Speech Acts Theory

By :

Muntadher Abdullah Mubadir

Muntadher Nazar Jabbar

Supervised by :

Asst. Prof. Mohammed Taher, PHD

2025

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

(قُلْ هَلْ يَسْتَوِي الَّذِينَ يَعْلَمُونَ وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ إِنَّمَا يَتَذَكَّرُ أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ)

[الزمر:9]

In the name of Allah the merciful and most gracious

(Are those who know equal to those who do not know؟ None will be mindful ˹of this˺ except people of reason.)

[Az Zumar : 9]

Dedication

This work is dedicated to those who have always believed in me, supported me, and inspired me to persevere through every challenge.

To my beloved family, whose unwavering love and encouragement have been the foundation of my journey. Your sacrifices and constant support have given me the strength to overcome every obstacle and strive for excellence.

To my dear friends, who have stood by my side, offering words of wisdom, laughter, and motivation during the most demanding times. Your companionship has been an invaluable source of joy and comfort.

To my esteemed professors and mentors, whose guidance and knowledge have shaped my academic and intellectual growth. Your dedication to teaching and mentoring has left an indelible mark on my life.

Finally, to everyone who has played a role, big or small, in helping me reach this stage—I am forever grateful. This achievement is not mine alone; it is a reflection of the love, wisdom, and support I have been fortunate enough to receive. With deep appreciation and heartfelt gratitude.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this work.

First and foremost, I extend my sincere appreciation to my advisor, ***Asst. Prof. Mohammed Taher, PHD*** whose invaluable guidance, patience, and encouragement have been instrumental in shaping my research. Your expertise and insightful feedback have been crucial in refining my ideas and enhancing the quality of this work.

I am also incredibly thankful to my professors and colleagues at ***University of Misan,*** for their constructive discussions and continuous support. Their shared knowledge and encouragement have significantly enriched my academic journey.

A special thank you to my family for their unwavering love, understanding, and motivation. Your endless support and belief in my abilities have been my greatest source of strength.

Finally, I am grateful to all the individuals, researchers, and authors whose work has inspired and informed my research. Your contributions to the field have played a significant role in shaping my understanding and perspective.

Table Of Contents

Abstract

Speech Act Theory, developed by J.L. Austin and later expanded by John Searle, provides a crucial framework for understanding language as a tool for performing actions rather than merely conveying information. This study explores the fundamental aspects of speech acts, categorizing them into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, and examining their role in various communicative contexts. It also delves into key issues such as indirect speech acts, felicity conditions, and the distinction between explicit and implicit speech acts, highlighting their significance in everyday interactions. Furthermore, the study discusses the challenges in classifying speech acts and the complexities involved in distinguishing between different types of utterances. By analyzing both theoretical perspectives and real-world applications, this research underscores the importance of Speech Act Theory in linguistics, philosophy, and communication studies. The findings suggest that understanding speech acts can improve communication effectiveness, aid in cross-cultural interpretation, and enhance our grasp of implicit meanings in language. Future research may further explore the intersection of Speech Act Theory with digital communication, artificial intelligence, and multilingual discourse, shedding light on its evolving relevance in a technologically driven world.

Chapter One:

1.1 speech acts theory: An Introduction

The study of speech acts theory is a pivotal framework in linguistics and pragmatics, offering profound insights into how language transcends mere information exchange to perform actions that shape social reality. Rooted in the seminal work of J. L. Austin (1962), who famously argued that "to say something is to do something" (p. 12), this theory challenges traditional views of language by emphasizing its performative power. Austin's foundational model categorizes speech acts into three dimensions: **locutionary acts** (the literal utterance), **illocutionary acts** (the speaker's intention), and **perlocutionary acts** (the effect on the listener) (Austin, 1962, 94). These categories illuminate how utterances function as tools for promising, commanding, apologizing, and even altering social statuses—such as declaring two people married (Searle, 1969, 24).

Speech acts theory extends beyond verbal communication, integrating nonverbal cues and contextual dynamics As Yule explains, speech acts "study how speakers and hearers use language in context" (Yule, 1996, 47). while Bach underscores that verbal exchanges inherently fuse language with action, where "an action in verbal communication carries its own message". Tsui (Bach,1994, 4) similarly defines speech acts as "acts performed through utterances", and Birner reinforces their performative essence: "uttering something means doing something" (Birner, 2013, 119). Cook frames the theory as a method to "formulate how communicative knowledge is applied" (Cook, 1989, 35), highlighting its role in decoding intention and meaning.

