues for interpreting audience actions.

The findings of this study support several ideas about the future study of speech acts. Future studies may look at larger numbers of speech acts (e.g., by increasing samples) or by using quantitative methodologies (e.g., 'corpus linguistic' methodologies) to supplement qualitative findings. Researchers may wish to conduct comparative studies on cross-linguistic and/or cross-cultural differences (or similarities) in the use of speech acts. Future study should also focus on the new ways that we communicate electronically (e.g., use of social media), particularly as communication continues to evolve at a rapid pace and the nature of pragmatic strategies becomes increasingly complex. All of these future directions will add considerable value to the study of speech acts and will help develop a better understanding of language as a social action in today's forms of communication.

## References

- Abid, K. K. (2023). A pragmatic analysis of CNN news headlines on Ukraine and Russian war, *Journal of AlMaarif University College*. 34(3), 356-368. <https://doi.org/10.51345/.v34i3.755.g392>
- Al-Saedi, H.T.J., & Jabbar, K. W. (2020). A pragmatic study of newspaper headlines in media discourse: Iraq as a case study. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(3), 48-59. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.3.6>
- Asher, N. (2007). Dynamic discourse semantics for embedded speech acts. *John Searle's philosophy of language*, 2011-244.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Clark, H. H. (1979). Responding to indirect speech acts. *Cognitive Psychology*, 11(4), 430-477. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(79\)90020-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(79)90020-3)
- Culpeper, J., & Archer, D. (2008). Requests and directness in Early Modern English trial proceedings and play texts, 1640–1760. *Speech acts in the history of English*, 176, 45-84.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.

- Deamer, F. (2020). Why do we talk to ourselves? *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, 12(2), 425–433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-020-00487-5>
- Degen, J. (2022). The rational speech act framework. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 9(1), 519-540. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031220-010811>
- Diner, L. (2020). Errors analysis of directive speech act and politeness strategy in kaiwa chukyu learning. *Lingua Cultura*, 14(1), 43-50. <https://doi.org/10.21512/1c.v14i1.6278>
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). Analysis of speech acts in political speeches. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 2(2), 19–26. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4016-2701>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ludwig, K. (2020). What are group speech acts? *Language & Communication*, 70, 46-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2019.04.004>
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Muhsen, R. A. I., & Smeer, I. H. (2022). A pragmatic analysis of speech acts in Reagan's first inaugural speech. *Al-Adab Journal*, 140, 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v2i140.3636>
- Saud, W. I. (2024). Speech act of request: A contrastive study between EFL and ESL undergraduate students. *Journal of the College of Languages*, 50, 33-58. <https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2024.0.50.0033>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tanduk, R. (2023). Pragmatic aspects of speech acts: A cross-linguistic perspective. *English Review Journal of English Education*, 11(3), 881-890. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i3.8762>
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.