This chapter explores the theoretical foundations of speech acts, beginning with Austin's tripartite classification and expanding into Searle's taxonomy of five categories—assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Searle, 1969, 23).

1.2 Definition of Speech Acts Theory

Speech acts theory is a fascinating area of linguistic study that explores how we use language not just to convey information, but to perform actions. Developed by philosophers like J.L. Austin and further refined by John Searle, this theory posits that utterances can serve multiple functions beyond mere statements. For instance, when someone makes a promise, gives an order, or offers an apology, they are performing an action through their words. The theory categorizes these speech acts into three main types: locutionary acts (the actual utterance), illocutionary acts (the intended meaning behind the utterance), and perlocutionary acts (the effect the utterance has on the listener). Understanding speech acts is crucial for grasping the nuances of communication and the social contexts in which language operates.

Speech act, a variety of verbal communication and also a subdivision of pragmatics, Often takes place in verbal and nonverbal communication. (Yule,1996) states that Speech acts are a study of how the speakers and hearers use language. (Bach,1979) Explains that an action in verbal communication has message in itself, so the Communication is not only about language but also with action. In conclusion Speech act is the utterance that occurs and act refers to an action. (Hidayat, 2016 , 3)

Or how Austin describes it, to say something is to do something; or in which by saying or in saying something we are doing something' otherwise known as speech acts. (Austin, 1962, 12)

Tsui explains that speech acts are acts that refer to the action Performed by produced utterances.(Tsui, 1994: 4) In line with this, Yule states that Speech acts is action which is performed via utterances. Stating the same idea. (Yule, 1996, 47) Birner also says that uttering something means doing something. Here, People can perform an action by saying something. Through speech acts, the Speaker can convey physical action merely through words and phrases. The Conveyed utterances are paramount to the actions performed. (Birner, 2013)

Cook defines speech act theory as "an approach which tries to formulate how such knowledge is brought into play. (Cook, 1989, 35)

Chapter Two

2.1 Issues Related to Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory has been very influential in a number of fields, including applied linguistics. However, there remain a number of fundamental problems within the theory. These concern:

1. how many speech acts there are.
2. indirect speech acts and the concept of literal force.
3. the size of speech act realization forms.
4. the contrast between specific and diffuse acts.
5. discrete categories versus scale of meaning.
6. the relation between locution, illocution, and interaction.
7. the relation between the whole and the parts in a discourse.

(Flowerdew, 1990)

2.2 Explicit and Implicit Speech Acts

Explicit speech acts are those where the speaker's intention is clearly stated through the words used. For example, saying "I apologize" directly conveys the intention of apologizing. On the other hand, implicit speech acts rely on context and the listener's interpretation to understand the speaker's intention. For instance, if someone says, "It's cold in here," they might be implicitly suggesting that the window should be closed without directly stating it. Understanding the difference between these two types of speech acts is essential for effective communication, as it helps in interpreting the speaker's true intentions and responding appropriately.

For instance, if we say it's cold here" and mean" it's warm here"". The reason we are unable to do this without further stage setting is that what we can mean is at least sometimes a function of what we are saying. Meaning is more than a matterof intention, it is also at least sometimes a matter of

convention. One might say that on Grice's account it would seem that any sentence can be uttered with any meaning whatever, given that the circumstances make possible the appropriate intentions. But that has the consequence that the meaning of the sentence then becomes just another circumstance. (Searle, 1969, 45)

And furthermore, if he is using words literally, he intends this recognition to Be achieved in virtue of the fact that the rules for using the expressions he utters associate the expression with the production of that effect. (Searle, 1969, 45)

From J.L. Austin's "How to Do Things with Words":

1. "A performative utterance is one that does not merely convey information but rather performs an action." (Austin) This highlights the nature of explicit speech acts.)

2. "In making an assertion, one is performing an act of stating something that can be true or false, while in making a request, one is performing an act that seeks compliance."(Searle's,) (This illustrates the distinction between explicit acts and the implications of implicit speech acts)

2.3 Felicity Conditions

Felicity conditions are fundamental principles in speech act theory, introduced by John Searle and based on J.L. Austin's earlier work on performative utterances. These conditions determine whether a speech act is successfully performed. They are particularly crucial in understanding how language functions beyond its literal meaning, ensuring that communication is effective and meaningful in various contexts.

According to Searle, a speech act consists of locutionary (literal meaning), illocutionary (intended meaning), and perlocutionary (effect on

the listener) aspects. However, for an illocutionary act to succeed, certain **felicity conditions** must be met. These conditions include preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, propositional content conditions, and essential conditions. Each of these aspects plays a vital role in effective communication. (Searle, 1969, 16)

2.3.1 Types of Felicity Conditions

1. Preparatory Conditions

Preparatory conditions ensure that the context and participants are appropriate for the speech act. These conditions include:

- The speaker must have the authority or appropriate status to perform the act (e.g., a judge pronouncing a sentence).

- The hearer must be in a position to understand and accept the act (e.g., someone taking an oath must understand its significance).

- External circumstances must support the speech act (e.g., a marriage ceremony must be conducted according to legal or cultural norms).

For example, if a person without medical qualifications declares someone cured, the speech act fails because the preparatory conditions are not met. Similarly, if a promise is made to someone who does not understand the language, the promise lacks effectiveness. (Austin, 1962, 14)

2. Sincerity Conditions

Sincerity conditions require that the speaker genuinely intends to perform the act. A speech act loses its effectiveness if:

- A person makes a promise but has no intention of fulfilling it.

- An apology is insincere and merely stated for social compliance.

- A declaration of love is said without genuine feeling.

These conditions highlight the role of **intentionality** in communication. If the speaker is dishonest, the illocutionary force of the speech act is compromised, leading to a failure in its intended function.

For example, if a student falsely tells a professor they were sick to gain an extension on an assignment, the felicity conditions for a truthful statement are violated. (Searle, 1979, 62)

3. Propositional Content Conditions

These conditions ensure that the content of a speech act aligns with its intended meaning. The speech act must have a clear and meaningful structure.

- A promise must refer to a future event that is possible to fulfill.

- A command must direct the hearer to perform an achievable action.

- A question must seek information that can be provided.

For instance, saying, *"I promise you that the sun will rise tomorrow,"* violates propositional content conditions because the event is beyond the speaker's control. Similarly, commanding someone to "stop gravity" is invalid because the action is impossible. (Vanderveken, 1990, 102)

4. Essential Conditions

Essential conditions ensure that the speech act achieves its intended function within a social or linguistic framework. These include:

- The speech act must be recognized by the relevant community (e.g., a priest or official pronouncing a marriage valid).

- The speaker's utterance must be understood as fulfilling its intended function.

- The recipient must acknowledge the act and its implications.

For example, when a referee declares the start of a football game, the essential conditions are met only if the players recognize the authority of the referee and act accordingly. (Levinson , 1983, 74)

Felicity conditions play a crucial role in determining the success of speech acts in communication. Whether in legal, social, or everyday conversations, these conditions help ensure that language functions effectively within a given context. Understanding them is essential for linguists, philosophers, and anyone interested in communication studies.

2.4 Components of Speech Acts

Speech act theory, introduced by J.L. Austin (1962) and later developed by John Searle (1969), provides a framework for analyzing how language is used to perform actions rather than merely convey information. According to this theory, speaking is not only about stating facts but also about performing acts that influence interactions and shape communication. Speech acts consist of three fundamental components: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. These three levels of communication help in understanding how meaning is constructed and interpreted in different contexts.

The locutionary act is the basic act of producing an utterance, which includes the physical production of sounds (phonetics), the structure of words and sentences (syntax), and their conventional meaning (semantics)

(Austin, 1962, 18). In simple terms, it refers to the act of saying something in a grammatically and semantically correct way. For example, the sentence "The sky is blue" consists of a series of words arranged in a meaningful way that conveys a factual statement. However, a locutionary act in itself does not carry communicative intent beyond its literal meaning (Searle, 1969, 25). Despite its fundamental role in speech acts, it is only the first step in conveying meaning.

The illocutionary act represents the speaker's intention behind the utterance (Searle, 1975, 33). It is the function or force of the speech act, such as making a request, giving an order, making a promise, or issuing a warning. For example, when a speaker says, "I promise to help you tomorrow," they are not merely stating an intention but performing the act of making a promise. This layer of meaning depends on social conventions and context; the same sentence may carry different illocutionary forces depending on how and where it is said. The concept of illocutionary acts is central to understanding language as a tool for performing real-world actions rather than just transmitting information (Levinson, 1983, 41).

The perlocutionary act refers to the effect that an utterance has on the listener (Austin, 1962, 45). Unlike locutionary and illocutionary acts, which focus on the speaker's role, the perlocutionary act considers the listener's reaction, which may or may not align with the speaker's intent. For instance, if a teacher tells a student, "You should study harder," the perlocutionary act depends on how the student interprets and reacts to this statement—whether they take it as motivation, criticism, or pressure. Perlocutionary acts highlight the fact that communication is not always predictable and that meaning is co-constructed between speakers and listeners (Searle, 1975. 50). The same utterance can evoke different

responses depending on the listener's background, emotions, and the surrounding social context (Leech, 1983, 55).

These three components—locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary—interact dynamically in communication. Understanding these distinctions allows linguists, psychologists, and communication scholars to analyze how speech functions in real-life interactions. By distinguishing between what is said, what is meant, and how it is received, speech act theory provides insights into the complexities of human communication (Brown & Levinson, 1987,60).

2.5 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Speech acts can be classified based on how explicitly they express the speaker's intention. The distinction between direct speech acts and indirect speech acts is a crucial aspect of pragmatics and was extensively studied by Searle. This distinction helps in understanding how linguistic structure and context influence the interpretation of meaning. (Searle 1975, 68).

A direct speech act is one where the grammatical form of an utterance directly matches its intended communicative function (Searle, 1975, 72). In other words, the syntactic structure clearly corresponds to the illocutionary force of the statement. For example, an imperative sentence such as "Turn off the light" is a direct command, a declarative sentence like "I apologize for being late" is a direct apology, and an interrogative sentence such as "Do you like tea?" is a straightforward question (Leech, 1983, 80). These utterances leave little room for ambiguity because their linguistic form directly conveys their intended meaning. Direct speech acts are common in formal, explicit, or instructional settings where clarity is prioritized.

In contrast**, an indirect speech act** occurs when the speaker's intended meaning does not align explicitly with the grammatical structure of the sentence (Searle, 1975, 85). In these cases, listeners rely on contextual clues and pragmatic inference to interpret the true intent behind the words. For example, instead of saying "Close the window," a speaker might say, "It's getting cold in here." While the latter statement is a factual observation, it can also function as an indirect request for someone to close the window (Brown & Levinson, 1987, 90).

Indirect speech acts are frequently used for politeness, strategic ambiguity, and social harmony. According to politeness theory, proposed by Brown and Levinson (Brown and Levinson 1987,95), speakers often use indirectness to avoid face-threatening acts (FTAs), which are statements that might impose on or embarrass the listener. For instance, instead of bluntly saying, "Lend me some money," a person might say, "I'm a bit short on cash this month." The second version sounds more considerate and less demanding because it gives the listener the option to respond without feeling pressured (Blum-Kulka, 1987, 100).

The use of indirectness varies across different languages and cultures. In some cultures, directness is preferred as a sign of honesty and efficiency, whereas in others, indirectness is valued as a way of maintaining social harmony and respect (Levinson, 1983, 105). For instance, in English-speaking cultures, it is common to ask for things indirectly—"Could you possibly open the door?"—while in other languages, more direct requests may be considered acceptable and not necessarily impolite.

Additionally, **indirect speech acts** are frequently used in hierarchical relationships, such as those between employers and employees, teachers and students, or government officials and citizens (Searle, 1975, 110). A subordinate may say to their manager, "It would be great if we could finish

early today," rather than explicitly requesting, "Can I leave early?" This type of indirect speech helps maintain professional etiquette and avoid appearing too assertive in a workplace setting (Leech, 1983, 115).

The distinction between direct and indirect speech acts highlights the complexity of language as a communicative tool. While direct speech acts provide clarity, indirect speech acts offer flexibility, politeness, and social adaptability. The ability to interpret indirect speech acts is crucial for effective communication, particularly in cross-cultural interactions where misunderstandings may arise due to differing expectations regarding directness and indirectness (Blum-Kulka, 1987, 120).

Chapter Three

3.1 Classification of Speech Acts

In the realm of linguistics and communication, understanding how we use language to convey meaning is essential. The classification of speech acts provides a framework for analyzing the various ways in which utterances can function in conversation. This chapter delves into the intricate world of speech acts, categorizing them into distinct types that reveal not only the literal meanings of words but also the intentions behind them and their effects on listeners. By exploring locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, we uncover the layers of interaction that shape our daily communication, as classified by Austin. (Austin, 1962, 94)

Alternatively, Searle's five main categories—assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations—provide another lens for understanding speech acts. This exploration not only enhances our comprehension of language but also enriches our appreciation of the subtle dynamics at play in human discourse (Searle, 1969, 23).

3.2 Austin's Classification

Austin classifies speech acts into three main categories: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts.

- **Locutionary Acts:** These are the basic acts of producing sounds, words, or phrases. It involves the literal meaning of the utterance.

- **Illocutionary Acts**: This refers to the intended meaning behind the utterance, such as making a promise, giving an order, or asking a question.

- **Perlocutionary Acts:** These are the effects or responses that the utterance has on the listener, including how they interpret the statement and act accordingly.

- Austin's classification emphasizes the importance of context and intention in understanding language use (Austin, 1962. 94).

3.3 Searle's Classification

Searle's taxonomy of speech acts categorizes them into five main types, each defined by the speaker's intention and the function of the utterance:

- **Assertives**: Convey information that can be evaluated as true or false (e.g., "The sky is blue").

- **Directives**: Aim to influence the listener's behavior (e.g., "Please close the window").

- **Commissives**: Commit the speaker to future actions (e.g., "I will help you with your homework").

- **Expressives**: Express the speaker's emotions or attitudes (e.g., "I'm sorry for your loss").

- **Declarations**: Change reality through authoritative statements (e.g., "I now pronounce you husband and wife"). Each type of speech act serves a different function in communication, highlighting the complexity of language use (Searle, 1969, 24).

Conclusion

Speech Act Theory provides a comprehensive and systematic framework for analyzing how language functions beyond the mere transmission of information, emphasizing its role in performing actions and shaping social interactions. By classifying speech acts into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, the theory offers valuable insights into the different dimensions of communication. The locutionary act focuses on the linguistic content of an utterance, the illocutionary act highlights the speaker's intent, and the perlocutionary act concerns the effect on the listener. These categories collectively illustrate how language operates dynamically within human communication.

Moreover, the study of felicity conditions—the contextual and situational factors that determine whether a speech act is successful—further refines our understanding of how meaning is constructed and interpreted. The distinction between explicit and implicit speech acts and the role of indirect speech acts demonstrate the complexity of communication, where meaning often transcends the literal words spoken. For example, in polite requests, sarcasm, or indirect commands, speakers rely on shared social and linguistic knowledge to convey messages effectively.

Despite its significant contributions, Speech Act Theory is not without its challenges. One major difficulty lies in the classification of speech acts, as the boundaries between different types are often blurred. Another issue is the interplay between locution, illocution, and perlocution, where multiple interpretations can arise based on context, tone, and cultural background. However, these challenges do not diminish the theory's impact; rather, they invite further exploration and refinement.

In contemporary communication landscapes, Speech Act Theory remains highly relevant. In an increasingly globalized and digital world, where conversations often take place in multicultural and technological settings (e.g., social media, AI-driven interactions, and online forums), understanding speech acts can enhance cross-cultural communication, discourse analysis, and even human-computer interaction. This highlights the need for continued research in areas such as artificial intelligence, multilingual communication, and pragmatic meaning in digital discourse.

In conclusion, Speech Act Theory remains a cornerstone of linguistic and communicative studies, offering profound insights into how language functions as a tool for action. By deepening our understanding of this theory, we can improve our ability to navigate conversations, interpret intentions accurately, and foster more effective communication in both personal and professional settings. Future research should continue to refine the distinctions within speech acts and explore their applications in emerging communicative domains, ensuring that the theory evolves alongside our ever-changing linguistic landscape.

References:

Agus H. (2016) Speech Acts: Force Behind Words.

Amy B. M. Tsui (1995) English Conversation, Oxford

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words (pp. 14–17). Harvard University Press.

Betty J. Birner. (2013) Introduction to pragmatics.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? Journal of Pragmatics, 11(2), 131-146.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. (1989) Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flowerdew, J. (1990) Problems of Speech Act Theory From an Applied Perspective. PP 79-105.

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

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics, Cambridge University Press. (pp. 74–77)

Searle, J. R. (1979). Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts (pp. 62–65). Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J.L. -Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts (pp. 59-82). Academic Press.

Vanderveken, D. (1990). Meaning and speech acts: Principles of language use (pp. 102–104). Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (1996) Pragmatics. Oxford university press.